



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, February 9th, 5:30pm
Room 241, JDUC

1. Presentations

Principal Woolf- Good evening, and thank you very much for inviting my colleagues and me to the SGPS council. I don't have a presentation. I do have a couple of brief comments on this presentation and some possible options to present to you. The origins of the proposal we brought to your executive go back to discussions long before many of us were in this room- go back to the commitment of the AMS to a capital contribution to the Queen's centre. We are informed that it was mooted, that there would be a SGPS contribution put to the members and the proportional amount was 4.5 million dollars at some point. Move to a few years later, the Queen's centre about to open, we raised this issue and sought to get this on a referendum question and after some negotiation with your executive, you have the motion that you will be shortly be voting on. Why should a graduate or professional student vote on this referendum to support the Queen's centre- paying 120\$ a year?

The Queen's centre is a significant enhancement to everybody.

It is an expensive building

It could not have happened without the AMS and its 25 + million contribution over a number of years.

The University is in a rather challenging set of financial circumstances. Every university in Ontario and beyond Ontario is in a similar financial situation. In essence, why we would very much like your help for these reasons:

1- We would like the graduate and professional students to be as invested in campus and in the centre as much as the undergraduate students.

2- We would like your help. We have a significant debt. We have all seen the consequences in the classes that we and the department heads, etc wrestle with every day. We know that in the context of planning, we need space for graduate and professional students. We mean physical and academic space.

I know, just as well as everyone...there is not enough room for graduate students. We are interested in pursuing a graduate centre or college space in the coming campaign.

Let me be clear- these two things are not linked. In the sense that 'no' vote on this, does not mean no graduate college. What a 'yes' vote on a referendum means is putting us in a better position to move forward, relieve the financial debt. A contribution will show to the outside donors how committed the internal donors are to this project.

Let me say that we would very much like to have the SGPS's positive vote on a capital contribution to the Queen's Centre, how we actually get there is absolutely a matter for discussion. You certainly have an immediate question before you, or will amend this on how you see fit. We are open to discussion. I would like to hear the flavour of this discussion in the time allotted and I would like to make some closing comments after questions.

Mark Rosner- Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

Jerome James- I just had a question about the space being allotted to the centre. Is it going to be graduate pub space, or a room for graduate students to hang out?

Principal Woolf- I don't know if we have got to that part. We still need to discuss this. Currently the AMS is invested in us. But the short answer is that we don't have a formal group and are in the process of setting up a group.

Janice Deakin (Dean of Graduate Studies)- Phase 1 is out there. But phase 2 and 3 are in the process. In phases 2 and 3 we used the AMS and SGPS to discuss this for the Queen's centre. There is some discussion of the space but we are not there at this point.

Principal Woolf- There is no sense to discuss this until phases 2 and 3 they are will be built.

Principal Woolf- In proportion to you contribution you will get a similar construction.

Councilor - I realize that the fee is mandatory, but would you be open to the fee being optional? Given that the fee may fluctuate- would you be open to it being an optional fee?

Principal Woolf- The difficulty of an optional fee, the general idea is that it doesn't get us anywhere, there is something in the SGPS constitution... after 3 years fees need to be renewed?

Mark Rosner- All fees need to be renewed every 3 years.

Councilor- Would the main focus be on life sciences and include the ARC?

Principal Woolf- Would not include the ARC. It would include the parts of the refurbished JDUC. It would remain a student life facility.

Marvin Ferrer- The SGPS pays the operational fees for the operations of the Student life centre?

Principal Woolf- Actually you pay only for the JDUC.

Janice Deakin- There is a mandatory fee to pay for that. There is a shared responsibility for the JDUC and the Athletics centre.

Marvin Ferrer- I'm wondering about your positions on student government fees and why are we paying for this operational fee?

Principal Woolf- The operational fee is going to the JDUC not to the new building.

Councilor - What is the logic of the administration to choose the number 4.5 million? How did they arrive at 25 million?

Principal Woolf- I cannot speak to this, that decision was made by a prior AMS exec.

Michael Ceci- 25.5 million was decided based on how large the student body. It wasn't any specific formula. An overarching 30 million was to be given by student body.

Amir Nosrat- They left out SGPS for the decision on this number. They assumed that the SGPS should contribute the remaining amount.

Mark Rosner- We are not debating.

Amir Nosrat- Is this a request, not a demand, Principal Woolf? If this is a request, my question is what has the administration invested in the SGPS so that we can invest in the AMS and SGPS together?

Principal Woolf- We are doing our level best at the moment to protect our financial situation at the moment. We are trying to protect TAs, TA alliance, and things that need to be protected. I think we see in the senior administration and throughout campus a strong and enhanced role for graduate students in developing Queen's for the future. I encourage you to contribute comment to the plan.

Janice Deakin- The request is ultimately to have the membership of the graduate and professional students. At least consider the contribution of capital. This is a request for the bricks and mortar that will be here for the next 50 years. As much as I've been the Dean of the Graduate school, the TA support budget, the number has increased by 3 million. The international has increased by 1.5 million for tuition offset for international students. As the administration changes, historically here, the graduate programs are smothered by the hype of the undergraduate students. But I have to say that the grad programs and students are doing much, much better.

