

Minutes
UMES Council Meeting 07R-15
2007 February 21
5:30 p.m.

Dean's Conference Room (E2-361 EITC)

Present: Elise Dyck, Adam Coolidge, Gwen Nedohin, Kathryn Hearson, Phil Dompierre, Dr. James Blatz, Douglas Readman, Nathan Kehler, James Mckee, Tyler Shipman, Nathan Jolly, Jessica McCombe, Matt Jones, Scott Hammond, Kelli Goldstone, Jane MacAngus, Garrett Keith, Nhi Le, Chris Nichols, Katie Szilagyi, Ariel Brawerman, Victor Lam, Dario Schor, Daryl Godkin, Dave White, Megan Lusty, Steve Woodrow, Janet Young

Absent with Regrets: Jenelle Salanguit

Absent: Eric Wickstrom, Amy Meacham, Romain Coudiere, Marc Seewald , Rohan Lall, Nemish Budhia, Daisy Yee

Guests (Engineering): Dr. Douglas Ruth, Ante Mandusic, Travis Friesen, Ashun Qureshi, Rober Dekoninck, Arjan Jianfar, Jeremy Pinkos, Leonard Hadi, Nicholas Jackimec, David Costigane, Jonathon Foord, Richard Chaput, Jane Powlak Scrowcroft, Guliean Gateneau, David Boyd, Ryan Bernier, Maeir Olfman, Denis Lu, Brian Peck, Will Darracott, Steve Foubert, Shane Zakluck, Jarvis Penner, Andrew Grierson, Steven Bohrn, Paul Klassen, Evan Thompson, Johnathan Aird, Kayne Dunn, Mui Sen Chong, Boon Sin Gan, Alexander Ashton, Manu Chaudhary, Praneeth Cherukuri, Rahulan Sethupathy, Jordan Thomson ,Parneet Kaur Mavi, Amber Skrabek, Thervene Camana, Burke Libby, Joe Morgan, Irianan Osaghae, Obong Umanah, Eu Wern The, Jeremiah Eady, Carly Delavau, Asadilan Indrabudi, Fajar Firmansyah, Jordan Illott, Kevin Ginter, John Mabee, David Enns

Guests (other): Michael Olson, Paul Taylor, Rachel Gotthilf, Trintte Konge, Cathy Anstey, Carson Jerema, Aisyah Abdkahar, Dharma Bhatt, Navreet Deol, Scott Eklund, Hamed Hendizaeh, Tracy Hunt, Christopher Henry

I. Call to Order – 5:42 p.m.

II. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve agenda (leave 14.2 and 14.3 tabled; include sports and grad Reports to Council)

Moved by: Treasurer

Seconded by: VSE

Motion Passed Unanimously

III. Approval of Minutes from 2007 February 7 (07R-14) meeting

Motion to approve minutes

Moved by: Spirit

Seconded by: Socials

Motion Passed Unanimously

IV. Old/Tabled Business

14.1 Getting involved in UMES next year – Senior Stick

- exec nomination from February 26th – March 5th at 5:30 p.m.
- candidates meeting March 5th at 6 p.m.
- campaigning period from March 7th at 6 p.m. to March 14 at 6 p.m.
- forum on March 12th
- voting on March 15th and 16th

14.3 CFES Congress 2007 Report – Members of CFES Congress Delegation

Tabled

14.4 WEC 2007 Report – Members of WEC Delegation

Tabled

V. New Business

15.1 Proposal to Increase Student Fees – Dean Ruth

- budget overview:
 - Operating income breakdown, total \$12,788,238
 - Operating expenses, -\$257,344
 - Other resources in faculty: part does not belong to Dean (external granting belonging to academic research, operating start-up academic ~\$50000 funds; around \$1,093,067 not Dean's), income funded/individual allocations hides deficits but not actually in accounts, university cannot cover this deficit anymore, using professor's money
- showed first deficit in 2000, ~\$1.5 million in debt in 2006
- central wrote off this debt, but we cannot run any more deficits (there is no more money after paying overheads)
- spending constraints can keep down debt, but cut down quality
- next year: defer recruiting, cut TA budget by 25%, reduce outreach activities; projected operating expenses (with these changes) leave \$36,737 (cannot reduce TAs any more, cannot violate what CEAB was told about spending \$325,000 on new equipment)
- other: building only 80% renovated; no public furniture; to means to maintain building; cannot provide other supports students deserve (TAs, electives, lockers, etc.)
- consequences: we will not lose our accreditation immediately; lack of recruiting leads to more sessional professors and less electives; raiding professors' funds; reducing TA's; serious repercussion possible in 4 to 5 years; accreditation of your program even after you graduate is important to your career
- student referendum (increase engineering courses 40% for a total of ~\$1 million)/approach government for true cost of offering programs (including funding for IEEQ)
- money allocation explained/five criteria needed for tuition raise explained
- what we need: ~\$3.5 million short

