



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, January 12th 2010, 5:30pm
Room 236, JDUC

1. Presentations

2. Adoption of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION

01/12/10:1

Moved Alfonso Nocilla / Patrick Welsh
BIRT the agenda for January 12th, 2010 be adopted.
CARRIED

MOTION

01/12/10:2

Moved Steve Osterberg / Chad Edwards
BIRT the minutes for December, 2009 be accepted.

CARRIED

3. Executive and Speaker Reports

a) President – Vicky Bae (report attached)

b) VP Graduate – David Thompson (report attached)

Not too much to report. I am working towards a teaching fellows' policy. Unlike TAs there is no Senate policy for teaching fellows. Come see me or send an email if you have any questions. There has been some discussion on policy for travel bursaries and there have been recommendations for revising their administration. The Student Advisors were at the international student orientation, running an effective case study on events that impact

international students. If your department has interest in the SAs making a presentation to their faculty they can be contacted.

c) VP Professional – Kate Kahn (report attached)

Nothing to add.

d) VP Campaigns and Community Affairs – Steve Osterberg (no report)

e) VP Finance and Services – Amir Nosrat (report attached)

Nothing to add.

f) Speaker – Mark Rosner (no report)

Another invitation to apply for CRO. Pays \$600 and requires running the SGPS election. Duties include preparation of ballots, stations, hiring, generally running the election.

Shauna Shiels: Can any member run for CRO.

Rosner: Yes.

By-law and policy review committee is also looking for members.

MOTION

01/12/10:3

Moved _____ Chad Edwards _____ / _____ Josh Cole _____ BIRT
Executive and Speaker reports be accepted.

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

a) Graduate Student Senator – Andrew Stevens (no report)

I did not have anything to talk about at the time of the submission. Since then, some points of information include an address from the Principle on the future of education – internationalization, the role of states and how individuals work together to achieve goals. Janice Deakin raised points on his comments in the Globe and Mail. He clarified that it was not a matter of following the liberal arts model but rather using graduate students as a mediator between faculty and undergrads. This presents an opportunity for the SGPS to revise their own positioning.

There was some questioning on how the Grad School coordinator will present the upcoming budget. The concern is whether ITAs and international funding will continue to grow.

There were also comments on the graduate fair in China to actively attract students. The university is keen to attract students as these students are increasingly attached to funding from the Chinese Government which can cover travel and tuition.

Requesting for how the membership can change, by adding a two positions in order to seeking a balance between the Board of Trustees and the Senate.

Finally, applied science faculty council is in need of three reps in order to have effective representation. If you are interested I will forward names.

Alfonso Nocilla: Have there been any human rights issues connected with the Chinese recruitment.

Andrew Stevens: There has been none. The agreement has already finalized, but it is open how we want to add this to the recruitment drive in China.

b) Board of Trustees – Alfonso Nocilla (report attached)

I mentioned the new VP Academic and Provost. Any changes submitted to the university planning committee will have to be made quickly. In addition to my report, if we are going to add issues relating to membership it will have to go through SORC.

Andrew Stevens: SORC is meeting tomorrow so these changes will have to be made by then.

c) Committee Reports

d) Commissioner Reports

i) Social Commissioner – Diala Habib (no report)

ii) Communications Commissioner – Sean Richards (report attached)

Nothing to add.

iii) Equity Commissioner: Sophia Virani (report attached)

e) Other Reports

i) Committee Coordinator – Laura Gale (no report)

ii) Equity Coordinator – Laura Szabo Greisman (no report)

iii) International Students Coordinator – Aasma Khan (no report)

iv) Sustainability Coordinator – Ivana Zelenika (no report)

Mark Rosner: Report in late

v) Education Students' Coordinator – Alessandro La Gomba (no report)

vi) Rector – Leora Jackson (no report)

vii) Chief Returning Officer – Vacant

viii) Departmental Reports

MOTION

01/12/10:4

Moved _____Josh_Cole_____ / _____Patrick_Welsh_____ BIRT Senator/Board of Trustees/Commissioner/ Coordinator / Committee, and Other reports be accepted.

CARRIED

5. Question Period/Departmental Issues

none.