Victoria Bae- I'd like to speak to Marvin's question about the operational fee. We do pay for the operation of the JDUC. Money has also gone to pay for the transition of the Queen's centre.

Principal Woolf- Reemphasis. There is a difference between a capital contribution and an operational contribution. This is a contribution only for the bricks.

Pat Welsh- What would happen if the student body overwhelmingly overturns this referendum? Will there be an additional fee imposed on students?

Principal Woolf- We cannot impose fees unilaterally. But how can we go to the AMS and tell them that they have to share the entire student body who half has said that they overwhelmingly said they do not want to make a capital contribution? It is a matter of discussion, but to have a building like this, there has to be a collective commitment. You have use of the building, but in terms of the governance, it is simply a matter of fairness

Pat Welsh- Can I ask another question?

Mark Rosner- Can that wait? There is a matter of time. We have a number of things to discuss.

Jeff Welsh- Do you know the approximate figure for the current advancement budget?

Principal Woolf- I would have to get that to you. We are in the midst of VP budget submissions.

Jeff Welsh- In terms of making the pitch for constrains of the budget situation, the advancement of this amount of money, it seems to me that there are several millions of dollars that could be played with every year? Second question- The issue of whether the SGPS will be included in the Queen's centre governance if there is a capital contribution... historically representation has always been based on the operating budget. There are always contributions based on the operating budget. The suggestion that the SGPS will contribute 20% is reprehensible to me. I'd like you to find a way to justify this to the members. I think the way you are going about this by empty threats is reprehensible.

Principal Woolf- No comment on Jeff Welsh's concerns.

Andrew Stevens- The problem I see is that this is not a student owned building, this is a university owned building. I am in support of capital contribution to buildings, like Commerce and Medicine. Etc., But I am concerned that governance is based on capital contribution beyond government grants. Is this how this will work from now on, similar to a user fee? So then unless we pay for the building we will not have access to the building?

Principal Woolf- We did not say that.

Andrew Stevens- It is a university owned building that we have limited representation on the governing body?

Principal Woolf- We are not in an age of all government ownership. I am simply indicating what I think the logical outcome will be and it is not a threat. It is for this body to decide whether it wants a role in the governance and I think it is a legitimate question to ask.

Heather Gainforth- You mentioned that you want us to be integrated and that we are in a challenging financial situation. Is it Ok to put a price on integration? With grad students having less and less money, is there a price on integration?

Principal Woolf- This is not an academic building. This is an auxiliary space that is not funded at all by government. Many people are not aware that we can get some funding for academic buildings such as Medicine and Commerce, but this is an auxiliary space. For a graduate college, we would most certainly come back to discuss a contribution for that project. I don't see how the two are connected.

Leora Jackson - In general, external benefactors don't buy a say when student groups make a contribution to a university donation. Does that mean they are viewed differently, or have a role in the way it is spent?

Principal Woolf- There are seats on the board for the benefactors. There is a category for benefactors.

Leora Jackson - A \$1000 dollar contribution.

Principal Woolf- The amount is for another discussion. But the principle is not in discussion. These are academic decisions, but this is not such a circumstance.

David Thompson- I appreciated this discussion, especially the discussion stating that there is no link to a Queen's Centre contribution to a grad centre or college. Will there be any discussion for SGPS? Will there be any benefits to us other than for a capital contribution?

Principal Woolf- this is a good point. I'll answer this and make my closing comments. We value a collegial relationship with SGPS and its members, so the answer is yes and no, we respect any decision. I think my colleagues and I have a good sense of the flavour of this discussion that we may need to have a longer discussion....

We would be perfectly comfortable with the outcome of this meeting to set up a working group for positive exchange for a contribution to the Queen's centre. Recognizing that this may take another year, but we feel better for this.

Yes we are interested in entertaining a discussion about this subject.

Thank you. I appreciate your frank and full views on the subject. We will respect your decision on the evening. We will respect the decision of the membership if the referendum comes up. We would be happy to talk about building a clear case for what is next for the members of the SGPS. If you decide to withdraw the referendum we are very much engaged in having this conversation throughout the next year. Thank you very

much.

2. Adoption of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION

02/09/10:1

Moved ___Andrew Ross_ _____ / ___Chris Harris_____ BIRT the agenda for February 9, 2010 be adopted.

Carried

MOTION

02/09/10:2

Moved ___Steve Osterberg__ _____ / ___Chris Harris___ BIRT the minutes for January, 2010 be accepted.

Carried

Victoria Bae- There have been many flaws in the meetings' minutes. Names are inconsistent, first and last names are inconsistent. The minutes lack professionalism and have strange formatting, bolding at random places, formality of language, etc. Is it the role of the deputy speaker to change the formality of language?

Mark Rosner- Good suggestions. The Deputy Speaker resigned last night. Michelle is willing to continue on, a motion later on will be taken later on to ratify her as Deputy Speaker later on. Are there any other concerns for the minutes? Any other concerns will be updated in the minutes for the agenda.

