



3rd General Assembly at the President's Meeting of the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students

October 1-4, 2009
Vancouver, BC



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 10:47

2. Call for quorum

The number of voting members present is 32 out of 47

3. Election of plenary chair and secretaries

Proposal Proposition	
02-CFESPM-1 / 02-FCEEGRdP-1	
Title:	Election of the plenary chair Élection du président de plénière
Mover:	National Executive Exécutif national
Language :	English Anglais

Goal:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•

Where as:

Be it resolved that:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ryan Campbell be elected as plenary chair.



Result / Résultat:

For / Pour	32
Against / Contre	0
Abstain / Abstention	0



Proposal
02-CFESPM-2

Title: Election of secretaries | Élection des secrétaires de plénière
Mover: National Executive | Exécutif national
Language : English | Anglais

Goal:

Where as:

Be it resolved that:

- Marie-Claude(French) as well as Julia Coleman (English) be elected as secretaries for the plenary session.

Result | Résultat:

For Pour	32
Against Contre	0
Abstain Abstention	0



4. Adoption of the agenda

	Proposal Proposition
	40-CFESPM-3
Title:	Agenda Ordre du jour
Mover:	National Executive Exécutif national
Language :	English Anglais

Goal:

Where as:

Be it resolved that:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The agenda be adopted as circulated.

Result Résultat: passed	
For Pour	31
Against Contre	0
Abstain Abstention	1



5. Hearing of Proposals

Proposal | Proposition

02-CFESPM-4

Title:	Evaluations made by the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board é Évaluations fait par le Bureau canadien d'agrément des programmes de génie
Mover:	Polytechnique
Secunder:	Sherbrooke
Language:	Français

Goal:

- Allow the engineering societies to make sure that the programs available at their institution are accredited and that the students get their diploma at the end of their studies.
- Permettre aux associations étudiantes en ingénierie de s'assurer que les programmes donnés dans leur institution soient accrédité et que les étudiants auront leur diplôme d'ingénieur à la fin de leurs études.

Where as:

Be it resolved that:

- That the executive of CFES approach the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board to investigate the possibility to have the evaluations of programs made available to the engineering societies.
- Que l'exécutif de la FCEEG approche le Bureau canadien d'agrément des programmes de génie afin d'étudier la possibilité de rendre les évaluations fait par celui-ci disponible pour les associations étudiantes.

Result: PASS

For	25
Against	5
Abstain	2



Poly:

Sherbrook: agreed with poly

Ottawa: Support the motion, concerned about wording in the 'be it resolved' wants it to be more definite.

Poly: If it's written looser it might be easier to do. Schools might be angry with it.

Western: Why isn't this info available?

poly: they just don't have to make it available

UvicA: the spirit of the motion makes sense, but I'm worried about a few things. The NE has a lot to do now anyways, they don't have that much time to do this. what is that point? so you know, is this more an school-to-school based question and not a CFES problem?

ETS: the point is that we have the evaluations of teachers and we have the power to change the program, so if we know what's wrong we can fix it.

Queens: I understand that it's important to know if your school is accredited or not, because you're paying for it. Everytime that I have asked for this kind of info I have got it, I agree with Uvic A, I think it's more of an internal thing (school to school basis)

Sask: agree with UvicA, I think most schools make it clear, especially when you're up for accreditation like we were last year, everyone knew, and wanted us to know.

Calgary: I think this is more of a safety net.

NatExec: the info they get would be: classes they look at, ect. what poly is looking for is more than just knowing if you're accredited, the more info you have the better, almost make a list of what you want to know

UvicA: I feel like the schools will get the info about accreditation and worry about losing it, and maybe the info isn't made public because they have bigger problems (staying accredited)

poly: I don't think that it's that much work, my school would like it better than a CE course.

Sherbrooke: It's just like a condom, you have it in your pocket, you use it if you need it.

Queen's: York just lost their accreditation, it's a bad situation, students aren't getting diplomas. they knew they were up for it and knew they probably wouldn't get it. Knowing that you're up for it isn't going to help your school stay accredited. how does this help

toronto: knowledge is power.

waterloo b: queens you said there are better things to do, can you clarify?

nat exec: to clarify, it's not simply a issue of knowing when it's knowing what led up to this. we do evaluations. if you know what those problems are you can start to fix them. it's nice to think you can trust the admin to deal with this but it's nice to be prepared.

Sask: call to question



Proposal
03-CFESPM-5

Title: Regional Agreement
Mover: National Executive
Seconded:
Language: English

Goal:

- To define a relationship between the CFES and ESSCO and between the CFES and the QCESO.