- information session: Monday, February 26th, 11:30-12:30 in E2-229; Tuesday February 27th in E2-229; 11:30-13 229; Wednesday, February 28th, 12:30-14:30 in atrium

- accreditation report will be out in approximately 1 week, but decisions are not made until June

- Questions:

- *What is the current accreditation situation?* Everything accredited

- Dave White: *What happens to engineering in Manitoba in 4 to 5 years if accreditation lost?* 80% of engineers in Manitoba are from the UofM so this will not happen and we will do everything to not lose accreditation; would have to write exams if you do not graduate from an accredited program

- *Will faculty lobby government for more money?* Next Wednesday the faculty is asking the government for \$3.5 million

- *What will be the TA situation if the increase is improved?* TA hours will go back to at least what they were at the beginning of this year

- *What about the differential fee?* Differential fee will not apply, international students pay the \$40 increase; condition of referendum

- *Government is increasing how much they pay, why not wait for more funding?* The faculty already knows how much they are getting, doesn't account for much; professor salaries are not competitive anymore

- *Is the money projected from increasing tuition assuming the current number of student?* Yes, totals projected are with a steady enrolment

- Matt Jones: *Besides lobbying the government, is the faculty doing anything else?* Increase does not help operating bottom line, constantly doing fundraising for rooms, scholarships, etc.

- Phil Dompierre: *Is any money going to central?* No, increase of fees is all going to engineering; either the surcharge goes directly or there is an increase in tuition and there is an increase in our baseline

- Kathryn Hearson: *What is the probability of government actually giving more money to cover baseline?* Unlikely, we have barely gotten an increase in funding in 26ish years

- *If we knew we were going steadily in debt why did we wait for now?* Everyone believed the government would allow increase in tuition or help; deferred things; if government doesn't give us money it has to come from students

- *Why can't university work together to restructure and know where money goes?* We have one of the lowest costs of administration in the country; there is not a lot of money wasted at university

- *What about money spent on operating aurora system?* If we hadn't gone to a new system we wouldn't have had anything when the old system decommissioned (old made in 80's); not as bad as problems other universities had; budgeted for new system, government gave rest of money

- *Why is there a \$1 million increase with 1/4 going to bursaries, but only a \$300,000 deficit?* Real deficit is not \$300,000 to \$400,000; trying to keep raising of fees to minimum

- *How come engineering gets such a small portion of university's budget?* Each faculty's Deans would make that same comment

- Rahulan Sethupathy: *If referendum doesn't go ahead and there is no government funding, how will we retain professors?* Sooner or later some professors will go
- *If there were constant funding increases during 90's, why were buildings not done then?* Buildings come out of a different budget
- *If \$20 million was raised for building, why is fundraising costs cut?* Fundraising is expensive and not something that brings immediate result; the person who gives you the money tells you where it goes
- *Why is money used for "fun" stuff?* Most of this money comes from endowment fund (which is controlled by students); a lot of that money has been used to rebuild labs and it really wasn't for that
- *What happens if referendum says we increase tuition by 40%, and then the government says they will give us the money?* Surcharge will be dropped after government funding implementation
- *If we increase tuition fees, the government knows we are getting money, so aren't we giving them an excuse not to help us?* We don't no what governments position is, if they believe there shouldn't be a tuition raise they will come through; cannot wait on government to give us money, we need to solve our own problems
- Dave White: *Is this only a short term solution?* Yes
- Scott Hammond: *After UBC took off their tuition freeze, how did tuition raise?* Some went up 80% over several years
- *University already increased international student fees last year, why can't we pressure central for more funding? How many international students are in the faculty?* The faculty is 16% international students; the money is spent across the university, we get some budget increases
- *International students choose UofM for quality education at a low price and they may go somewhere else, will this put strains on planed budget?* International student fees are expensive everywhere, we cannot help this
- Ariel Brawerman: *Are there any long-term plans/projects how to solve this if government doesn't give money?* Government has to increase funding or tuition fees will increase even more; the government will have to do something with political pressure put on it
- *Are there any plans in case we loose students?* We may loose students because of this, but we have tried to keep lower/same fees as the rest of Western Canada; only place cheaper is Newfoundland; other places will be going up too
- *How will things be in September?* Increase in professors will not be in September (it takes time to recruit); equipment will increase in September

Motion to take a 10 minute recess

Moved by: VSA

Seconded by: Sports

Motion Passed

Meeting resumed at 7:07 p.m.