3. Executive and Speaker Reports

a) President – Vicky Bae (report attached)

Please keep your questions about the Queen's Centre until after. It appears that the SGPS will get more space for the SGPS as a whole. This opens the door for the SGPS to have a more central hub for their members and their societies. To follow up on the international tuition freeze- the letter has been sent out. Law, business, the school of medicine have all signed. The letter has been sent out and I will speak to this in my report next month. It was also signed by both SGPS and AMS. Think that this was a significant move

b) VP Graduate – David Thompson (report attached)

Nothing to add.

c) VP Professional – Kate Kahn (report attached)

Nothing to add.

d) VP Campaigns and Community Affairs – Steve Osterberg (report attached)

Two things- one humorous, one not so much. We met with the city. 247 people with recycling bins on their front porch which is in fact in violation of a city by-

law. We also met with the city-university relations committee about safety issues. Stephanie Nairn is trying to get the city to address the safety issues in city parks. The very beginnings of discussions have begun. Maybe, blue lights will be involved. I would love feedback on whether it is too dark, that traffic is too heavy, etc. They tried to convince us that it is not a park issue. I need some ammunition to get something done. I need comments from you. Thanks.

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

Nothing to add. Let's thank Sean Richards for his dedication. He just had a baby on Saturday. Thanks Sean, congrats

f) Speaker – Mark Rosner (no report)

MOTION

02/09/10:3

Moved ___Jillian Burford-Grinnell___ / ___Andrew Ross___ BIRT Executive and Speaker reports be accepted.

Carried

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

a) Graduate Student Senator – Andrew Stevens (report attached)

The discussion with the senate on the principal's Where NEXT. This has been going on for more than 5 years. Hopefully now something more tangible will come from this, such as, developing some more concrete values that will better inform us and inform on financial issues. This is an ongoing issue (a little under a year) of SORC, as in, who represents education students? AMS or ESS? At the grad studies council, we discussed the issue that PhD enrolment is under and the Master's is over and how they are trying to balance out the financial issues. Thankfully Janice Deakin is trying to pass award bursary for travel, etc. I think it would be helpful if the members looked over this proposition. We need some representation from the Applied Sciences faculty for feedback.

b) Board of Trustees – Alfonso Nocilla (no report)

c) Committee Reports

d) Commissioner Reports

i) Social Commissioner – Diala Habib (report attached)

There is a SGPS family skate. Unfortunately, there is no place to rent skates in Kingston. If you have a place in mind where you can rent skates, let me know. I encourage you to read the e-letter to find out what is going on in social events. The international students have a place where you can rent skates, but only for international students

ii) Communications Commissioner – Sean Richards (report attached)

Nothing to add.

iii) Equity Commissioner: Sophia Virani (report attached)

Amir Nosrat- Questions to be submitted to Sophia: In David's report there was a recent change regarding the centre for teaching and learning. Queen's has made

it mandatory for international students to take a course in English language. You are charged 100 dollars. You are forced to take this course and then pay 100 dollars. What is the equity commissioner planning on doing about this? And where do they stand on these issues at the international centre?

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 (report attached)
- v) Education Students’ Coordinator – Alessandro La Gomba (no report)
- vi) Rector – Leora Jackson (no report)

The tricolour awards nominations are now going on. This is the highest award to a Queen’s student in the community, not for academic or athletic achievements. The nomination form is online, you can find it if you go to queensu.ca/rector.ca. I encourage people to nominate people and honour their own. Nick Day, who will be replacing as me as Rector is present and would like to say a few words.

Nick Day- Hello, I’m excited to work on these issues. This is a great way to get to know you. Thanks so much for letting me sit in today.

Jeff Welsh- A question for the Rector: Do you know if senator Welsh can be a recipient of the award?

Pat Welsh- We can work on it.

- vii) Chief Returning Officer – Aniss Amdiss
- viii) Departmental Reports

MOTION

02/09/10:4

Moved _____Andrew Ross_____ / ___Pat Welsh_____ BIRT Senator/Board of Trustees/Commissioner/ Coordinator / Committee, and Other reports be accepted.

Carried

Aniss Amdiss - the SGPS election and referendum will be taking place on the 17th and 18th. There will be 6 polling stations at the JDUC, Queen’s Centre, west campus, etc. If you have any questions, please come see me. An all candidates meeting will be held on February 16th at 5:30- 7:00 at the Grad Club.

David Thompson- The second floor will be open.

Mark Rosner- I want to echo this sentiment. Get the information out to departments. .

5. Question Period/Departmental Issues

Steve Osterberg- This is out of synch. Most of the fees we were in agreement with, except one big one. The walk home fee will probably be pulled when we move to move them. This is an opportunity to let them speak because they have to leave. The issue the finance and services committee had with the walk home fee increase is due to mismanagement of their budget. There were a couple of lines that were extraneous, such as an advertising line and a poster, and money spent on refurbishing furniture. The need for salaries was a legitimate request but could be tighter. They will be speaking to this issue.

WALK HOME PRESENTATION by Leslie Yun (Vice President Operations) and Ellen Allwright (Hospitality and Safety Director) and Mike Sinclair (Head Manager of Walk Home Service)

Leslie Yun- Why we need this increase and the reasons. We will answer questions as well. Walk home is one of our premiere services. We average about 50 walk homes every night. An increase in demand for walk home. Increased demand based on security issues. We go as far as the lake, west campus, etc. this is a vital part of our university. The increase is important- minimum wage has gone up to a total of \$10.25- a 30% increase.

Increased visibility, and demand. Wait times are longer. When students have to wait an unreasonable amount of time, we give them a taxi chit. But we are already over budget for this. We are hoping to increase staffing to two more groups.