6. Business Arising from the Minutes

MOTION

01/12/10:5

Whereas the Housing Committee was established in Council's August session; and

Whereas the Housing Committee along with the Executive were charged with the task of initiating the process of establishing a separate Housing Authority which remains subservient to the SGPS; and

Whereas the Housing Committee along with the Executive have made preparations for the establishment of a new Housing Authority.

Moved Amir Nosrat / Stephen Osterberg BIRT that the Housing Committee, along with the Executive, establish a separate non-profit Corporation in accordance with local, provincial, and federal laws in a timely manner.

Mark Rosner: The SGPS has been considering a proposal to purchase and rent properties to graduate students. We commissioned a report from Queen's Business Consultants, which is available online. The executives have also posted a Q&A to address concerns regarding the proposed housing authority. This motion has been tabled as we received the QBC report last month.

Amir Nosrat: If you haven't been around feel free to ask questions. After 8 months of work week will decide today what action to take on this authority. This decision must be made today. All economic indicators point to rising housing prices. We have spent 8 months responding to concerns and researching this decision. As an executive we feel this will be an excellent long-term decision. We anticipate risks, but we feel that we have taken the steps to minimize these risks. We must also ratify the by-laws of the authority and the release of the funds. This is time sensitive and so we feel this must be passed immediately to remain viable.

Patrick Welsh: Thank you and thank the executive and council. We have spent a lot of time debating the motion and all the details. I think it is important to not pass this motion today. I do not support this initiative. The QBC report did not recommend this authority out of two options. It is either an investment or a service. If it is a service the initial purchases will only help students. Where will the additional money come from in this case? If an investment, it is conditional on the rent to students. How can this project provide affordable rent and a profitable return? In this case the profit will only be realized when we sell the houses. If we buy additional houses, we will be less inclined to sell. The concern is not that we will lose money, but that the authority will become a boondoggle with escalating costs which will require additional fees to cover unanticipated costs. In addition, how can our short term body manage a project with such a long timeline? In summary, I recommend that we not support this motion.

Stephen Osterberg: When the initiative began we wanted to know how we could get a better return on the \$250,000 in the bank account. We considered stocks

but settled on housing which is solid and will return a profit eventually. We want the profit from rent to cover other services such as healthcare and other expenses. The goal is not a housing service itself but rather a cashflow for the organization. As for unforeseen consequences, we don't anticipate problems. While there will be unexpected events, our planning has left room for such contingencies. As for management, this will be done by future execs.

Alfonso Nocilla: First, I do not like the cost. We are laying out hundreds of thousands of dollars to help eight students. It will be difficult to sell if there are issues for them to deal with. In addition, we are creating a bureaucratic system for future management to run. This should go to referendum to get the opinion of the members. Finally, there are a number of other options such as bonds that we could take advantage of. The reports on this authority did not include a comparison to bonds for example. The consultants ultimately did not recommend this option and real estate is a risky venture.

Chad Edwards: Fortune favors the bold. Houses are at or below their market values and we have a ton of cash. I spent an unbelievable amount of time myself reviewing this project. We will first help just eight students but over time help more.

Amir Nosrat: I want to address the notion that the report did not recommend this project and in fact it said it would be very profitable. What they were concerned with was the learning curve associated with running the venture. What they recommended was that we partner with another student housing service. I have contacted one and they are interested in partnering with us. There are other options such as Queen's community housing and other housing services near campus. Based on the report this project can be profitable. As for the project becoming a beast, we have hired consultants and lawyers to prevent it from becoming too complicated. There will be institutional resistance, but it will always be bound by us. This not a project for individuals - I am graduating and will not see or use this service. This is for the membership and an institutional commitment, not an individual commitment. There was concern over costs and imposing on future members. Prices will not lower in the future, in ten years, down the road. We may have problems with liquidity if we have to sell in four months but the future exec will always have the option to sell. I support the motion.

Andrew Stevens: Houses do have the potential to loose value. Are the executives suggesting that they are limiting themselves to a partnership or will the executive be coming back and running it single handed.

Mark Rosner: There is no binding part of the motion requiring a partnership.

Andrew Stevens: There is an issue that we are tying up money for the future which can have an impact on students in the future.