15.2 Tuition Surcharge Referendum – UMES Executive

- Motion: Tuition Surcharge Referendum (passed around with including governing rules)

- Jane Polak Sowcraft is CRO, chair passed off to her for this part of the meeting

- Discussion:

- Steve Woodrow: *Dean didn't mention that faculty is covering this year's deficits by taking out of professors' operating accounts and paying them back over 2 years; Dean came up with proposal and exec reviewed it (specifically brought forward the second question); Jane Polak Scrowcroft has experience in UMSU, UMES, and EWB; is an unbiased person; UMES brings forward the referendum, council members may campaign, but no space/money of council is aloud to be used; created standing rules so it is fair for all involved; trying to find way to help faculty operation*

- Gwen Nedohin: *I don't see why council will not approve this, why can't we go to students? Why are we even debating this?*

- James McKee: *Details is what we need to talk about; why can't we use council office space to make a poster?* Steve Woodrow: *UMES members may have an opinion, but we felt it would be inappropriate for UMES members to have an advantage*

- Shane Zakluk: *Doesn't UMES appoint 5th floor space?* Steve Woodrow: *We appoint space, but do not control it; student groups have their own issues*

- Scott Hammond: *UMES office is not just for members, lounge for all members, welcome signs, it is everyone's space.* CRO: *The reason is that we feel it will be an unfair advantage to have those resources available, we are already splitting website space; in interest for it being fair the space is off limits.* Steve Woodrow: *The only people with keys/use after hours are council members*

- Katie Szilagy: *Believes clause is wrong stance for UMES to take; as elected representative of students it is not inappropriate to take a stance if we believe it is in the best interest for students.* CRO: *Steve as senior stick talked about UMES being neutral and the 'yes' campaign unattached from UMES*

- Alexander Ashton: *We should all be against a tuition increase for accessibility; there is lower tuition because there are lower standards of living in Manitoba; cannot go up 40% without everything else going up; engineering tuition increase would force people to not be able to spend as much time on hobbies; competition with other universities: we will lose against other cities, bad weather/nightlife; we should focus on other alternatives: seek funding from provincial/federal, talk to admin; increasing tuition has negative impacts*

- Jarvis Penner: *E1-589 available for campaigning.* CRO: *We are discussing the referendum*

- James McKee: *Agrees with Katie to remove clause; this needs to be done, why can't we have a very strong 'yes' campaign?*

- Scott Hammond: *Manitoba does not have bad standard of living, there are low costs of living; cost of education change is very minor to what we will be making after education and what we will be making in the summer; the money we are charging will only make our education better and help me get a better job and do a better job.* CRO: *reminder, we are talking about the motion on the floor*

- Jordan Illott: *UMES was elected by engineering students, therefore UMES has a right to make decision/not to by students; this right is given by democratically appointing students; UMES' role is to speak for students*
- Gwen Nedohin: *We have a right to opinion; we want a real answer, want true statement of what students want*
- Travis Freisen: *Can the selection of campaign teams be clarified?* CRO: there is no requirement, based on CRO and DRO's rule that teams are valid, rule on good will of people
- Manu Chaudhary: *(Goes to hand-out papers. CRO: cannot submit handout because they are bringing forward a campaign team) Respects UMES council efforts, but offended by referendum handles; referendum ultimatums not in spirit of UMES; UMES not responding to questions/rules about referendum, not giving enough notice of referendum, no student consultations were held prior to UMES referendum, deficiencies against UMES constitution; UMES has been pre-campaigning, painting banners in office space/ saw pre-campaigning made over reading week, not enough time to consider issue, undemocratic to hold referendum; no other options, not fair representation. CRO: talking about motion, issues you brought forward can be brought to me*
- Praneeth Cherukuri: *Most people don't know about fee increase, shouldn't the time be decided upon today?* Steve Woodrow: constitution structured for 2 ways to present referendum; society members petition, other is that UMES council brings forward motion (need days and a specific question from the Dean, so we couldn't do this until today); only requires 1 week of campaigning prior to the vote; other issue is that this has come up close to the end of the year; don't want to leave until too late when people want to focus on exams
- Jordan Illott: *Received campaign materials from 'no' side yesterday.* CRO: not about the motion. Steve Woodrow: just as a matter of respect, please speak to the chair, do not make attacking comments. CRO: this is about the motion, there will be a forum next week provided this passes
- Praneeth Cherukuri: *What is the point of the engineering day of action if we have a referendum before? What questions are on referendum?* Steve Woodrow: first question addresses faculty proposal, second put forward by UMES to use as statistic/bring to government; our concern is that by not dealing with this soon the source that faculty uses to balance now (faculty members), may cause young, un-established professors who are the future of faculty to leave; giving 'yes' vote will cause stir in government: you have let us down, will you come through?
- Katie Szilagyi: *Urges UMES to take stance, encourage someone to make motion; will be a lot of support for 'no' side, I think we need to respond; if you consider referendums held against tuition freeze, the one that was successful did have support of student organization; we should take a position, issues of neutrality handled by neutral CRO; at last meeting we wanted to help engineering*

