society of graduate & professional students
CANADIAN FEDERATION OF STUDENTS LOCAL 27

MINUTES
Society of Graduate and Professional Students' Council
Local 27 of the Canadian Federation of Students
Tuesday, March 22nd 2011, 5:30pm
Robert Sutherland Room, JDUC

1. Presentations

Grad Club – Ryan Kelly Club's primary focus is to serve as a welcoming environment for graduate students. We have made several improvements is the purchase and installation of live music and sound. Two new LCD TVs and renovated bathrooms. We have new chairs for inside and the patio. We also convinced the university to get us a new roof. We have installed security cameras installed and there have been some instances over the past year that encouraged me to get these installed. We will have an official mission statement and strategic plan at our AGM which is occurring next Thursday. If you want to have a say in how it is run please come to the AGM.

Academic Task Force
Iain Reeve - I am serving in capacity of the academic task force - Steve Tanner, Mark Jones, Petra Fachinger, Peter Taylor. We have been undergoing an academic planning process over the past year. This came forward from the principal and not having an academic plan. We should have such a plan to guide our financial, research decisions. We are hopefully in the last step of this process. This is our main opportunity to interact with graduate students. We are also just here to hear general comments we would be happy to hear them and incorporate them when we are drafting our plan.

Daniel Moore – I wonder if it would be productive what do graduate students bring to Queen's – same as any other school – but what is exactly is it that Queen's offer to graduate students? What is unique about that? It may be interesting to think of that as a proactive measure. It would be good for the future.

Iain Reeve – We are considering that.

Jawad Qureshy – Where are we in the process? When is this exercise going to be completed?

Peter Taylor – We are presenting a preliminary report at the senate meeting in April. There is a big job of implementation. Different groups are going to implement this in different ways. We want to ensure that these ideas can work. At the end of April we should have an idea of the vision. During the summer we are going to think about process and implementation which cannot be done too quickly as you have to test things out. It should come together by the Senate meeting in September

of a plan that can be finalized.

Shaughnessy Hawkins – Commendation of this work.

Jawad Qureshy – Could you explain by each of the four pillars that plan is going to be built.

Iain Reeve – As we have been consulting with groups acorss campus we have come up with four pillars – the first is fundamental academic literacy – building the essential academic skills. Second – disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity. Third – global citizenship – students should be competent about other cultures. Fourth – about community, health wellness. Is Queen's a good place? What type of values do we want to see on campus?

Jillian Burford-Grinnell – Where does the research fit?

Mark Jones – Core mission gets at research. The pillars are trying to define the student learning environment.

Usman Mushtaq – I am wondering if one of you could speak on global citizenship and how this relates to international students?

Petra Fachinger– Internationlization is only one facet of global citizenship.

Usman Mushtaq– What does this mean in relation to the types of students that we attract at Queen's?

Steve Tanner – What I really hope is that if not hear, afterwords that those interested in these issues can look on the website and articulate the views you would like to share. What do you think that relationship should be? Go and write down what you have to say about that.

Iain Reeve – We are conscious about the potential benefits of internationalization. We are trying to consult with international groups on campus. We are not trying to be overly prescriptive and talk about broad values.

Kalanthe Khaiat – If there is to be a preliminary presentation in April and the finalized implemention in September is there opporuntity to communicate then or should students get involved now?

Steve Tanner – We would like to hear from students as soon as possible. This is an interactive and open-ended process. Once we have a general idea we can then make changes.

Amir Nosrat – We did voice our concern to Principal Woolf as there seems to a problem bringing international students into this process. We would sincerely appreciate any help.

Steve Tanner – Could you send me the version of the letter.

Iain Reeve – we are going to have an open town hall on the 29th about global citizenship. I encourage you to come

Audience member - Broad conceptual issues. How can you implement such ideas?

Petra Fachinger– We hope the writing centre is going to take a central role.

Steve Tanner – We are making general recommendations to faculties. We are hoping to make recommendations that will materialize in certain ways. We have tried to announciate general enough principals under the pillars. In general students should have general training in writing, but we cannot go into the faculties and tell them how to implement that.

Iain Reeve – This document will give consistency.

2. Adoption of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION 03/22/11:1
Moved _____Iain Reeve_____ / ___Eric Rapos_____ BIRT the agenda for March 22nd, 2011 be adopted.

Eric Rapos– Question about procedures and conflicting motions.

Michael Bravo – We start with the first motion and if that fails we move to the second. If that fails we move to the third. If one goes through the other cannot be put through.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell – We will have the opportunity to discuss all three motions during the first motion.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:2
Moved ____Marvin Ferrer_ _____ / ___Meghan Bylsma_____ BIRT the minutes for the March Council Meeting be accepted.

Carried

3. Executive and Speaker Reports

a) President – Jawad Qureshy (report attached)
Thank You Michal Bravo - Hello all - I'd just like to start by saying that this is my one chance to report on the entire year so I will be taking a few minutes longer than usual ...

But instead of talking about the specifics of each initiative I have been involved in - I think it is better for me to speak about a particular part of my job - so I am sure you know that it is part of my job to be the official spokesperson for the SGPS - so that is the specific part of my job that I would like to speak about and how that has played out over the year.

I have found this role of representative to be an interesting - and telling - position to be in. Interesting because I have had some ability to influence people's thoughts about the SGPS and telling because in my meetings I get to see a wide variety of people around campus and they often tell me exactly what they think of the SGPS - often quite explicitly.

So this is what I'd like to report on ... Give a strategic overview of where I think we stand relative to the rest of Queen's ...

When I became President many months ago - the SGPS was considered quite unhelpful to Queen's because we had decided as a membership not to pay into the Queen's centre. At the BOT and the Principal's Office - we were looked upon as an ungrateful organization, happy to enjoy the benefits of campus renewal, but unwilling to pay in order to enjoy
its benefits. At the first BOT meeting I attended as President-elect, the membership of the SGPS was explicitly maligned as lacking of school spirit and any vision for Queen's. What was worse was that at that point in time - it also seemed that the QC was the only thing that many people in senior administration were willing to speak us about seriously ... And - when they saw that they weren't really getting anywhere with that particular initiative - many seemed to lose interest in what we had to say about other issues.

So this is what my role as representative has been about over the last year - It has been to begin conversations on other fronts while also responding to critique that we have no vision for Queen's as displayed by our refusal to pay into the capital budget of the QC.

The QC conversation is not quite over, but is dying. Other conversations however - are doing much better than they were a year ago. Our relationship with the SGS has improved - they actually gave us money this year (thanks to DM in particular). Our relationship with Student Affairs has also entered into a new phase (they also gave us money - thanks to both JBG and DM). Our relationship with the BOT has become more complex in the sense that they no longer see us as just sources of money but as a teaching / research / public policy resource (Thanks to SH / AMG / DM - whose ideas I shamelessly plagiarize in my speeches at the Board). Even at Richardson Hall - our advice is taken more seriously than it was when I started - and we are often consulted by the Provost in order to head off problematic initiatives before
they become official policy. To me all of this has NOT happened just because this year's executive is awesome (the people I have worked with are awesome, but that is not the whole story).

To me - our success is also due to the fact that we have articulated a different, more coherent vision for Queen's - and if our vision is taken more seriously today - it is because we occupy a special position at Queen's and use that position to reflect upon the needs of our students wisely.