There has been a 10% increase in staffing- this represents over more than 300 000 dollars in budget. The depreciation figure does not go to furniture. This goes to radio services. In terms of furniture, none of this money goes to furniture in the Walk Home Office. Even with the increase, we are working at a deficit. We consider this a valuable service and ideally we will work to get out of this deficit.

Pat Welsh- How much usage do SGPS members use?

Mike Sinclair- Any numbers we have are anecdotal. We pride ourselves on confidentially. A significant amount of people from the SGPS do use the walk home student. These figures are anecdotal, but rest assured that grad students do use our service

Rob Church- Are SGPS members allowed to apply for walk home?

Leslie Yun - No they are not allowed to apply. This is a benefit for paying into the AMS. We are looking for an operating cost and think that this a separate issue. The employment opportunities we offer are only to our members.

Steve Ostenberg- None of the issues are about its worth. It is all about budgetary expenditures. Do you have the same number of staff when it is bright and sunny as when it is only bright and sunny until 4?

Mike Sinclair- There was a general flow from 7-9. In the summer when we are open to 9-11 we have 2 teams. Right now, we have about 11 teams on. Week by week we look at our previous numbers, try to cut down, or try to make no waste in our staffing.

Victoria Bae- The question is about the budget not the specific issues. Do you have an explanation for other issues that the finance committee has spoken of?

Steve Osterberg- The social and the advertising, posters...

Mike Sinclair- The different lines for different expenditures are messy. I agree on you on this point. There are different areas of advertising. Hours of operation change, key chains which was a big success. With any advertising we have seen a huge boom in participation and application. With online advertising we have saved a lot of money including Facebook groups.

Leslie Yun- Even if we did cut our budget in half, we would still only break even. With social funds, this comes to about 20 dollars per staff member, which comparably to other staffs is not that much. For appreciation, this is a reasonable amount.

Michael Ceci- It is less than 20 dollars per staff just as a form as appreciation throughout the year.

Mike Sinclair- The reason that the advertising needs to be so large and important is that the students that need this service the most don't know that it exists and that is why the budget is the way it is.

Leslie Yun- We have 5 people (??) to help with marketing and HR issues who are not salary but on wage.

Mark Rosner- Thank you.

Walk Home- Thanks for having us.

Mark Rosner- I'd like to flag appendix number 2- that was submitted by a Post Doc from a McGill student. Authorship issues for PhD theses. After 2 years, you are required to publish your work as open source.

David Thompson- Unless you sign a deferral at the time.

Mark Rosner- All intellectual property rights remain the same, I encourage you to read and look at this issue.

Victoria Bae- This can directly impact our membership.

Jerome James- Does her letter affect Masters students?

David Thompson- Yes, it does.

Jerome James- How do other institutions deal with this?

David Thompson- It varies between universities. A vast majority have a voluntary open source as opposed to a mandatory status. But there is an increasing move to making to mandatory.

Jerome James- And the benefits?

David Thompson- There are benefits...information is available, there is an open forum for discussion. But there is an issue of publication and publishers not interested in publishing work already online. I can circulate her letter for next time and then we can discuss responses afterwards.

Mark Rosner- Great, thanks. Any departmental issues?

Marvin Ferrer- Student constables. There was a pro- life speaker and student constables checked every single sign that went into the event and approved all signs. I e-mailed the student constable on what basis signs would be refused if they were going to be refused at any point. I got no reply. Are we ok with that?

Victoria Bae- I am not Ok with that.

Vivian Wasiuta- Has anyone else come across the issue of medical insurance for grad students working in the field? If there is an accident, what coverage do students have if they are not considered employees or by who their employer is? This is something, in my history, universities do not deal very well. Has anyone come across this, and is there an issue for grad students working in the field and medical insurance?

Mark Rosner- We do have extended medical coverage. We can double check to see if it's a work related issue whether you are covered.

Sean Richards- It depends on what the issue is.

Vivian - Who evaluates these issues?

Sean Richards- It depends a lot on the individual cases. I can't give a blanket answer because it is dealt mostly individually.

Catherine Copp- I had a lot of advisement by student advisors. I would recommend going to talk to someone.

Vivian Wasiuta- I went through a plan that all of my employees would be covered. I had a personal injury that will cost me 10, 000 dollars because I am not an employee but my

employees are covered. Our extended medical and dental coverage is pretty limited.

Mark Rosner- Student advisors have an advocacy role and help to navigate the administration effectively. We also offer a dental bursary and an emergency fund.

Rob Church- For Amir: for the housing authority, is it a not for profit organization, or for profit, going a separate structure which we never discussed. Is this a discussion simply for not for profit?

Amir Nosrat- Council voted for housing. I submitted my report. I encourage everyone to read the draft for the new housing authority. Final remarks: I will be asking for about 150, 000 dollars next council meeting.

Mark Rosner- Any motion over 1000 dollars needs to be read at two consecutive meetings before it is brought to vote.

Amir Nosrat- There are alternatives. If you feel strongly about this...

Rob Church - To see that the two other options have appeared out the the ether.

Mark Rosner- This is a procedural matter. We have only approved a not for profit corporation. That's it. Any other concerns?