Marvin Ferrer: I was for the motion until I realized that we can only grow the service if we add more money to the program in the future. There is too long a timeline for me to support.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell: Thank you everyone who worked on this project. Yes houses depreciate but very slowly and only over time. Mortgages last 20-25 years and the mortgages will be paid in 20 years. The rents seem to cover the expenses of the houses and the conservative estimates do a good job of addressing emergencies.

Patrick Cashin: If we decide to put this up, and a year for now we decide to sell, how much money have we put into this project in the first place? How much are we putting into this project aside from the houses?

Patrick Welsh: The surplus is from years of waiting and I question if it is responsible to commit so much to this project and the SGPS is not up to the task. I am concerned with tying this body to this commitment will only hurt students in the future. It is really easy to spend other people's money. The concern is that when the housing authority is established it will be a boondoggle

Amir Nosrat: There were some questions asked and forgive me if I miss one. There was a question how much will be spent. This motion will not commit any money, only allow the executive to consult lawyers and consultants to bring back more concrete numbers. If you have problems with the motion you can amend to add additional restraints which you are completely entitled to. We were looking at committing 120-130,000 plus legal fees, which represents half of our current funds. The houses will always be there and the housing markets have already bottomed out. The prices are currently rising. We will have less liquidity; perhaps two or three months to sell. This motion is not committing any money or any plan. If you have further concerns you can come to the council or the housing committee. There is still time to address concerns. There are two additional steps to approve the by-laws and again to release money. I know there are uncertainties but that does not mean we should kill the project all together.

Andrew Stevens: Initially I was in support but am now lukewarm, I wonder if there is a precedent for housing authorities. Have there been any bankruptcies? Rent in this city is extremely high and I wonder if there is room for future growth. How often have these authorities tanked and how can we maintain the revenues?

Shauna Shiels: Did Amir ask for us to approve the project with money or just to keep planning.

Mark Rosner: This motion is just to establish a non-profit corporation.

Andrew Burcelle: I think everyone is concerned about taxing members down the road. But the consultants have said that it will be profitable. I feel if we don't move ahead we will have regrets in the future.

Amir Nosrat: As for passed co-ops, there are failures and successes. Case in point was the Princess Towers which began as a housing coop, which ultimately failed. Student housing Cooperative was started in 1944 and now has houses worth \$15 million and they are willing to partner with us. The AMS had a housing service but moved away from services to lobbying. The university now makes money on the 200 or so units. This was based on the AMS's decision to move to lobbying.

Patrick Welsh: It is important to consider that the AMS had one of these projects and later moved away from it. While we are making no financial decisions, this is about thumbs up or thumbs down.

Amir Nosrat: Our predecessor in the 1960s had their own housing service. I'm not sure what happened but it was part of the deal for the AMS to sell to the administration.

Alfonso Nocilla: Yes, this is an opportunity. There are lots of opportunities and they can be pursued. The only other plan this has been compared is a coffee shop. We have been talking like this is guaranteed but this may not be the case. What should be foremost in our mind is that we will not be held accountable. It will be the students of this university that will have to pay for any mistakes. We cannot go forward without comparing to other options and before going to the member ship.

Shauna Shiels: We cannot know why other organizations sold their housing authority. I think the main issue is the money and everything we do here is a matter of adding constraints and fees to students. Although it only houses eight students, there is value in using the revenue to fund additional programs, such as a daycare program. I bought a house. In the short term we can apply income to dental care.

Josh Cole: I think our whole goal here is to provide more services to our constituents and this achieves this purpose. I think the ability to sell could be a minus so that future memberships don't sell.

I think this is an excellent idea and I applaud the efforts that the executives have made and I think this will be a money-maker that will put money back into our programming.

Vicki Bae: I also want to speak for this motion. With any project there is a risk that we can lose money but at least we will be using the money to support our students. It is quite a lot of money that has just been sitting without helping anyone. This is as good a time as ever to start a housing authority.

Rosner: Let's move to a vote:

For: 20

Against: 12

CARRIED

7. Main Motions

Mark Rosner: We need to propose election dates: How is Feb 17 and 18?