So what is this special position that we have claimed on your behalf? There are a few themes that come up consistently...

First - we have made it obvious to people that we neither want nor will we be forced into replicating the same relationship with the administration that the AMS enjoys - most of us are adults, we have a more complex membership - with more diverse students. As an executive, we are also responsible to a student body that wishes to be recognized
on its own terms - so trying to push us around will get people nowhere. For the most part - this stance has worked quite wellWe also connect parts of the campus together in the way that nobody else has quite managed to do - whether it is West Campus students / off campus students, post-residency students, professional students, graduate students - we have a role to play. Even looking at things through a functional lens - we connect the teaching / research / public policy / student life functions of the University in a way that nobody else on campus can quite do ... So consulting with the SGPS
allows a reach of scope that is quite beyond our numbers. We are the connective tissue between parts of the student body that normally wouldn't connect - so we are both special and quite crucial to coherent policy-making at Queen's.

Another theme that has come up is that we have our own, complex views on where the University is headed. So our initial opposition / input into the Academic plan has not been just about large class sizes or the possibilities and impossibilities of virtualization. We have consistently made a case for the role of our graduate students in teaching / research and the role of our professional students in the public service functions of the University. For example, as Queen's renews its curriculum, the most innovative improvements to its course portfolio actually come from TF's - whose unique courses drives Queen's claims about educational excellence. With every iteration of the Academic Plan - it is this vision that is being reflected in the documents produced - and I am hopeful that this will continue.

Despite these gains, there are some who continue to question the representative abilities of the SGPS - some of this has surfaced in the Rector debate - and I am sad to say that some people still want to speak to us about the QC, but I am also glad that this is no longer the only prism through which SGPS members are now seen ...

I suppose that if there is one thing I have learnt on your behalf over the year - it is this. We are good at, and frequently march to our own tune. SGPS Council is a thoughtful, deliberative body - one that has good reasons for every position it takes - and we are comfortable taking uncomfortable positions if that is what our students deserve. This is not a weakness of the SGPS - it is exactly our strength - and I thank you all for hiring me to help articulate this to the rest of
Queen's over the past year.

b) VP Graduate – Daniel Moore (report attached)
Want to thank the executive I had the privilege of working with. I have put a lot of thoughts in regards to academics such as an academic commissioner. Academic issues bring forward other issues on campus. There is nothing dry or useless talking about academics. I am confident in the incoming executive to do that.

c) VP Professional – Shaughnessy Hawkins (report attached)
The engagement we have as law students is fairly reactive. I think we have been more effective this year is due to the productive goals and targets that we set in conversation. Oftentimes good ideas are brought forward I am the advocate for professional students that are often not going to like such ideas. I think the ESS has been an excellent example of professional students that we can engage with. I hope law students see this relationship and see it as positive. I encourage other LSS members to be productive and proactive. I think they have listened to my perspective and the exec has worked to find compromises. I believe this is a 180 change and see that they are more amenable to the needs of professional students.

Andrew Stevens – The LSS created a document about the relationship between them and the SGPS. How has this informed your decisions and policies that you have tried to enact this year.

Shaughnessy Hawkins – I think it is an excellent report. I have written a response to the report about things we are going as an organization to address what we have done and what we plan to do. It has influenced my decisions and how I have engaged in this role. It has helped me serve law student needs this year.

d) VP Campaigns and Community Affairs – Anne-Marie Grondin (report attached)

You'll find a general description of my activities over the last year in my report. I want to take the next few minutes to share some of my perceptions on their level of effectiveness. First, on the issue of campaigns: the SGPS Executive and staff have done an amazing job advocating individually on the membership's behalf this year. As you are well aware, however, our lobbying efforts are rarely as strong as when the Executive, or when Council endorses a particular request. In the same way, advocacy can be rendered more powerful if we reach out to other student organizations to support our efforts. This isn't always necessary, but it is an option to keep in mind, and one that I fear has been somewhat discarded simply because many of our connections to other organizations are through the CFS.

Similarly, the very mention of 'campaign' seems at times to arouse suspicion with Council. I hope that you know me well enough by now to feel reassured that, when I say I want to work further at promoting campaigns this year, I don't mean calling on people to picket, to stage a takeover of the Office of Advancement, or to jeopardize the relationships, and the reputation we have worked hard to protect. Awareness-promotion campaigns such as the Equity Team's Accent Discrimination Campaign, the Open-Access Campaign, or the Bottled-Water Free Day Campaign are often conducted in collaboration with those very people whose esteem we hope to foster. In fact, each of the campaigns I have just mentioned have allowed us to build rapport with these parties, and to promote the SGPS as an organization which cares about our campus and our members' needs. Over the next year, I think we can capitalize on our successful relationships to respectfully advance these needs even further through new campaigns, which I will tell you more about at our next regular Council meeting.

As for my thoughts on equity: the road to achieving equity is a long and an arduous one. For several reasons, it is difficult to measure our successes in this regard. Our best indicator of success would consist of no longer needing an Equity Team, a D.E.T., equity employment criteria, and so on, to advise us on how to 'become' more equitable, were we to simply 'be' equitable. Notwithstanding our continued conscious efforts, however, we are not yet there. Nonetheless, this doesn't mean that we haven't been effective as equity advocates. On the contrary, the SGPS has demarcated itself as a defender and promoter of equity this year, not only within enclosed pockets, but as an organization as a whole – and we have been recognized as such by several notable groups who do equity work on campus. I think our now well-established relationship to these groups will continue to benefit the SGPS in the future.

Still, I want to suspend my official pronouncement on our progress this year, pending the outcome of our membership's ruling on the matter of removing our University Rector. I will keep my specific comments on the matter for our discussion, but at this point, I only want to relay some concerns brought forward at a Senate Educational Equity Committee meeting I attended late last week. Specifically, though the controversy has been framed as one of misrepresenting the Queen's community, a careful reading of the Rabble.ca article reveals that, in fact, the Rector was defending an educational event happening on our campus. By condoning him for doing so, we and others might be seen as working against some of the Senate Educational Equity Committee's mandates, such as to:

- Promote activities that foster a safe, supportive and inclusive campus community that values diversity;

- Promote opportunities to share experiences and diverse perspectives among campus members;

In this sense, the freedom to defend educational spaces is quite intimately tied to the promotion of educational equity, and to the provision and maintenance of an educational environment that is

inclusive of all social identities – not through absolute consensus opinion, but by ensuring that all divergent identities are afforded fair and equal opportunities to engage in educational activities on campus. I urge you to keep these concerns in mind as the meeting unfolds, and, in closing, ask again that we conduct ourselves in a way supportive of the same principles I just mentioned.

David Myers – I would like to ask about CSF on equity – There is a maximum of four defederation issues per year.

Anne-Marie Grondin – I attended the first annual general meeting. I want to make sure that when I am talking about equity I am talking about the equity committee here at Queen's. I haven't talked about CSF and equity. I think your concerns are shared and valid, and shared by our students and students on campuses. The CSF is membership driven. The membership has tended to be graduate or undergraduate students and not professional students. I think it is important to come to Caucus and address these concerns.

Clair – So you only need 20% of the student body which would represent the remaining 80%?