Motion to extend debate 10 more minutes

Moved by: Dave White

Motion Passed

- Janet Young: *Since UMES is about being fair, we could split UMES into 2 sides and have 'no' and 'yes' campaigns to do all the researching for each side; would bring better feelings to support campaigns*

Amendment: Strike “BIFRT that members of UMES council should not use society resources for campaigning purposes” from the motion, and BIFRT UMES will be 1 of the 2 yes campaign teams and that this will be reflected in the rules and allow UMES us of the UMES Council office

Moved by: EC

Seconder: CSME

Not friendly

- Question Period: (Moving chair to Paul Taylor)

- Shane Zakluk: *Are choice of campaign teams drawn at random?*

- Rahulan Sethupathy: *UMES support does not include any resources not defined by referendum*

- Daryl Godkin: *As UMES council is elected/appointed to represent body, UMES represents students and should represent best interests and will have to combat well funded 'no' side, it should be supported by council*

- Steve Woodrow: *There are spending limits; campaigning outside of building out of our control; UMES has been on shaky grounds with members, doing better, but this is controversial issue; faculty has asked us to represent students, they need to make up their own mind; UMES members can be part of campaign teams*

- Jordan Illott: *UMES should support, some groups should support, democratic right*

- Dave White: *Eat hike funded by UMSU/CFS. CRO: there are budgetary constraints*

- Dave White: *Can 'yes' side approach CFS for funding?*

- Elise Dyck: *More people on UMES campaigning for 'yes' side whether or not we are official; we just won't say we are doing it in name of UMES; don't think it will sway vote*

- Alex Ashton: *Don't believe this should be put on table; most important thing UMES will be doing this year; CFS says they want to reduce tuition and it is well known; UMES did not state this before, it probably would've affected voting*

- Manu Chaudhary: *UMES is already on 'yes' side; UMSU on this because engineering students on this and UMSU will stand for this; what will no side do?*

- Travis Freisen: *Was UMES council elected to lead or are they glorified weather vane?*

- Katie Szilagyi: *Representative democracy, many people unaware of university politics; why is UMES any different? Why do we need to be neutral? Why can't we poll student body and say you guys elected us and this is what we believe is in your best interest?*

There is meaning in saying that this is what we say is best; UMSU/CFS say this is what students think in paper, but we won't be able to say that there is a student body behind this; we are engaged in university community and we believe that this is what we think is better

- Rahulan Sethupathy: *Representative democracy, you are elected as voice for that group; we as student council, as representatives of students, want this vote*

- James McKee: *If we have a campaign team made of almost all UMES members, it will could look dishonest/bad if we are doing it behind scenes; if UMES wants to take a stance they should so it is out in the open*

- Daryl Godkin: Intent is to inform students, with strong 'yes' and 'no' sides factual information will be presented and allow students to make educated decision

- Question called:

Amendment: Strike "BIFRT that members of UMES council should not use society resources for campaigning purposes" from the motion, and BIFRT UMES will be 1 of the 2 yes campaign teams and that this will be reflected in the rules and allow UMES us of the UMES Council office

Moved by: EC

Seconder: CSME

For: 17

Against: 5 (Steve Woodrow, Adam Coolidge)

No abstentions

Motion Passed

Back to original motion:

- *If UMES is going to have 'yes' side, can 'no' side have collective vote?* CRO: Once this is passed it is at CRO's discretion, all 4 sides will have the same funding

- *Manu Chaudhary: Have you consulted professional (lawyer) about question? The question sounds biased.* Steve Woodrow: Would you propose a different question?