Moved by Chad Edwards/ Aniss Amdiss BIRT that the SGPS hold annual elections on February 17 and 18, 2010.

CARRIED

Mark Rosner: If there are any motions to propose fees for referendum, optional or mandatory, the deadline is Jan 20. They should be submitted to the finance and services committee.

Amir Nosrat: This is a good option for faculties to raise funds for programming.

Mark Rosner: We are still looking for a CRO.

8. Other Business

Discussion on Queen's Centre Fee

Guests: Caroline E. Davis, Queen's Vice-Principal (Finance and Administration)
Janice Deakin, Associate Vice-Principal (Graduate Studies)

Mark Rosner: Undergrads contribute a fee to the capital costs of the new Queen's center. The administration is seeking a similar fee from graduate students.

Shauna Shiels: Will we get a stake and position in the governance committee?

Janice Deakin: I have been involved with this project for a long time, since before the Queen's center was built. The question was whether the graduate students could make a contribution of 4.5 million to the project. This was a plug number of graduate students to undergrad in 2004 and made in consideration for the pledge that the undergrads made. I think the undergraduate passed an opt-out fee so the payments continue until \$25.5 million is raised. The time line is not clear but the fee will remain until that amount is collected

Shauna Shiels: Are there added benefits for students who opt in.

Janice Deakin: No, this is a cap contribution only, not an activity fee. This does not have to do with using the facility, only the cost of the facility. We did not have a chance to ask the advancement office. This means the amount given can be considered a donation and can be used for tax purposes.

[Clarification: The undergrad fee (~\$141) is not optional.]

Mark Rosner: How does the governance of the Queen's Centre work and how will we be able to participate?

Janice Deakin: There has been discussion on this due to problems with governance with the JDUC. The new Principle suggested that the governance structure be set aside for the time being and the center is now handled by Athletics. This structure has been contentious.

Vicki Bae: The management board presently does not include the SGPS. The body overseeing the JDUC is the same one overseeing the Phase 1 of the Queen's center. Amir and I sit on a number of these committees. About additional benefit for opt-in, we all pay fees which go into the operation of our facilities. As far as I know giving the Center a commitment did not guarantee any access to the facility and is considered only a donation. There has been a movement toward charging more for operations given we did not make such a commitment, which we are fighting.

Pat Welsh: What I never understood was how there is no much miscommunication about our portion. Was it declined in the past by our executive?

Janice Deakin: Estimating donation was part of planning the project. There were conversations whether grad students were interested. As I recall there was little interest and it was difficult to convince executives at that time. This was a routine planning estimate. The project does not hinge on it and during the planning the SGPS was not included.

Patrick Welsh: There was at least interest in a guarantee that the school would not come back to the SGPS at a later date for more money.

Janice Deakin: With the AMS the students committed to the project before the MOU. The assurances are negotiated upfront or following a referendum. They were concerned that additional fees to not appear to supplement the center. There is an annual review before money is transferred to the school to check for compliance.

Amir Nosrat: I am not for or against the fee but have been concerned about the attitudes towards the SGPS exec for not committing to the project. There have been informal problems at meetings and I am concerned about the lack of consideration for our membership. We already have access to the building so what additional benefits will we get from this donation.

Janice Deakin: I have no knowledge of the behavior you have insinuated and I hope this is not addressed to the graduate studies. We can certainly work with you to address any such problems. As for benefits, I have to ask whether you make donations to the cancer society or other charities. As for governance, this is still an issue that is being resolved. There is no other benefit that becoming another supporter for the excellent new buildings.

Andrew Stevens: There were no consultations over the previous academic years. We had a vague idea of a donation as a gesture of support. The 4.5 million was never discussed. This was not raised.

Marvin Ferrer: Would you say that a "fee in another name" would be a consequence of not making this donation?

Janice Deakin: There are no discussions on that but I cannot talk on this as I do not know.

Caroline Davis: One pressing issue is that the administration deal with these issues before such projects are launched. These details should be part of the planning process for such projects.

Pat Welsh: If I recall the original plan was 120M for phase 1, now 169M, for an eventual total of 220M.