Anne-Marie Grondin – The Canadian federation would need 20% of the population in order to go to referendum.

e) VP Finance and Services – Jillian Burford-Grinnell (report attached)
Most of time was spent with the SLC. Discussing a management and operation agreement and a new constitution. Most members will know that we have asked for more offices, social space. After many years this came into fruition. There is the social lounge along with offices down the hall. We are having a ribbon cutting ceremony soon. Child care is still a pressing need – please contact us with thoughts on this.

f) Speaker – Michael Bravo (report attached)

MOTION 03/22/11:3
Moved __Eric Rapos_____ / __Carolyn Prouse_____ BIRT Executive and Speaker reports be accepted.

Carried

4. Committee, Commissioner, Senator, B of T and Other Reports

A) Graduate Student Senator – Iain Reeve (no report)
B) Board of Trustees – Benjamin Grant (report attached) – committee report I encourage you to find Jawad's email and fill out the survey.
C) Committee Reports (reports attached)
D) Commissioner Reports
   i) Social Commissioner – Abdullah Abunafeesa (no report)
   ii) Communications Commissioner – Sean Richards (report attached)
   iii) Equity Commissioner: Carolyn Prouse (report attached)
      We are trying to institutionalize anti-opression, equity issues. One of the things I have been able to do with queen's accessibility award which has been broadened to students. The nominations close on March 31st for this award.
E) Other Reports
   i) Equity Coordinator – Kalanthe Khaiat (report attached)

We are now in a position where we have the most voice by inputing comments to this academic report. March is the month for everything the equity committees exists. This is an exciting time to work in equity. We have an event at 2 PM in Stauffer this Monday in the speakers corner about learning disabilities.

Marvin Ferrer – Could you comment on the value of those awareness weeks contributes to diversity on campus?

Kalanthe Khaiat – There is always at least one event that is dedicated to academic inquiry during these awareness events. The value in holding these awareness weeks in academic settings fosters meaningful dialogue from diverse backgrounds and diverging social backgrounds.

ii) International Students Coordinator – Amir Nosrat and Becky Pero (no report)
I submit my resignation one month early.

iii) Sustainability Coordinator – Ivana Zelenika (no report)

iv) Athletics Coordinator – Amanda Leonard (no report)

v) Logistics Coordinator – Corey Valinsky (no report)

vi) Planning Coordinator – Nicole McCallum (no report)

vii) Rector – Nick Day (no report)
I attended some meetings at the advancement committee. I continue to work with the water access group about raising awareness about the water bottle on campus. The most important is the Queen's academic planning committee. You should be aware that recent meetings have seen presentations from Deans about faculty budgets. Everything has been cut that they can. They cannot survive without structural changes to the budget. Tricolour award nominations have all been received.

Andrea – How one would get a hold of the water awareness group.

Nick Day – Contact me.

viii) Chief Returning Officer – Mikhail Kellawan (report attached)
We have a bi-election with the CFRC which will be happening March 28th, 29th. This is online only.

ix) Departmental Reports

Eric Rapos – Annual conference to open all of SGPS. Not a lot of attendance outside of computing. There will be another one held next year. We are moving into our third year. I would still like to get computing involved with SGPS.

MOTION 03/22/11:4
Moved ____Mark Rosner_____ / ___Andrew Stevens_____ BIRT Senator/Board of Trustees/Commissioner/ Coordinator / Committee, and Other reports be accepted.

Carried

5. Question Period/Departmental Issues

6. Business Arising from the Minutes

7. Main Motions

MOTION – 2nd reading of proposed Bylaw Change 03/22/11:5
Whereas Council has already passed the first reading of this bylaw change and is required to pass the second reading at the March AGM

MOVED ___Kalanthe Khaiat_____/__Abdullah Abunafeesa_____BIRT B.9.2a be amended as follows: The following constitute the Appointees of Council, and shall be responsible for assisting Council and the Executive with a specific aspect of the SGPS' operations, and are responsible for reporting to Council:
(1) Communications Commissioner
(2) Social Commissioner
(3) Equity Commissioner
(4) International Students Affairs Commissioner
(4) Education Coordinator
(5) Equity Coordinator
(6) International Students Affairs Coordinator
(7) Web Coordinator (webmaster)
(8) Logistics Coordinator
(9) Planning Coordinator
(10) Athletics Coordinator
(11) Layout Coordinator
(12) Academic Affairs Standing Committee

MOTION – 2nd reading of proposed Bylaw Change 03/22/11:5-M1
MOVED ___Daniel Moore_____/__Anne-Marie Grondin_____BIRT that the number (12) be striken from the list.

Carried

MOTION – 2nd reading of proposed Bylaw Change 03/22/11:5-M2
MOVED ___Daniel Moore_____/__Anne-Marie Grondin_____BIRT that (4) Education Coordinator by moved to (12).

Carried

MOTION – 2nd reading of proposed Bylaw Change 03/22/11:5 – AS AMENDED

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:6
Whereas recent discussions surrounding IAW (Israel Apartheid Week) have been highly charged, leaving some of our members to feel that they cannot freely and safely engage in the democratic process in person at the AGM;
and

Whereas members of the ESS are unable to vote in person at the AGM because of course-based practicums.

MOVED ____Logan Crowell_____ / __Shaughnessy Hawkins_____ BIRT the SGPS hold a referendum on 5 April 2011 and 6 April 2011, in accordance with P.7.1.3., stating the questions:

1. Should the SGPS formally recommend to the University Council of Queen's University that Nick Day be:
A) removed from his office as Rector
B) not be removed from his office as Rector
C) be censured

The results will be conveyed to the University Council, including a statement in the form as follows: Of the SGPS members that voted on the question to make a recommendation to University Council regarding Nick Day, ___ % voted in favour of removal, ___ % voted not in favour of removal, and ___ % voted in favour of censure.

2. Should the SGPS officially add its name to the petition written by the organizers of 'Support Academic Freedom & Queen's University Rector Nick Day'?

Michael Bravo – This motion sends to referendum both of these two questions. Whatever recommendation is made to the university council the statement of the results must be included when given to the university council.

Shaughnessy Hawkins – The reasoning is ultimately up to you about what you would like to do. This meeting I don't believe could go forward without this option. I think that certain people couldn't be here is a structural problem that we need to look at for next year. I think we lose the voice of people that may not want to sit through a meeting that is highly charged. This provides people with the option to engage in more meaningful conversation.

Eric Rapos – I don't feel this is the best place to address this issue as this is not representative of SGPS.

Michael Bravo – The reason we have included both motions is so that we can disucss all the issues pertaining to this. If you want to make a change you can make amendments.

Iain Reeve - I am in favor of this motion. I think that everyone in SGPS should have the option to raise their concerns about this issue. I think there is a need for open dialogue. If we do go forward with this motion perhaps there would be another opportunity in a different setting to voice certain concerns.

Sylvia – Against the motion. I am sure that graduate students who do practicums may not have access to internet who will therefore not be able to participate.

Connor Langford – I support this motion. I think this is the right idea to make it open to other students. I am going to propose an amendment to questions 1 and 2.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M1
MOVED ____Connor Langford_____ / __Iain Reeve_____ BIRT that first referendum question

be changed to a "yes/no" question and that the second referendum question by removed.
Mark Rosner – I think giving students the option to censure is not problematic in the least. If students chose censure they want the individual to stay. I don't see the harm in providing them with these three options.