6. Business Arising from the Minutes

7. Main Motions

MOTION

02/09/10:5

Moved _____Victoria_Bae_____ / _Steve Osterberg_____ BIRT the SGPS AGM be moved from March 9th to March 23rd.

Mark Rosner- I will rule this out of order. We are required to publicize and Council decisions are final. Short of an election or extenuating service, I think that the bylaws are final and that the decisions that are made in this forum are final. I don't know the content of the bylaw submissions but I am ruling this out of order.

Victoria Bae- I submitted this motion. I move that we challenge the chair. (seconded by Kate Kahn)

MOTION

02/09/10:5

Moved _____Victoria_Bae_____ / _Steve Osterberg_____ to challenge the chair's ruling.

Kate Kahn is made temporary speaker

Mark Rosner- Council's decisions are final. No motions have been changed. Tough luck, the changes that can be made- it is unfortunate, we should have caught this sooner, the notice should have been made sooner, but we have made our bed.

Victoria Bae- This is an important change we have to make. I was not a part of the executive. It is my knowledge that the AGM happens after the March meeting to acknowledge this problem. We were given about a week to make changes effected by the speaker. I asked for a month to work on this issue. I think that bylaws and issues need time to reach an effective form. There is a precedent. Last year, we moved a council meeting after the day after Remembrance Day. We do have plenty of time; we have 2 or 3 newsletters to be put out to the members online.

Jeff Welsh- If Council's decision being final that means that there is no other body to challenge council's decisions. Generally when this kind of language is used, this is Robert's rulebook. For this, this is not an issue. For the readings, 2 weeks, there is this council meeting, there is the council meeting on the 9th and after it ends, the general meeting would be after, the only question would be whether the council would be open to accept motions now and then on the 9th and then vote on them at the council meeting on the same day. Is this allowable?

Victoria Bae- If the AGM happens on the 9th, and no one submits changes... we cannot make changes to bylaws until November. I think that we need to make changes before that time.

MOTION 02/09/10: 5-Call the question

Moved _____ Chris Harris/ _____ Amir Nosrat _____ BIRT to call the question to uphold the Speaker's ruling

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: 5-Uphold ruling of Speaker

Not Carried

Vote on MOTION 02/09/10:5

Moved _____ Bae _____ / _____ Steve Osterberg _____ BIRT the SGPS AGM be moved from March 9th to March 23rd.

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10:6

Moved _____ Amir Nosrat _____ / _____ Victoria Bae _____ BIRT the Executive sign onto the AMS/SGPS Service Agreement, or a similar document that

preserves its substance as presented in Appendix 6.

Amir Nosrat- The service agreement has failed at negotiations for over 9 years. The point of the service agreement is to regulate services, journal, CFRC, Walk Home, etc and to avoid headaches. The AMS has just signed on and approved it at their board. Please sign on to this.

Pat Welsh- This seems to be a fairly fair negotiation. But it is costing someone money. What role does the SGPS employment play in the negotiation given that we are paying a proportional amount of fees. Is this a type-o?

Amir Nosrat- Yes, this is a talking point of a service agreement. This would not have passed at AMS. I am hoping to get a foot in the door and see how these services can be better tailored to SGPS service. For example, the journal neglects grad concerns. Having a direct representative would better represent our concerns.

Pat Welsh- Is this issue up for more debate?

Amir Nosrat- The service issue will be up for debate every 3 years

Marvin Ferrer – Student constables?

Amir Nosrat- We don't not share fees for student constables.

Chris Harris- Does any change for Walk home, does it make it moot?

Amir Nosrat- All of these shared services will have to be carried for referendum. Yes, this will be a moot point.

Sean Richards- What is the fee?

Amir Nosrat- The fees are classified. These are shared services, such as the ones with AMS. This must be an amendment, by referendum they must be carried to a new class as stipulated by this service agreement.

Victoria Bae- The walk home fee will be regulated by this agreement. Then won't this render the walk home fee discussion today null?

Amir Nosrat- No.

Mark Rosner- Further questions?

Pat Welsh- What do you envision a similar vision to be?

Amir Nosrat- Mike? Change the title to better sell to the other assembly. Making this more legally binding.

Mark Rosner- This would just entail grammatical or typographical changes?

Amir Nosrat- Or the title.

Steve Ostenberg- What do we get? There is a good restrictive structure to how much we can get. Basically we are allowing the AMS to increase their fee by 9%. I fear we are giving too much away of our own governance.

Amir Nosrat- We will not have to regulate all of the AMS fees. We would get representation on these bodies and direct links to the journal, CFRC, the Walk Home service, etc.

Mark Rosner- No further discussion?

MOTION 02/09/10:6:

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: 30min

Moved ___ Mia Golder/ ___ Steve Osterberg ___ BIRT to extend the SGPS meeting by a half hour

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10:7

Whereas the SGPS budget is to be revisited.

Moved ___ Nosrat ___ / ___ David Thompson ___ BIRT that the Emergency Student Aid line be increased by 1666.66;
BIFRT that the Grants Program line be increased by 1666.66;
BIFRT that the \$1666.66 be contributed to the Dental Bursary program.

Amir Nosrat- Motion- 5000 dollars for budget. Split 3 ways.

Mark Rosner- This will come up for second reading.