Where as:

- No such agreement exists;
- Both QCESO and ESSCO have approved the agreements

Be it resolved that:

- The CFES adopt the CFES/QCESO regional agreement;
- The CFES adopt the CFES/ESSCO regional agreement

Result: passed

For	22
Against	4 (UVICA)
Abstain	6(UVICB)



National exec: this has been developed with the regions and the bod, this is to clarify the relations between the regions. ACES and WESST had organizations set up different, but ESSCO and QCESO had to pay observer fees to attend events

Ontario: this was drafted with the ESSCO president, and ESSCO has approved it

Quebec: same

sask: in ESSCO agreement it said 2 exec members, does that include ontario ambassador?

nat exec: no, they are on the nat exec.

sherbrooke: how come ontario gets two seats, and qcseo only gets one?

toronto: so qcseo gets to go to pm and only one at congress

quebec: that's just what we decided on

ottawa: weren't these agreed on?

nat exec: if they want to make change later, it has to be voted on.

sherbrooke: we have three ppl from ontario, you don't really need more than one to observe.

western: what three?

chair: at least two from exec, plus ambassador

mcgill: if they wanted to be changed, both parties need to adopt them?

nat exec: yes.

western: yes maybe you only need more one observer for info sake, but more than one would help get regions get closer

sask: doesn't making them pay observer fees to observe make sense?

nat exec: we're all poor societies, they might have to bump up their student fees to try to afford it

sask: then should we all only pay \$200?

nat exec: we charge observer fees to societies in the states, ect. and these societies are part of the org.

nat exec (ont): having a place where presidents are able to easily meet is important, you can learn a lot

ets: can i move to ammend qceso

sask: congress input maybe?

congress 2010: i like money, but i'll do what you tell me to. it's only like 2000 to 3000 dollars

ets: move to amend the QCESO agreements to include 2 representatives at congress

Laval: seconds

ETS: the more the better. Let's have two

Laval: wave

Saskatchewan: instead of agreements,



toronto: does ESSCO also want to invite 1 person to PM?

Sarah: ESSCO usually only invites 1, we could add but don't think anyone has time to come

nat exec: idea behind delegate: debate many times, I think starting point is invite one or two people, not sure if same benefit of having 5 or 6 vs 1 or 2, this is a good starting point

mgill: due to structure of west and atlantic, they have representation, isn't this creating a disparity?

sask: won't affect anything, only one person from school can go, but more than one can go from essco? it's not fair for the schools individually

concordia: in quebec, lots of school are small, can't afford; might be better to go as quebec rep to observe instead, even if no vote, can still be there

nat exec: more even playing field, if sarah/laura are happy, and regions are happy, then we should vote

chair: question is whether this doc is better than the one before

in favour: 23

opposed: 0

abstention: 9

Ammendment Passes

No more discussions

NE: this is good. we can change this at plenary. Yay

Western: is the fee scaled? Yup. This is bad for ESSCO

Poly: ammend the Quebec Agreement to make it fees scaled

NE: second

UVICA: we are giving Quebec and Ontario extra people. This is unfair to WESST and ACES

NE: WESST and ACES attend for free. And can be supported by CFES for funding and travel. Make a regional agreement if you decide you don't like your cut. The ball is in your court.

UNBC: who comes to congress?

NE: the BOD gets to go for free. WESST and ACES each have a representative on BoD.

UVIC A: Now ESSCO and QCESO send two people, but everyone else gets one.

NE: I think that's something we should discuss, and you should bring to your region. Equal representation should exist, and if you feel that your region could benefit from sending more, please bring this up to them.

WaterlooB: If your region has already dismissed this, then you can bring it up to them for changes.

NE: Point of reference, for years ESSCO and QCESO have been left out. Based on this structure, the fee that the WEST and ESSCO and QCESO pay ends up being very similar. Additional changes that would make it exactly equal for everyone would require changes to the constitution.



Ottawa: Call question.

31 in favor, 1 abstain.

Speaker: All those in favour for this amendment of changing the QCESCO to be the same as ESSCO.

28 in favour, 4 abstain

Ottawa: Call the question.

Speaker: All in favour of ending debate:

29 in favour, 3 abstain.

NE: Should we have a recess?

Speaker: Any amendments to the time?

None

Speaker: All in favour of 10 min recess?

9 in favour, 12 opposed, 11 abstain.

Speaker: Move to vote

6. Voting

7. Closing of the Assembly/Adjournment

Moved by: EXEC

Seconded by:

Meeting adjourned at 11:56