Charan Rainford - I think that censure could be a separate question.

Leah – Nick Day has already been censured and has not actually changed anything in his conduct.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M1:1
MOVED ____Lauren_____ / __Eric Rapos_____ BIRT that a separate question be added that reads "Nick Day be censured/not censured".

Connor Langford– I think we should ask the primary question first. I think if students come forward about a motion to censure then we would engage in another referendum. I speak against this amendment.

Steven - Amendment to amendment clouds the issue. Separating this out as Mark's suggests clouds the issue. It muddies an overly complicated issue.

Jawad Qureshy – Speak against. I think a yes/no question is completely false. The question itself has not come from students. I would like to comment on the censure of Nick Day – the SGPS has never censured the rector before.

Lauren – I am against the amendment to the amendment. This is a very contentious issue. Students may want more discussion. For the moment students may be more comfortable with a censure. I don't want to continue down a path that is already toxic.

Mariane – I want to speak against the amendment to the amendment.

Logan Crowell – Binary is not relevant here. What we don't want to present a confusing option which is what a three point question is. I don't think we should do this by presenting a confusing question. This would allow students to answer one question and move on to the next. The point is very accurate, you have to phrase it so there is no ambiguity. In a three-way option they do not have the choice to select one and another if they so wanted to.

Eric Rapos – It gives four possible options to answer the question. Not removing and not censuring needs to be an option.

Shaughnessy Hawkins – If you wanted to see who voted no, no, you would not be able to do this.

Marvin Ferrer – I would like to speak against the amendment to the amendment. I think our membership can understand this question. I think the question captures the diversity of opinions that students have on the topic. I think to take away options from people does a disservice that this referendum is trying to achieve.

MOTION 03/22/11: + 30 Minutes
MOVED____Jon Foster___/__Eric Rapos____BIRT that the SGPS AGM be extended for thirty minutes.

Carried

Iain Reeve – An affirmative vote to remove or keep the rector is then put towards the university council. This gives the council a clear indication of students in favour or not in favour of this motion.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M1:1 Call to Question
MOVED ____Abdullah Abunafeesa_____ / __Amir Nosrat_____ BIRT that MOTION 03/22/11:6-M1:1 be called to question.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M1:1
Not Carried

Michal Bravo – We are now back on the amendment to make the first question a binary question and to strike the second question from the referendum.

Kalanthe Khaiat – The option of censuring is important to members of the SGPS council. The option to censure and maintain could be a third option to the single question. I think it is important to agree on a definition on what censuring means. A censure it seems only makes sense as a request from the SGPS that Queen's university council.

Daniel Moore – Want to speak against this motion. Not all members are available to vote on this issue. To take away number 2 is to take away the decisions that they are not able to make by not being here. I don't think that is a fair way to go about representing all options on the table.

Marvin Ferrer – I think we are babying our members. I would speak against.

David – What we are disagreeing on is style and not content. If it is an issue of style we should really debate…

Michael Bravo – The exact phrase that is brought to referendum has to be determined at council.

Nora Zwingerman – I am in favor of this amendment. I think it is important to get this first question proposed and then bring forth this question with a second referendum.

Benjamin Grant – Two points –The referendum is not going to be looking for qualitative data. I think that it is worth noting that the AMS question is binary and it would help the university council to see similar questions and results.

Nick – You are at risk of splitting the no vote and the yes vote.

David Thompson – Against this amendment. I believe that the three questions as they stand do not represent my sentiment. If someone feels that the question is illegitimate is there an option for a spoiled ballot.

Michael Bravo – We could add that if you wanted to.

Jessica Parker – I don't think we have dealt with censure. I don't understand the second question

whether SGPS stands behind the vote or not. Isn't that the point of the referendum?

Michael Bravo – The question is about way the referendum went will be reported to the university council. It is not a question or an indication of SGPS support.

Charan Rainford – Can we not isolate that element and vote on that separately?

Michael Bravo – Currently we have a motion on hand about making the first question binary and removing the second question.

Sean Abraham – On May 1st the university council is considering two options removing him or not. They are not in the business of censuring the rector.

Marvin Ferrer – Point of clarification. If we recommend to censure is there anything stopping them from censuring. They can censure?

Michael Bravo - Yes.

Sean Abraham – The AMS has put forth a referendum about removing Nick Day. They will be discussing this issue.

Samantha – In favor of this motion. It is an easy way for students' opinions to be measured. Providing clear measurable metrics. I am in favor of striking the second part of the question. I don't believe that we should be putting our names on something after the decision has been made.

Anne-Marie Grondin – The university council will consider a recommendation. The university will receive a ruling on behalf of the SGPS. Similarly if wanted to mimic what the AMS was doing we wouldn't be here. I think that Jawad did an amazing job of demonstrating how we do things. We wanted to come up with the best plan for everyone. We wanted the referendum question to be informative. I am unsure about why having three options is problematic. I think by removing the university rector I think we are sending a pretty clear message that we do not support him. To reiterate what Daniel we need to provide equal opportunity for members not present to vote on this issue.

Connor Langford – I am concerned about how we will interpret the data. What we really need to do is define a question is clear and concise that can easily be interpreted. What we are doing is passing on the information. We need to keep this as objective of question. In a referendum there are two types of questions either binary or have a number of questions about demographics which is not what we are trying to do here. When all this data gets funneled to university council including those of AMS, it will be difficult to interpret the results. The SGPS represents a large number of students I would speak against point 2. I think we should be removed. I think we need to take the data on the issue and then move forward with what we want to do.

Carl Hardy – In regards to the language of the referendum have come from SGPS members?

Michael Bravo – Yes.

Carl Hardy – I would like speak against this amendment. We take away the option to other members about the option of the petition.

Jawad Qureshy – It is not the job of the SGPS to make it easier for university council members. Our job is to reflect the views of our students. The only reason is this is coming to referendum is to involve more people. To remove the second question is to imply that Nick and only Nick is at fault.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M1 Call to Question
MOVED ____Lauren McNicol_____ / __Iain Reeve_____ BIRT that MOTION 03/22/11:6-M1 be called to question.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M1

Not Carried

MOTION 03/22/11: + 30 minutes
MOVED____Eric Rapos___/Steven___BIRT that the SGPS AGM be extended for 30 minutes.

Carried

Jillian Burford-Grinnell – We have mentioned some structural issues – ESS are away on practicum. I have some concerns. If we plan a referendum and it will be online are those students that cannot attend tonight able to access the internet. I have concerns if that it does go to referendum that ESS students won't be here and students who are heading off to research and practicum areas.

Leah – The faculty of education does still send us stuff. There are students overseas and some may not have access to internet.

Michael Bravo – I think issues can be taken care of with the CRO and ED.

Leah – Most students wont' be back until April 11th.

Kalanthe Khaiat – Is the date what we are discussing right now?

Michael Bravo – Yes.

Anne-Marie Grondin – Our discussion so far has been procedural. How are we going to discuss the issue at hand?

Iain Reeve – We were speaking to amendments.

Michael Bravo – Now that we are back on the main motion we can discuss this.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M2
MOVED ____Shaughnessy Hawkins_____ / __Eric Rapos_____ BIRT that the first referendum question be changed to read as follows:
"Should the SGPS formally recommend to the University Council of Queen's University that Nick Day be: a) Removed from office, b) Censured/not removed, c) Neither removed/or censured."