- *Praneeth Cherukuri: Questions are usually unbiased and without much information; are you in favour of tuition hike? Yes/no.*

- *Daryl Godkin: As to wording of question, worded specifically so that it can be brought to government so that nothing else can happen to it; any amount/type/not bring back to faculty; very specific to outline what will happen so that nothing will be a surprise*

- *Steve Woodrow: Why do you need it to be a question? Voting 'no' says you do not support*

- *Scott Hammond: If wording should be as neutral as possible, you say this is what we want to do, needs to be clear; worded out clearly where money is going*

Amendment: Technical societies can collectively run second 'yes' campaign

Moved by: technical societies-UMSME, IEEE, CSME, CSCE, ASME

Seconded by: Socials

Not friendly

Questions:

- *Dave White: If UMES put forward false campaign, students wouldn't be properly represented; the tech socs may not get randomly selected*

- *Gwen Nedohin: Why can't tech socs join UMES?*

- *Andrew Greyerson: If all yes campaigns are not all under same side, might not be quite as unbiased*

- *Dave White: I agree*

- *CRO: Strongly suggest that amendment does not pass, would not be fair to let other students not have chance to take campaign sides*

- Scott Hammond (tech socs): *We represent large amount of student; don't always like UMES council, may like tech socs more and may then see that they are working together with common goal*

Debate:

- Jordan Illott: *Tech socs represent large number of students; tech socs with name on motion feel that this is what would best represent their student groups; members are not children of UMES, very independent, affiliated but not correct to say children; represent a lot of students and they feel this is what represents their members; it is clear that CFS and UMSU are supporting the 'no' side; need to ensure that space available for 'yes' campaign is allocated to someone who is going to have strong campaign*

- Steve Woodrow: *Need to leave this partially open; wrong place and wrong time to bring UMES and tech socs closer together*

- Kathryn Hearson: *Even though student groups represent a different group of engineers, they are still part of council and have say in council; from outside it would look like we are taking over the 'yes' campaigns; can foresee as a chance, but make UMES look better even though we are taking stance*

- Dave White: *limitless budget from UMSU and CFS; tech socs would have better funding.* CRO: reminder, both sides limited to \$100

- James McKee: *Don't think tech socs will be viewed in league with council; better way to represent students to have UMES and tech socs to have their own campaigns; tech socs would probably allow anyone to join up with them*

- Shane Zakluk: *\$100 budget is for internal use only; UMSU and CFS may want to put huge banners up outside of engineering.* CRO: only engineering students may participate on campaign teams, only engineering students may register a campaign team; \$100 is restraint for all 4 teams or material will be removed; tech soc 'yes' slate would have to be markedly different from UMES slate, would that detract from UMES slate?

Dave White: *Everything has been said*

- Questioned called:

Amendment: Technical societies can collectively run second 'yes' campaign

Moved by: technical societies-UMSME, IEEE, CSME, CSCE, ASME

Seconded by: Socials

For: 4

Against: 12

Abstentions: 4

- Original motion called:

Tuition Surcharge Referendum

For: 17

Against: 0

Motion Passed

- Floor returned to Steve Woodrow

15.3 UMES-Organized Student Demonstration – UMES Executive

- when we talked about potential of referendum, we talked about having a UMES student demonstration, “engineering day of action”
- thoughts on how/where:
 - Rahulan Sethupath: *Should go forward, phase 2, even with tuition fee increase there will still not be enough to fix everything; professional, but still who can yell the loudest*
 - Nathan Kehler: *As many people need to know as possible*
 - Shane Zakluk: *As a small percentage of the university, we should express our views which are unseen*
 - Scott Hammond: *We definitely need to do this; 1st years have not see the worst of the UofM/why we should do this; we need to show what is actually going to happen*
- general consensus is that this is a good idea
- Discussion:
 - Daryl Godkin: *proposed that we go to legislature; have student and professional representation (APEGEM, Manitoba hydro); go forward and protest for more funding for university; both ‘yes’ and ‘no’ sides because all students need the funding*
 - Dr. Blatz: *As faculty representative and board member of APEGM, highly recommend coming forward to board; impacts professionals in province*
 - Alex Ashton: *Need government funding; could probably get funding from CFS for this day, they want to get increased government funding too*
 - Praneeth Cherukuri: *If all those other associations want to come, will that be aloud?*
 - Steve Woodrow: *Tech socs will not have a problem with this*
 - should we convene as all parties after referendum to see what we want to do? dates previously discussed too soon if we want professionals and everyone to take part
 - earliest possible date, Friday, March 9th
 - Alex Ashton: *Makes a stronger point if closer to referendum; more threatening to have before hand*
 - Jordan Illott: *Regardless of results of referendum, it still works well after referendum. If yes, we need your support but we are willing to pay for the future of economic success in province; no then saying we can’t pay more; before referendum people running campaigns may not want to see eye-to-eye during campaigning periods; results good to go with/make strong argument*
 - Shane Zakluk: *We need to ensure that if we have support from UMSU this doesn’t become more university lobbying; it is exclusively engineering, it is our profession that is having the problem*
 - Nathan Kehler: *Can’t rush, need good argument and unified front, but can’t do it too late; everyone needs to know what we are doing and what we are trying to do*
 - Alex Ashton: *CFS would probably still support, probably get more support from engineering students than rest of university*
 - Praneeth Cherukuri: *Can government just fund engineering?*
 - Dr. Blatz: *Faculty council meeting on February 27th*
 - Steve Woodrow: *We want to ask for half day off to get support of this*
 - Dave White: *Built 30 foot Red Lion like in 70’s; may need more than pickup signs; we need to create “professional spectacle”*