Amir Nosrat- No, because this is just a re-visitation.

Mark Rosner- It will come up for a second reading.

MOTION 02/09/10:7:

Carried

Mark Rosner- Fees subject to renewal for SGPS council- rather than going for referendum they can be carried by council.

MOTION 02/09/10: Omnibusing motions 6-19 (except 16, 17)

Moved ___ Steve Osterberg/ ___ Pat Welsh ___ BIRT motions 6-19 (except 16, 17) be voted on as a package.

Steve Osterberg- Most of these are renewals. We have gone over these. There are no big surprises.

Amir Nosrat- The finances services committee has recommended it for approval.

Pat Welsh- With the chair's permission, both movers would be prepared to make amendments individually.

Mark Rosner- 16 and 17 need amendments.

Andrew Stevens- Do you receive any information whether the money is being used properly?

Gareth Stackhouse- We make inquiries as to how the money is being used. We look over these packages and see how these organizations are doing. For example we went back to the Food bank. We do the dirty work, so council meetings do not go on forever.

MOTION 02/09/10: Omnibusing motions 6-19 (exception of 16, 17):

Carried

Fees Subject to Renewal By SGPS Council

MOTION 02/09/10:8

Moved ___ Amir_Nosrat ___ / ___ Steve Osterberg ___ BIRT the OPIRG Kingston Class B Optional Fee (indexed to inflation) of \$4.28 be renewed.

MOTION 02/09/10:9

Moved ___ Amir_Nosrat ___ / ___ Steve Osterberg ___ BIRT the Human Rights Office Positive Space Program Class B Optional Fee (indexed to inflation) of \$0.27 be renewed.

MOTION 02/09/10:10

Moved ___ Amir_Nosrat ___ / ___ Steve Osterberg ___ BIRT the Dawn House Women's Shelter Class B Optional Fee (indexed to inflation) of \$0.52 be renewed.

MOTION 02/09/10:11

Moved ___ Amir_Nosrat ___ / ___ Steve Osterberg ___ BIRT the Queen's Journal Class A Mandatory fee of \$3.50 be renewed.

MOTION 02/09/10:12

Moved ___ Amir ___ Nosrat ___ / ___ Steve Osterberg ___ BIRT the Kingston Coalition Against Poverty Class A Optional fee of \$2.50 be renewed.

MOTION 02/09/10:13

Moved ___ Amir_Nosrat ___ / ___ Steve Osterberg ___ BIRT the

AMS/SGPS Food Bank Class A Optional fee of \$1.00 be renewed.

MOTION 02/09/10:14

Moved ___Amir_Nosrat_____ / ___Steve Osterberg_____ BIRT the Kingston Youth Shelter Class B Optional Fee (indexed to inflation) of \$0.91 be renewed.

Fees Subject to Renewal, Increase or Establishment by Referendum

MOTION 02/09/10:15

Moved ___Amir_Nosrat_____ / ___Steve Osterberg_____ BIRT the Student Refugee Support Class B Optional fee \$3.04 be put to referendum in the following form: "Should the SGPS renew a Class B (indexed for inflation) Optional fee of \$3.04 for the Student Refugee Support?"

MOTION 02/09/10:18

Moved ___Amir_Nosrat_____ / ___Steve Osterberg_____ BIRT the QISS Bursary Program Class B Optional Fee (indexed to inflation) of \$0.64 be put to referendum in the following form: "Should the SGPS renew the QISS Bursary Class B Optional fee (indexed for inflation) fee of \$0.64?"

MOTION 02/09/10:19

Moved ___Amir_Nosrat_____ / ___Steve Osterberg_____ BIRT the Queen's Legal Aid Class A Mandatory fee increase from \$4.50 to \$5.00 be put to referendum in the following form: "Do you agree to an increase from \$4.50 to \$5.00 n the mandatory Class A fee for Queen's Legal Aid? The fee is not indexed to inflation and has not been increased in 15 years. This fee provides Queen's students with legal services."

Mark Rosner- Vote for fees to be renewed (see motions) to be put to referendum, the student refugee support. QISS – referendum. Increase for legal aid? Everything before will be automatically renewed by council.

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10:16

Moved ___Amir_Nosrat_____ / ___Steve Osterberg_____ BIRT the Sexual Health Resource Center Class B Optional fee of \$4.28 be put to referendum in the following form: "Should the SGPS establish a Class B (indexed for inflation fee) Optional fee of \$4.28 for the Sexual Health Resource Center?"

MOTION 02/09/10: 16-M1

Moved ___Marvin Ferrer/ ___Steve Osterberg___ BIRT the fee change from \$4.28 to 85 cents.

Marvin Ferrer- That was the amount that we submitted. We only need 85 cents.

Amir Nosrat- Are you a representative of the Sexual Health Resource Centre?

Marvin Ferrer- Yes, I am with them and I asked the director and we don't need 4.28\$, as much as we would like it.

MOTION 02/09/10: 16-M1

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: 16-M1 (Motion as amended):

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10:17

Moved _____Nosrat_____ / _____Andrew Ross_____ BIRT the SPGS Sustainability Class C Optional Fee (indexed to inflation) of \$1.50 be put to referendum in the following form: Council put the following question to referendum: "Should the SGPS establish a \$1.50 Class C optional Sustainability fee (indexed to inflation) to be managed by the SGPS Sustainability Committee which is to go toward sustainability focused graduate initiatives at Queen's University?"