Mark Rosner – There was an amendment previously put forth that was similar in nature and that we have already dealt with.

Michael Bravo – I am going to overrule this amendment.

Iain Reeve – This amendment clarifies the previous wording.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M2: Overturn Decision of Speaker
MOVED ____Iain Reeve_____ / __Eric Rapos_____ BIRT that the decision of the Speaker to overrule MOTION 03/22/11:6-M2 be overturned.

Michael Bravo – If you vote yes to overturn the decision of the speaker we are going to then deal with Shaughnessy's amendment.

Carried

Iain Reeve – I think this clarifies the wording and I want to call it to question.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M2: Call to Question
MOVED ____Eric Rapos_____ / __Iain Reeve_____ BIRT that MOTION 03/22/11:6-M2 be called to question.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M2

Carried

Eric Rapos – I think a referendum opens it up to more opinion. Even though the AGM is open to everyone however I think a referendum is better. I think there are other venues to discuss this issue.

Usman Mushtaq – I want to reframe the discussion a bit. I am against this motion and referendum. I don't think this is an issue of student voice. I think this is a situation of academic freedom. This freedom allows me to work. In the second year of my masters I had the opportunity to campaign against a company called Monsanto. Once you leave this meeting you will see a big building called the ILC that monitors its own temperature. This is an indication of the cutting edge research that occurs. It is a great way to open up the pockets of alumni. It's note worthy for me was from a board member of Monsanto. I was only able to take campaign against Monsanto because of my academic freedom. For me this defense for academic freedom is imperative. To have a referendum about this issue is that we are willing to negotiate on a non-negotiable right of academic freedom. It is a right that we need to protect for future students and academics. I would like to get back to this discussion which is the main issue.

Kalanthe Khaiat – I am in full agreement with Usman. The fact that this has become such an issue puzzled me on a level and I see where some positions are coming from. The referendum options seems to be the most equitable option that will allos SGPS members to speak and voice their motion.

Joe Steele - Negotiating this un-negotiable area is setting a negative precedent. There is a lot of misinformation within the AMS. They have shifted the focus away from the issue of academic

freedom. It should not go to a referendum.

Mark Rosner – It strikes me that a referendum will be divisive. I don't think organizing a referendum about this issue. I think it will polarize the issue. I think that it is a red herring because if you think you're in favor of a referendum as you are going to have to choose an option. I think it is going to be inconclusive on our membership. From my own perspective the rector is a political role. I think there think we need to have a dialogue and not have a show down. I think that is not productive and not in line with how we have dealt with issues in the past.

MOTION 03/22/11: + 30 Minutes
MOVED ____Eric Rapos_____ / __Anne-Marie Grondin_____ BIRT that the SGPS AGM be extended for thirty minutes.

Carried

Jerome James – I would like to bring to the record an article published 2003 which was 8 days after bombs in Baghdad from US. (Reads article). He made these comments without consulting the student body. He took this side because he believes it was right. Nick Day defended the legitimacy to promote an on campus student event. He wrote on the platform of equity. He has done more about representing the other on campus. It is for that reason that we should not support this question. If he is following precedent from Rectors before him than we cannot fault him.

Iain Reeve – Do we have speaking limits?

Michael Bravo – 2 ½ - 3 minutes max. I know we have a lot to add to the discussion but let's try to wrap this up in the next hour tonight.

David Olivsen – I think that the freedom of expression is fundamental to everyone. I don't think it is the issue of politically charged opinions. I believe the problem is that he put the opinion into the mouth of students. I have heard many people suggest that they are in support of freedom of expression but are against a referendum. This is in direct contradiction. There is some irony in having these two questions if in fact the letter to impeach is passed in the first question which would then be in direct conflict with the second question. This is confusing.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M3
MOVED____David Olivsen/___Audience member___BIRT that the second referendum question be striken.

Michael Bravo – I would say this is similar to what was brought forth before.

David Olivsen – I think we were working on the wording of those questions.

Michael Bravo – I would say no to this.

MOTION 03/22/11:6-M3: Overturn Decision of Speaker
MOVED ____Jess Hickey_____ / __Lauren McNicol_____ BIRT that the decision of the Speaker to overrule MOTION 03/22/11:6-M3 be overturned.

Not Carried

Amir Nosrat – How many members were asked to draft this motion?

Michael Bravo – I need four members to put forth a motion.

Shaughnessy Hawkins – A bunch of people emailed us and asked for representation.

Michael Bravo – There were six emails asking for a referendum.

Shaughnessy Hawkins - We took what we received and turned it into a referendum.

Alex – In regards to academic freedom. The decision for the referendum is our ability to have academic freedom. I don't think that fact a referendum could be divisive is a reason to not perform one.

Daniel Moore – I want to speak against the motion. I want to speak directly to the criticisms brought up that there is a problem between claiming academic freedom and voting for a referendum. I think the basis for this referendum is up for discussion.

Nora Zwingerman – Think how long hard council members have fought to put SGPS on a letter. There is a lot of weight using an official name on a letter. It is more than just one opinion. I would like to respect other people's opinion. Going against a referendum is not accommodating people who did think this was offensive. Attaching a title is attaching more than just an individual. Please realize that students have vocalized they wanted a referendum and the ability to be heard.

David Olivsen – I think that is flawed comparison. Quoting someone such as Jawad the president of the SGPS his sentiments don't necessarily represent those of the SGPS, but just his as president.

Carl Hardy – Is there a procedure within the SGPS bylaws to bring the referendum to question?

Michael Bravo – You would need 10% of the voting body.

Carl Hardy – Has there been any attempt to get 10% of the vote? Has there been any obstruction to doing this?

Michael Bravo – No. I have made it clear to all members of the exec, council, has received information about this petition.

Carl Hardy – So there have been no obstructions or complaints? OK. If there have been no attempt to go through the channel to instill a referendum. I am against this motion. I want to call it to question.

Connor Langford – Graduate students signed the AMS petition.

Michael Bravo – This does not play into the SGPS. We have worked hard to create an autonomous nature of the SGPS. I understand if they wanted to start a petition they could have emailed and called.

Connor Langford– There have been a body of students that have signed this petition.

Iain Reeve – It is true that the SGPS sent out the letter and then the agenda was sent for this meeting which may have influenced students to not create a petition.

MOTION 03/22/11:6: Call to Question
MOVED ____Eric Rapos_____ / __Iain Reeve_____ BIRT that MOTION 03/22/11:6 be called to question.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:6: + 30 Minutes
MOVED ____Eric Rapos_____ / __Anne-Marie Grondin_____ BIRT that the SGPS AGM be extended for thirty minutes.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:6 – AS AMENDED

10 - Yes
184 – No

Not Carried

Michael Bravo – I will remove 03/22/11:7 from the minutes as it is out of order

MOTION 03/22/11:7
Whereas there is already a by-election to be held on 28 March 2011 and 29 March 2011 regarding the CFRC fees as a result of a majority of the membership of the SGPS recommending to not increase the CFRC fees at the annual March elections and referenda;
Whereas the result of the previous motion necessitates another election one week after the aforementioned CFRC by-election;

MOVED _____/_____ BIRT the SGPS delay the by-election to be held on 28 March 2011 and 29 March 2011 until 5 April 2011 and 6 April 2011 so that the SGPS membership only has to vote at one election and allows the organization of a single, streamlined election process for both issues to be voted upon.