Caroline Davis: \$15.5M from fundraising, still \$10.7M outstanding. We are trying to collect, but it is hard to get new money once the building is built. We have \$3.2M to date from the AMS. There is still a gap of \$128M.

Janice Deakin: As you all know this has not been smooth sailing; there have been changes in top leadership and shortfalls due to the economic crisis. Queen's used to never put a shovel in the ground before the money was in the bank. The history of Jackson Hall was made around 1938 because the students were tired of not having an athletic facility and was based initially on student pledges. My own view is that those facilities are for health and wellness and community. Queen's has to provide more and the existing facilities are so tired and old that there was real bravery to start these projects to add valuable facilities. It is a serious problem with the funding crisis, not for the lack of sound and brave decisions.

MOTION to extend meeting by 20 minutes Moved by Andrew Stevens/Marvin Ferrer
CARRIED

Vicki Bae: It was my understanding that the AMS was responsible for drafting the MOU.

Janice Deakin: I think we sat in summer house where Hood and I worked on language. It was not a matter of one side bringing the language; it was a back-and-fourth process.

Vicki Bae: I want to clarify that if we make the donation that the fee structuring will remain in our hands initially.

Janice Deakin: When you have the money and the support of the students, if the grad students voted in favor of a capital contribution, you would be in a stronger position to make a commitment.

Andrew Stevens: Is the money going to Phase 1 or the whole project?

Janice Deakin: The wording made reference to the entire building so it was likely for the whole project. This is something you will have to decide for yourselves.

Caroline Davis: We went into debt on Phase 1 so we will have to make decisions on future work.

Andrew Stevens: So the money has been directed to Phase 1, so what will happen with Phase 2 and 3.

Janice Deakin: Our approach will likely be to have the money in the bank before the next phases continue, especially since it is hard to raise funds once the building is complete.

Shauna Shiels: I think the funding from students is admirable but the demographics of students at Queen's is changing and students are less able to pay for such things, especially as grad students.

Janice Deakin: If we talk about income from students, 2010 is much higher than in the early 1900s. TA dollars are tied to inflation. While the entire operating budget has been cut year over year, the student support budget has been defended. I realize graduate students are in need, but I have to push back on this point. The grad center has been very good to students. As dean, I understand the push to always do more but I have to say that we are doing a good job.

Shauna Shiels: Do we have to opt out on campus or can we do it online.

Mark Rosner: It was available online at the SGPS this year, but I'm not certain for future years.

Marvin Ferrer: I want to dispel misconceptions about the undergrads support the the exec when this happened at an AGM with about 700 students. We should not have the idea that the undergrads supported the motion.

Chad Edwards: Has the shortfall affected the university's credit rating?

Caroline Davis: The rating agencies evaluated us before the project. This will be an important issue on future projects.

David Thompson: If we say no will you come back to subsequent councils again for money?

Janice Deakin: If you or the exec decide not have a referendum, we will probably come back to get a referendum. If there is a referendum and the students say no, it is much less likely that the university will come back. That dog ain't going to hunt.

Ryan Jeffrey: What is the status of Phase 2 and how have the university's plans changed?

Dumitru Oceanu: I'd also like to ask what the status of Phase 2 is and how have the university's plans changed?

Janice Deakin: They are just drawings but barring a lot of new money I don't think this will be touched. If a lot of money came through, we would be freed to start new projects. As it stands, we are limited to financing a quarter of new projects.

Mark Rosner: There is no motion but we have the opportunity to run a referendum in the upcoming SGPS election.

Vicki Bae: I think from the discussion, I think it is very clear that the council does not want to commit the money without any guarantees. I have to ask again what tangible benefits the

university can offer such as tuition freeze, access to spaces, if not now but before our meeting next month.

Janice Deakin: Before I became dean of the graduate school I made a case about graduate studies to the trustees. The major liability I felt was the reputation of the university as an undergraduate centered school. We have become more focused in the institutions that we compare ourselves with. We run at about 16% graduate students and I wanted to improve the footprint of the grad students so the students have a sense of a larger community. We don't have a Massey college, which could leverage interdisciplinary studies. I think the point is that there is a need for space for purely graduate use. The Principle was moved and liked this idea. It was one of the few areas where the administration and the graduate students agree. We are constrained on new buildings until this one is paid for, but a graduate college is very desirable. I'm not here to promise space or say one for another.