Mark Rosner- \$1.50 sustainability fee. Classification of student fees- I would suggest this not be a class C fee, but a class B fee to reflect a better interpretation of bylaws. The question should also read for professional students as well. If we could open this up to discussion.

Amir Nosrat- As much respect as I have for the speaker, this is a class C fee, not a class B. It should remain a class C fee and should be increased.

MOTION 02/09/10: 17-M1: In favour of including the word professional:

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: 17- M2: Change fee from class C fee to class B:

Not Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: 17-M2 (Motion as amended):

Carried

Mark Rosner- Ok, so there is a problem with room booking. We can move to the John Orr room just right down the hall. I would appreciate you to not disappear. The most controversial question is about to be discussed. My apologies.

MOTION 02/09/10:20

Moved _____Andrew Ross _____ / _____Mia Golder_____ BIRT the increase of the Queen's WalkHome Class B Mandatory fee (indexed to inflation) of \$3.98 be put to referendum in the following form: "Do you agree to an increase to the Queen's

Walkhome Class B Mandatory fee (indexed to inflation) from \$13.83 to \$17.81, an increase of \$3.98?”

Mark Rosner- We pay this fee, but the question is to put this to referendum

Jeff Welsh- This increase would be due to mandatory increase- Ontario wage increase. Voice my opinion to congratulate the service committee. Our members use it, and if the quibble is over a couple thousand of dollars, I certainly wouldn't want this on my conscience if there was an attack.

Mark Rosner- This is a renewal. This must be moved to be consistent at our bylaws. Last renewed in 07-08.

MOTION 02/09/10:20: M1

Moved ___Amir___Nosrat_____ / _____Steve Osterberg_____ to add that the fee was last renewed in 07-08.

CARRIED

Amir Nosrat- Can you make this an AMS-SGPS walk home? Can you make the change in the title?

Michael Ceci- I don't like to be put on the spot, there would require more discussion on this point.

Steve Osterberg- Is this Queen's or AMS? What is its title?

Mark Rosner- Does it have an official title?

Steve Osterberg- Concludes Queen's and AMS? A friendly amendment.

MOTION 02/09/10: 20-M2

Moved____Steve Osterberg/____Victoria Bae____ BIRT to change the title of Queen's Walk Home Service AMS Walk Home Service

Motion 02/09/10: 20-M2: Call the question

Moved ___Victoria Bae/_____ BIRT MOTION 02:09/10: 20-M2 question be called.

Carried

Mark Rosner- Any further discussion?

Jerome James- Not what it's called but where the advertising money is going to go? Many of my roommates didn't know where this money was going. A lot of the advertisement needs to go to the graduate students too.

Steve Osterberg- Point of information. This is a moot point anyway; we are going to pay this based on the service agreement.

Victoria Bae- This is not a moot point.

Mark Rosner- This is a legitimate question Jerome.

Leslie Yun- We will try to make a more concerted effort to reach out to graduate and professional students.

Chris Harris- Any new SGPS members who have not gone through their undergrad may not understand that the AMS walk home is also a service for grad students. A name change would be beneficial without spending any money for advertising.

Mike Sinclair- For all intents and purposes, it is simply called the Walk Home services for legal purposes.

Amir Nosrat- The services agreement would address these concerns more directly.

Leslie Yun- We don't call it the AMS Queen's journal, we don't use the AMS in our services, just to clarify.

Mark Rosner- No further discussion.

MOTION 02/09/10: 20-M1 (Motion as amended):

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10:21

Moved _____ Mia Golder _____ / _____ Jess Hickey _____ BIRT the establishment of the Queen's Centre Class A Mandatory fee of \$112.50 be put to referendum in the following form: "Do you agree to the establishment of a Class A Mandatory fee (not indexed for inflation) of \$112.50 to be contributed towards the Queen's Centre capital project?"

Mark Rosner- Council is encouraged approve all fees at referendum. We are debating whether to put the question on the ballot. Provided that the seven criteria; phrased correctly, not misleading, indexed to inflation, contact information, copy of financial statement and question is submitted to financial and services committee.

Victoria Bae- We need to extend the meeting.

MOTION 02/09/10: +30min

Moved ___ Steve Osterberg/ ___ Mia Golder ___ BIRT the meeting be extended by a half an hour.

Carried

Gareth Stackhouse- We vote and recommend to council. We had a lot of debate and back and forth e-mail debate. We decided not to recommend. Three different views of the question: The no vote; not recommend we take this to council. Not in the financial interest of the membership. Yes; take the question to the membership and have them decide and hopefully it will be defeated and show the administration what we feel about their question. The Abstentions; not in the best financial interests but believes that it is beyond the reach of the committee. It is for council to decide.

Rob Church- Based on Principal Woolf's motion, the wording, it is a substantial amendment, not financially significant but we will accept the philosophy.

The rationale is that the administration's idea is that their proposed motion will fail. Right now the principal offered the beginnings of a working group. At Queen's, things are often done in working groups; it would be foolish to not take this advantage. This offer solves the problems. There will never be a better opportunity to discuss the fee itself. So as it stands right now, the examination would be 30 minutes with the principal and a few e-mails with Mark. Given the amount of time with Amir's 150, 000 dollar housing proposal, the Principal's proposition of one year is an appropriate amount of time to discuss a 4.5 million dollar contribution.