MOTION 03/22/11:8

MOVED Jaclyn Mackenzie/___ Yohan D'Souza _____ BIRT the SGPS support the following letter to the University Council recommending the removal of Rector Nick Day from his position as rector.

Dear Members of the University Council,
On behalf of the Society of Graduate and Professional Students, we would like to express our concerns regarding current Queen's Rector Nick Day's recent actions.
We believe in academic freedom and the value of free public discourse. We are not concerned with the personal opinions that Rector Day expressed in his letter to Mr. Ignatieff, but rather that he over-extended the mandate of his role. As an elected student representative, the Queen's student body trusts Rector Day to represent us on matters of education to the administration of the University. By

making divisive political claims to the leader of the Official Opposition as the Rector, he has abused his office and breached our trust.

By signing his letter to Mr. Ignatieff as "Rector", and by explicitly noting his role as representative of approximately 20,000 Queen's students, Rector Day has ascribed his own political stance to the entire student body, both graduate and undergraduate. As soon as he identified himself as Rector, he went beyond personal expression.

Having been previously censured and warned against such actions in the past by the AMS, we believe that Rector Day's continued behaviour warrants removal from office.
Sincerely, The Society of Graduate and Professional Students

MOTION 03/22/11: + 30 minutes
MOVED___Eric Rapos___/____Marvin Ferrer___BIRT that SGPS AGM be extended for thirty minutes.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11: Debate Limit
MOVED___David Olivsen___/____Abdullah Abunafeesa___BIRT that the debate be limited to three for and three against the motion at hand.

Carried

Jacklyn Mackenzie – He did not consult the AMS or the SGPS. The letter was written in rector day in a highly disrespectful way. Many students are fearful to express their opinions. What is problematic is that he signed the letter as rector of Queen's which is representative of the student body.

Andrew – I am against. Ahmed introduced Niamo Cline. Ahmed opposed the invasion of Iraq which was a controversial debate at the time. No one at the time called for an impeachment of the rector. The introductory clause was in violation of IEW. If people are afraid to speak their mind it is contradictory to impeach people that speak their mind. In his capacity as a rector claiming that he would have problems justifying to himself remaining silent on this issue.

Alex – I support. Academic freedom is saying something to foster discussion. If you remove his points of IEW there are a few points about why people are alienated. He states that he condemns Ignatieff's condemnation and vilifies the state of Israel. The statements he makes are overgeneralized and the point that personally struck me is that towards the end of the article he labels Israel a genocide state. In summation is academic freedom is a great point, what we are arguing that Nick Day's points were not in academic freedom.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell – I would like to speak against this. When this originally began there were different at issues at hand. It has become a lot bigger. My concern with this motion is the letter specifically. What I find problematic is the last paragraph. I want to reiterate the point that we are our own separate society.

David Olsen – There has been a lot said about freedom of expression. Andrew made comment to an event in 2004. He spoke about Naomi Cline and that they had academic discussion. There were both side presents. It was well-debated. We got to debate in a forum that was appropriate for that. There has not been any discussion about the content about what he said. The most discussion is whether

he should be removed. What he said did not trigger academic discussion. The principals of academic discussion were not exercised in any relevant way.

Anne-Marie Grondin – Point of information – Are Israeli apartheid events limited to certain students?

Michael Bravo – If you pass this motion it becomes the stance of the SGPS. You cannot bring forward another motion at another meeting which would contradict this motion.

Carolyn Prouse – IEW is open to everyone. What Nick was really fighting for voices that tend to marginalized. He was fighting for the freedom of speech of those people. Equity is for voices that don't often get heard. In regards to representation – Nick day did not reflect the opinions of everyone he was speaking to academics, faculty, I think we need to remember that. He was fighting for people to acknowledge their opinions. He fought in all of our interests.

Connor Langford – Point of clarification. We did not pass the referendum and now we have stifled discussion?

MOTION 03/22/11: + 30 minutes
MOVED___Eric Rapos___/___Jon Foster___BIRT that SGPS AGM be extended for thirty minutes.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11: Recess
MOVED___Iain Reeve___/___Eric Rapos___BIRT that SGPS AGM be recessed for 5 minutes.

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:8

Yes – 50
No - 128

Not Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:9
Whereas "intellectual integrity", "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas," and "equal dignity of all persons" are held as "essential values" by Queen's University (http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/senate/policies/princpri/);

Whereas the research, expression and assembly of graduate and professional students are essential and indispensable to affirming the aforementioned "essential values";

Whereas the Rector's mandate is intended to "promote scholarly dialogue amongst students";
Whereas SGPS Council "supports, protects and upholds the freedom of speech and academic freedom of campus groups, students, activists, and academics at Queen's University who use the term 'Israeli apartheid' to describe the present conditions of legal, political, and economic, and social segregation imposed on the Occupied Palestinian Territories and the Palestinian people by the Israeli state";

MOVED Andrew Stevens/ ____Usman Mushtaq_____ BIRT the Society of Graduate and

Professional Student Council officially adds its name to the petition written by the organizers of "Support Academic Freedom & Queen's University Rector Nick Day" and sends the signed letter to the Principal, the Provost, Chair of the Board of Trustees, Chair of Senate, AMS President, and Queen's University Chancellor.

To: Members of the Queen's University Community
We, the undersigned, wish to state our deep concern over the recent attacks on the principles of Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression that have recently occurred at Queen's University. The unequivocal protection of these principles is crucial to the health and vitality of Queen's University's stated commitment to "develop leaders and citizens for a global society."
BACKGROUND

On March 9, 2011, the Queen's University Rector Nick Day published a "Response Letter to Michael Ignatieff" on the Liberal Party leader's "Statement on Israeli Apartheid Week." The letter expressed the Rector's position regarding Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW), outlining the rationale for its legitimate inclusion on Canadian university campuses as a matter of freedom of speech. At no point in the letter did Rector Day state that he was expressing the official view of Queen's University or of Queen's students as a group.

Only a day after the publication of the Rector's letter, Principal Daniel Woolf issued a public statement expressing his views, declaring that it was "inappropriate" for the Rector to voice his opinions regarding Ignatieff's comments. Principal Woolf stated he was contacted by "students, alumni, and others, who believe the Rector should no longer have the privilege of holding this office."

In his public statement, the Principal neglected to reference the messages from current students, alumni, faculty members, and others who had contacted him in support of the Rector and his right to speak publicly on such issues in his capacity as Rector.

Partisan student organizations, including the Campus Conservatives, Queen's Liberal Association, and Israel on Campus, circulated a petition seeking an AMS motion to poll the Queen's undergraduate student body on whether to recommend the Rector's dismissal by the University Council. This petition was presented to the AMS Assembly only one day after the publication of the Rector's letter to Michael Ignatieff.