Mark Rosner: Thank you for the information you brought.

Janice Deakin: The Principle is making attempt to come to your next meeting and we can forward any anticipated questions and topics on this issue.

(Guests leave)

Patrick Welsh: I think this is a worthwhile discussion to have. The process by which the fee was added was very sketchy. One thing to consider is that we were being pragmatic considering the university will get the money one way or the other. What we can get is a seat at the table and other assurances as they are desperate. As Amir was alluding to, the university does hold a grudge. We've never asked the students on this question, there was never a referendum - every ancillary fee has to be approved by students.

Chad Edwards: I think it is an interesting thing to look into. The one thing that is concerning me is the credit rating. The university has a large short fall, cutting departments and they are still coming to us. I am willing to pay 20, 30, 40 dollars especially if we can get something for it. Credit rating is very important.

Amir: There are two points. I generally agree with students contributing to project on campus but not for fees that can cripple students. I am much more interested in the opt-out option. We need a Finance and Service Committee recommendation to bring to the Council.

MOTION to extend meeting by 30 minutes Moved by Chad Edwards/Patrick Welsh
CARRIED

Shauna Shiels: I am against paying for buildings when our tuition is supposed to cover these costs. Our agreement definitely needs to address additional requests for funds. We were worrying about 120K for a house but had no problem with 4.5M.

Marvin Ferrer: Vicki was asking what we were getting in exchange for this donation.

Vicki Bae: The balance does not seem like it should be 4.5M. We should consider the current balance between under grad and grad.

Andrew: I think it was better to leave our balance as it was in 2004.

Andrew Stevens: They have pursued this fee. It is totally false that this has happened in the past. If members want to vote for this fine, but it is a bribe to offer money for a place on the admin

panel. We could invest 4.5M in a graduate only facility. By the National Post standard they have an extremely strong balance sheet.

Alfonso Nocilla: Don't underestimate the value of good will.

Aniss Amdiss: If we look at it as a donation it has values as good will.

Motion: Moved by Pat Welsh/Chad Edwards BIRT the SGPS finance and services committee present a non-binding recommendation at the February SGPS council meeting regarding a Queen's Center fee.

Amir Nosrat: There is a procedure based on the nature of submitting this.

CARRIED

Discussion on New Executive Assistant Position (see appendix 1)

Sean Richards: I wrote a document about my job description, which is not exhaustive. It is about 75% complete, meaning an additional 25% more to add. Is there interest in the idea of another full-time person working at the SGPS? If so, we can come back next meeting with a proposal for a new full-time staff member. Maybe we can come back next month with a more concrete proposal to discuss.

Mark Rosner: We want a straw poll to look at interest for adding a new position.

Ryan: You feel this is needed to provide services. Are there any down sides other than more fees?

Patrick Welsh: I support the idea, but do we have the space and will we have support for the service agreement if there is a whole collection of new fees? How can we anticipate passing this to achieve our goals?

Sean Richards: It looks like there will be significant fees next year. There are options for adding more front-staff or having part-time staff. In September sometimes I am working 80 – 90 hour weeks.

Amir Nosrat: Did you clarify what the costs would be in adding another employee?

Sean Richards: I feel anything lower than \$40K, you get what you pay for. With benefits, this would be around 50K. It's probably about 14\$ per member, as not all our members pay full fees.

(General support.)

CRO –

Aniss Amdiss: I will volunteer .

MOTION Moved by Pat Welsh /Kate Kahn BIRT Aniss Amdiss be named as the CRO for the 2010 election.

CARRIED

9. Notice of Motions/Announcements

Reports and Motions for the next regular Council meeting are due Wednesday, February 2th, 2010.

The next regular SGPS Council meeting will be on Wednesday, February 9th, 2010.