- Dr. Blatz: *Is faculty representative, is it the will of council for me to take motion forward to faculty council to support UMES supporting referendum?*
- CRO: *Faculty will remain neutral, individual members can join campaigns*
- Jordan Illott: *Do you need UMES' wishes to put that forward?*
- DR. Blatz: *Wouldn't do it if UMES didn't want it*

Motion that Dr. Blatz brings forward UMES position and asks that faculty supports umes's position

Moved by: SAE

Seconded by: Spirit

Questions:

- none

Debate:

- Jordan Illott: *If this is how engineering professors feel, it would be a great support for UMES' position*
- Nathan Kehler: *I don't think Dr. Blatz needs our support*
- Garrett Keith: *If you think faculty can campaign on its own, it could hurt 'no' sides if faculty supports 'yes'*
- Manu Chaudhary: *Could there be biased grading?*
- Steve Woodrow: *If evidence against there would be issues, but is addressed in ROASS*
- Manu Chaudhary: *If Dean said he was going to remain neutral, the faculty should be neutral*
- Steve Woodrow: *Faculty council can adopt position*
- Praneeth Cherukuri: *If all faculty is taking part it is completely influencing voting; we are not against UMES, we are against fee hike; we don't have same opinions as professors and they can influence students greatly*
- Jordan Illott: *All comes down to what faculty decides is appropriate, it is not inappropriate for us to ask*
- Dave White: *Affects faculty members as a whole quite a bit, don't think it should be put for by UMES; could be put forward by faculty if they think that this is what they want*
- Nathan Kehler: *Faculty not voting, but results affect members; they can support side that they want*
- Shane Zakluk: *Moral could affect teaching abilities; not be able to pay grad students/do research; detrimental if these opinions are affecting class*
- Steve Woodrow: *Faculty represents faculty; if they believe they should support this they should have it come from their own position, not that students ask them to do it*

- Question called:

Motion that Dr. Blatz brings forward UMES position and asks that faculty supports umes's position

Moved by: SAE

Seconded by: Spirit

For: 2

Against: 6

Abstain: 6

Motion defeated

- agreement that proceeding forward with demonstration is a good idea
- date suggested: Wednesday, March 28th (2 weeks until end of classes)
 - Shane Zakluk: *Wednesday p.m. most beneficial*
 - Gwen Nedohin: *In morning, not during lab time or faculty may not be as supportive*
- meet again as group for demonstration: wait until after referendum
 - Rahulan Sethupathy: *Some sort of ad hoc committee, should be formed with someone in charge of it; should organize that government is actually in session*

Motion that Alex Ashton is chair of Engineering Demonstration Committee struck as of tonight, dissolved by first day of exams; mandate to organize demonstration; members to be selected.,

Moved by: Sports

Seconded by: CSCE

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstention: 1 (Jessica McCombe)

Motion Passed

- Alex will call meeting ASAP

15.4 Pi-Throw Report – Pi-Throw Chair

- went well, thanks to volunteers and participants
- \$3675 raised for career trek

VI. Reports to Council

Grad – need somebody to sign for the grad liquor license: Chris Nichols

Sports – need volunteers for Spongee on March 2nd (umsafe and referees), sheet passed around

VII. Adjournment – 9:02 p.m.

Motion to adjourn

Moved by: Yearbook

Seconded by: Treasurer

Motion Passed Unanimously