After receiving defamatory and violent personal attacks, including a death threat, through email, Facebook, and Twitter, the Rector decided not to attend the AMS Assembly. The Queen's Journal reported that he felt "uncomfortable and unsafe." This environment of intimidation -- which Principal Woolf not only failed to address but also exacerbated -- has denied the Rector an opportunity to respond to the controversy prior to or during the AMS Assembly. Following a secret ballot, AMS Assembly voted to allow the question to proceed to a referendum set for March 22-23, 2011.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM & FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION
We believe that the Queen's University community must demonstrate its unequivocal support to upholding a campus environment of unfettered academic inquiry and discussion. Israel Apartheid Week (IAW) provides a forum for the Queen's University community to engage with vital issues of concern to human rights and Canadian foreign policy.

The Rector's response to Liberal Party leader, Michael Ignatieff, addressed common and often dangerous misconceptions with Israel Apartheid Week, an annual week-long event that has been

held on Canadian campuses since 2005.

IAW has been held at Queen's University since 2008 and is well attended by faculty, staff, students, and local community members. IAW makes an intellectual contribution to public understanding of Canadian and Israeli foreign policy, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the situation of the Occupied Territories and Palestinian peoples. Further, "Israeli Apartheid" is the subject of an internationally-recognized academic and political debate, one that is actively engaged with here at Queen's.
There is no doubt that IAW is a controversial event, particularly with respect to the use of the term "apartheid." As a leader in higher education and an institution dedicated to global citizenship, Queen's University must not retreat from its responsibility to engage with controversial issues; rather, it is the University's role to create and maintain space for civil discussion, dialogue, and dissent. While IAW events may challenge attendees to reflect critically on their presumptions and beliefs, a process that can be difficult for some, there have been no credible reports of anti- Semitism or targeting and harassment of Jewish or Israeli students during IAW at Queen's.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE RECTOR
In publicly addressing the protection of IAW as a matter of Academic Freedom, and Freedom of Expression, the Rector acted in accordance with the duties and responsibilities of the office which requires the Rector to "promote scholarly dialogue amongst students." The countless debates about this and other issues sparked by the Rector's public statements are certainly a testament to the fulfillment of this important mandate.

To suggest that all actions undertaken by the Rector must necessarily represent a consensus of the Queen's University student body is both impossible and renders meaningless the position of the Rector as an elected representative of students to the Board of Trustees and administration. Any public action or statements made by the Rector, especially those directly relating to matters of academic freedom and discourse, will no doubt may be seen as contentious by some members of the Queen's University community. It would be a frightening compromise of democratic principles if the Rector were to be restricted from acting publicly on matters relevant to student life and academic inquiry, while being expected to espouse institutionally-sanctioned lines in both her or his politics and actions.

We, the undersigned, wish to state the following:

1. We unequivocally support the principles of Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression in all circumstances. These principles are critical to the maintenance and vitality of an open and democratic community and must not be constrained in any way by interference from outside powers.

2. Differences of opinion and the motives of partisan political organizations regarding controversial issues are not justifiable grounds for the removal of the Rector from office by the University Council.

3. The position of Rector is accountable to the entire Queen's University student body and not any particular student government or constituency.

4. We urge the Queen's University student body to affirm its commitment to principles of Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression by voting "no" on the referendum regarding the recommendation of the removal of the Rector from his position.

5. We condemn the use of hate speech and violent personal attacks in all cases and call on Principal

Daniel Woolf to make a clear public statement condemning the use of hate speech and physical intimidation, including those made against the Rector.
Please send your personal statements of support for the unequivocal protection of principles of Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech at Queen's University to:
academicfreedomqueens@gmail.com

Andrew Stevens – I would like to note in the motion that BIRT the SGPS Council that those who are present should establish a position on how to further engage with the university council. The SGPS already supports IAW. SGPS funds this body. In March 2008 the motion came up because the same type of vilification of students and activists were being threatened. We wanted to protect the right of individuals to use the title IAW. This letter, this petition has been signed by 1400 individuals.

Iain reeve – I think in principle we have debated this issue.

MOTION 03/22/11:9 Call to Question
MOVED___Iain Reeve/___Jon Foster___BIRT that MOTION 03/22/11:9 be called to question.

Mark Rosner – Point of information is the entire letter to be sent to the university council?

Andrew Stevens – Yes.

Not Carried

Connor Langford – This is a very opinionated letter. It is also being sent to a huge number of members at Queen's University. If this letter is sent it has potential to do a lot of damage. I would implore you to vote down this letter. As a member of SGPS would prefer that we do not take a stance on this issue if this is the only remaining position that we have. I would suggest that you as graduate students write a letter to council about your opinion.

Kalanthe Khaiat – I would like to speak in favor of this motion. I think as a body we should be voting about this. As individuals you should sign or not sign the petition. Having a potential authority figure threaten the validity of our institution, our students to engage in academic freedom is no cool. I urge you to vote yes to this motion.

MOTION 03/22/11:9-M1
MOVED___Kalanthe Khaiat___/___Audience member____BIRT that "council" is striken and replaced with "the SGPS AGM on this day".

MOTION 03/22/11: + 30 Minutes
MOVED___Eric Rapos___/___Jon Foster___BIRT that the SGPS AGM be extended for thirty minutes.

Carried

Eric Rapos – This is AGM is meant to be representative of the entire student body. At AMS they are having a discussion on this topic. I don't believe this amendment reflects the entire student body.

MOTION 03/22/11:9-M1 Call to Question
MOVED___Ralph___/___Mark Rosner____BIRT that MOTION 03/22/11:9-M1 be called to question

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:9-M1

Not Carried

Steven – For this motion. There is an unfortunate under-representation of Jewish voices on IAW. The fact that IAW can do what they do, we need to defend this academic priveldge. What Nick said – I did not see anything in what Nick said remotely anti-semitic. Students saying that they cannot express what they want to say to Nick, is not true. Nick has a good heart and needed to bring this issue into debate. To accuse him to threaten him is terrifying. A vote to support this petition is to bring about the progress as a community of scholars and a community of thinkers. We need to make sure that people who are traditionally silenced are not being silenced any longer. We need to send a message that we will protect those rights to speech. If we don't have those rights what are we doing here.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell – I am speaking for this motion. I think it is essential that we take a stance if we want to be recognized and want to make progress. If we don't take a stance on this it will put us back to 2-3 years ago. Although any sort of vote will not be 100% representative of the enture membership it is essential that we take a stance. I feel that we should support this statement. No student society is unified in its outlooks but that we should support academic freedom. If we don't take a stance the SGPS will lose headway that it has made.

Joey – Against. I am with the department of engineering and physics. Ignatieff wrote a letter saying that IAW spreads anti-Semitism threats. I used to go to all IAW events. Recently I have stopped going because I can't stand the fear I experience. People who spread hate don't choose whether they spread hate it's the victims. I don't want SGPS to support this.

Mark – I think the reason we are all in this room sitting is due to the compassion that we all feel. I hope this is the beginning of productive dialogue and that there are productive spaces to discuss the issues raised. I support Nick Day. I also want to acknowledge and respect the intense personal connection that people feel with this issue. I would like to reiterate some of the points around each side of the issue. I think this is something beyond us as individuals. I have interest in seeing this go forward.

Nick – A simple majority at this time is 90 votes gets to represent us to the university as a whole. I believe this is a contentious issue. I feel uncomfortable using the SGPS council that may not be shared by a significant fraction of the population. I feel like we are caught in this atmosphere where we have to choose one or the other. As Connor said we have the choice to write as individuals which may better represent the diversity of opinions in this room. I am against this motion.