10. Adjournment

MOTION

12/08/09:8

Moved __Jillian _ Burford-Grinnell _____ / __Chad_Edwards_____ BIRT the SGPS Council meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

01/12/10

MR

CFS-27

Attached:

December Minutes

Attendance December Meeting

Reports

Appendix 1 – Executive Assistant Position Document

Attendance**DATE: Tuesday, January 12th, 2010**

Department/Position	Name	Attendance
ANATOMY & CELL BIOLOGY	Marvin Ferrer	X
ART CONSERVATION	Hai-Yen Nguyen	X
ART HISTORY	Catherine Copp	X
BIOCHEMISTRY	Namit Sharma	
BIOLOGY	Chad Edwards	X
BIOLOGY	Chris Harris	
BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING	<i>vacant</i>	
BIostatISTICS	<i>vacant</i>	
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	Kristen Bowey	
CHEMISTRY	Patrick Cashin	X
CIVIL ENGINEERING	Omar Khader	
CLASSICS	<i>vacant</i>	
COMM HEALTH & EPIDEMIOLOGY	<i>vacant</i>	
COMPUTING	<i>Dumitru Onceanu</i>	X
COMPUTING	Mohammed Hussain	
CULTURAL STUDIES	Shannon Speed	
ECONOMICS	Derek Stacey	
ECONOMICS & JD COMBINED	<i>vacant</i>	
EDUCATION	Clara Baik	
EDUCATION	Alex Townsend	
EDUCATION (President)	Jarek Prwowarczyk	
EDUCATION (VP External)	Victoria Forbes	
Education (Graduate)	Michael Lockett	X
EDUCATION (Graduate)	Marcea Ingersoll	
ELEC & COMPUTER ENGINEERING	Ryan Bepalko	X
ENGLISH	Andrew Bingham	
ENV STUDIES	Nicole Mcdonald	X
FRENCH	Usha Rungoo	
GENDER STUDIES	Katherine Mazurok	
GEOGRAPHY	Vivian Wasiuta	
GEOGRAPHY	Clare Wasteney	
GEOLOGY & GEO ENGINEERING	<i>vacant</i>	
GERMAN	Stefanie Kullick	
GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT	<i>vacant</i>	
HISTORY	Josh Cole	X
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	Vacant	

KINESIOLOGY & HEALTH	Heather Gainforth	X
LAW	Aniss Amdiss	X
LAW	Rob Church	
LAW	Sierra Robson	X
LAW MASTERS	<i>vacant</i>	
MANAGEMENT	Joachim Scholz	
MATH & STATS	Philippe DePass	
MECH & MATERIAL ENGINEERING	Jerome James	
MICROBIOLOGY & IMMUNOLOGY	Andrew Pursell	X
MINING ENGINEERING	<i>vacant</i>	
MINING ENGINEERING	Justin Thompson	
NEUROSCIENCE	Andrew Pruszynski	
NURSING	<i>vacant</i>	
PATHOLOGY & MOLECULAR	Jess Hickey	
PATHOLOGY & MOLECULAR	Mia Golder	
PHARMACOLOGY & TOXICOLOGY	Mike Philbrook	
PHILOSOPHY	Andrew D.F. Ross	
PHYSICS & ASTRO ENGINEERING	Eoin O'Dwyer	X
PHYSIOLOGY	David Rodrigues	
POLITICAL STUDIES	Keren Katz	
PSYCHOLOGY	Sveda Bahtiyar	
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	Tyler Sutton	X
PUBLIC HEATH	<i>vacant</i>	
REHABILITATION (PROFESSIONAL)	Patricia Papoutsis	X
REHABILITATION (RESEARCH)	Mary Thurgood	
REHABILITATION Therapy	Tessa Young	X
RELIGIOUS STUDIES	Kathryn Neeley	
SOCIOLOGY	Stephanie Cork	X
SPANISH AND ITALIAN	<i>vacant</i>	
THEOLOGY	Yusuf Kappaya	
URBAN PLANNING	Ryan Jeffrey	X
SPEAKER *tie breaking vote only	Mark Rosner	X
DEPUTY SPEAKER	Neil Irvine	X
PRESIDENT	<i>Vicky Bae</i>	X
VP CAMPAIGNS & COMM AFFAIRS	Stephen Osterberg	X
VP FINANCE & SERVICES	Amir Nosrat	X
VP GRADUATE	<i>David Thompson</i>	X
VP PROFESSIONAL	Kate Kahn	X
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	Sean Richards	X