Alex – The letter commented on the health of the university. I realize that I am not going to change people's opinions. I am going to bold prediction. By going forth and allowing this abuse of power you will not only be bringing on a bad image on council but all the graduate students and the university of students as a whole. IAW does instill fear. What we are doing is putting this one opinion into everyone's mouth. This is an abuse of power. York's reputation has suffered greatly because of a similar situation. I would suggest promoting discussion in the correct way and I don't believe that Nick did this.

Matt – I speak in favor. We come back to the issue of representation. Whatever is passed here is not putting words into the mouths of people. We are hoping that this best represents the opinions of its constituents. I think the correct response to Nick Day's article is that you can't say that for me you jerk, but as a representative it is allowable. He did not say that he was speaking explicitly on behalf of students. I also say that I am disappointed to ehar that there are examples of anti-semitism on campus and that these concerns need to be brought to attention to campus authority.

MOTION 03/22/11: + 30 Minutes
MOVED___Eric Rapos/____Jon Foster___BIRT that the SGPS AGM be extended for thirty minutes.

Carried

Matt – Against this motion. I am calling into question the petition itself. I don't think SGPS should attach their name to a petition such as this. Anyone could sign up for it.

Usman Mustaq – There are people that go through the petition to ensure that fake names are not used. I move to call to question.

MOTION 03/22/11:9 Call to Question
MOVED___Usman Mustaq___/___Matt____BIRT that MOTION 03/22/11:9 be called to question

Carried

MOTION 03/22/11:9

Yes – 99
No – 42

Carried

8. Other Business

9. Notice of Motions/Announcements
Nora Zwingerman – Please fill out the survey in regards to SGPS issues. You will get money for this.

Anne-Marie Grondin – No matter the outcome of tonight's meeting a lot of people were going to leave disgruntled. I think this speak specifically to the issue. The motion that speaks about academic freedom will send a message to the university council. I encourage you to have conversations with us how we can work to communicate about these things. I don't want anyone to leave thinking this is the end of the conversation. I will make it my first priority to ensure that we collaborate with other groups on campus. We are always open to feedback.

Reports and Motions for the next regular Council meeting are due Tuesday, April 5th, 2010. The next regular SGPS Council meeting will be on Tuesday, April 12th, 2011.

10. Adjournment MOTION 03/22/11:10 Moved ___Eric Rapos_____ / ___Jon Foster_____ BIRT the SGPS Council meeting be adjourned.

Attendance

Name		Represents	Present
Vacant	Vacant	Aboriginal Rep	
Marvin	Ferrer	Anatomy & Cell Biology	X
Christina	Prokopchuk	Art Conservation	X
Megan	Bylsma	Art History	X
Namit	Sharma	Biochemistry	X
Celia	Symons	Biology	
Patrick	Turko	Biology	
Joe	Steele	Biomedical Engineering	X
Vacant	Vacant	Biostatistics	
Ben	Grant	Board of Trustees Rep	X
Jonas	Gerson	Chem Eng (CEGSA) President	X
Bob	Cockburn	Chemical Engineering	X
Nicole	Day	Chemistry	
Jonathan	Foster	Civil Engineering	X
Vacant	Vacant	Classics	
Nora	Zwingerman	Community Health and Epidemiology	X
Eric	Rapos	Computing Science	X
Layan	Nahlawi	Computing Science	
Shannon	Speed	Cultural Studies	
Maralyne	Narayan	Development Studies	
Matt	Webb	Economics	
Julia	Brook	Education - Graduate - President	
Chi	Lam	Education - Graduate M.Ed	
Terry	Bridges	Education - Graduate PhD	X
Vacant	Vacant	Education Coordinator	
Tejinder	Dhaliwal	Electrical and Computer Engineering	
Jelena	Marelj	English	
Martha	Schabas	English	
Mike	McHugh	Environmental Studies	
Rebecca	Reginorld	ESS	
Sunny	Moondi	ESS	

Jennise	Fortner	ESS	
Derek	Smalls	ESS Liason to SGPS	
Hayley	Backewich	ESS President	
Francesca	Fiore	French	
Kaleigh	Alkenbrack	Gender Studies	X
Clare	Wasteneys	Geography	
Giselle	Valarezo	Geography	
Vacant	Vacant	Geology	
Connor	Langford	Geological Society	X
Dani	Dellaloye	Geological Society	X
Corina	Fonyodi-Szarka	German	
Vacant	Vacant	Global Development	
Iain	Reeve	Graduate Senator	X
Sarah	Waurechen	History	X
Minoo	Kianizad	Industrial Relations	
Holly	McIndoe	International Rep	X
Hannah Legh	Jones	Kinesiology and Health Studies	X
Jeremy	D'Souza	Law	
Brittany	Sargent	Law	
Stephanie	Timerman	Law	
Alejandra	Encinales	Law - Graduate	
Brianna	Butchart	Law - LSS President	
Logan	Crowell	Law Senator	X
Joachim	Scholz	Management	
Vacant	Vacant	Math	
Vacant	Vacant	Mature Student Rep	
Jerome	James	Mechanical and Material Engineering	X
Andrew	Purssell	Microbiology	X
Justin	Thompson	Mining Engineering	
James	Snyder	Mining Engineering	X
Tyler	Sutton	MPA	
Ethan	Zhao	Neuroscience	

Stacey	Karp	Nursing	
Charlene	Brown	Occupational Therapy	
Lisa	Hughes	Part Time Rep	
Jess	Hickey	Pathology	X
Dulcai	Lai	Pathology	
Yohan	D'Souza	Pharmacology	X
Ryan	McInerney	Philosophy	
Nathalie	Ouellette	Physics	X
Andrea	Mimee	Physiology	
Kate	McGarry	Policy Studies	
Charan	Rainford	Political Studies	X
Corrie	Goldfiner	Psychology	
Brent	Shaw	Public Administration	
Vacant	Vacant	Public Health	
Nick	Day	Rector	X
Shauna	Connaughton	Rehab Sciences (Professional)	X
Ian	Gilchrist	Rehab Sciences (Research)	
Tessa	Young	Rehabilitation Therapy	
Vacant	Vacant	Religious Studies	
Stephanie	Cork	Sociology	X
Tara	Downs	Spanish and Italian	
Ryan	Robinson	Theology	
Erin	Burns	Theology Senator	
Andrea	Renney	Urban and Regional Planning	X
Sean	Richards	Executive Director	X
Jawad	Qureshy	President	X
Anne-Marie	Grondin	VP Campaigns and Community Affairs	X
Jillian	Burford-Grinnell	VP Finance and Services	X
Daniel	Moore	VP Graduate	X
Shaughnessy	Hawkins	VP Professional	X
Abdullah	Abunafeesa	Social Commissioner	X

Amanda	Leonard	Athletics Coordinator	
Corey	Valinksy	Logistics Coordinator	
Nicole	McCallum	Planning Coordinator	
Carloyn	Prouse	Equity Commissioner	X
Kalanthe	Khaiat	Equity Coordinator	X
Amir	Nosrat	International Students' Coordinator	X
Becky	Pero	International Students' Coordinator	
Ivana	Zelenika	Sustainability Coordinator	
Michael	Bravo	Speaker	X
Morgan	Craig-Broadwith	Deputy Speaker	X
Mikhail	Kellawan	Chief Returning Officer	X