MOTION 02/09/10: 21-M1

Moved ___ Rob Church/ ___ Pat Welsh ___ BIRT MOTION 02/09/10:21 be taken off the ballot and the SGPS participate in a working group with the Principal and Administration

Mark Rosner- This amendment doesn't strike me as being in order. If we can debate the motion...

Rob Church- I would gladly wait. The council has basically decided that it won't be on the ballot.

Mark Rosner- I have moved this amendment out of order. You can speak to the motion. We will just consider the question, let's continue with the speaker's list.

Rob Church- I'd like to challenge the ruling of the chair.

MOTION 02/09/10: 21-M1

Moved ___ Rob Church/ ___ Pat Welsh ___ to challenge the chair's ruling.

Kate Kahn is made temporary speaker

Rob Church- There is no nefarious purpose behind the motion. The principal did give an

offer of a working group. I understand mechanically speaking why the speaker did this. Let's deal with this now while it's on people's minds.

Mark Rosner- When you have a motion, you can't amend the motion to do the opposite of what it demands. What you should do instead, is vote against the motion and substitute another motion at a later date. If people want to see the amendment pass then they should simply rule against the motion.

David Thompson- I am in agreement with Mark. I asked the question about incentives. Woolf gave us no real information. Why the fee is worded in this way is because there is 4.5 million dollars asked to be given and nothing in return. Point of order is that Rob works for Diane Kelly.

Rob Church- Point of personal privilege. How many people are TAs!

Pat Welsh- Point of Order. We are trying to separate personal issues and student issues.

Amir Nosrat- Point of information. It is pertinent that we explain how the committee came to this discussion.

Kate Kahn- Ruling on violation of privilege. Rob has a point.

Amir Nosrat- Could the finance and services committee clarify?

Gareth Stockhouse- The bare naked question: 4.5 million dollars in 10 years. There have been no negotiations and we thought this could be the most honest and valid explanation and then we could move on and say yes or no to the motions.

Victoria Bae- We are dealing with challenging the rights of ruling. I would like to speak in favour in Mark's ruling. Rob is trying to achieve things that could change two things at one time. This is not an amendment, I would therefore like to urge the council to support Mark's ruling.

Marvin Ferrer- I support Mark's ruling.

Pat Welsh- Practically speaking, council has the right to overrule the speaker. As Rob said, we have the ability to overrule the chair's ruling.

Jerome James- Why do we think we can't negotiate for the money we are getting?

Steve Ostenberg- Only those who are going to overrule Mark can speak?

Kate Kahn - A vote of yes would support Mark's ruling. A vote of no would support Rob's amendment.

MOTION 02/09/10: 21-Uphold Speaker's ruling

Carried

Mark Rosner as Speaker

Mark Rosner- Back to the speaker's list.

Steve Ostenberg- I'm not sure if I should speak because of a conflict of interest. I support the question 100%- if we make an amendment for a working group, you are signing off 4.5 million to people you don't know yet, for ideas you have no idea for things you have no ideas about yet. I do not want to go down in history as the most irresponsible SGPS council.

Mark Rosner- No student fee can be established without referendum.

Andrew Stevens- Normally it is not about whether we believe in the content of the motion. I do think this is a conflict. I think it would be best applied, if threats and intimidations are the way it is going, I think it is out of order.

Pat Welsh- If you were to vote against the fee we want to raise then we will create a new motion to address this problem. The question on the ballot right now came from discussions from last meeting. This only happened in the last few months. We might have the same question in a year's time, but given a year, we could further the discussion, decrease the animosity and clarify the questions. Such as, what are we going to get? Voting this down, would benefit us: more time, cooler heads and close this difficult chapter that has pressured us the past few months. One way or the other we are going to lead to a bad answer.

Sean Richards- If council wants to entertain the motion that Rob talked about, we would be able to table Rob's motion...

Victoria Bae- Point of information- Wouldn't that motion require that this question fail to go to referendum.

Mark Rosner- If council members wanted, they could table Rob's motion, come back to it and now deal with the motion.

Marvin Ferrer- One of the problems of this place- where we are being threatened, I think that in the spirit of a donation, that should be all that a donation is.

Steve Osterberg- Point of Information- We specifically chose not to discuss that discussion.

Victoria Bae- Point of personal privilege.

Mark Rosner- If people could say whether they are for or against the motion that would

be helpful.

Marvin Ferrer- I am for the motion, in the spirit of the whole donation concept I think we could take it to the members and see what we can get from them. I think our members are supreme and so are their decisions and that it is important to put this referendum.

Michael Ceci - This is not a donation. This is a student levy. The SGPS was at the table when the 30 million dollar fee came up. They could choose two options: pay operational fees or proportionally higher fees. I would speak in favour of Mr. Church's motion. There should be more discussion for whatever outcome, because it would only improve the situation. It was never the intention of the AMS to not include the SGPS in the discussions.

Amir Nosrat- Point of information. Could you please provide these documents?

Michael Ceci- Yes.

Steve Osterberg- What this amounts to is a mandate. If the question goes to referendum and fails it is a strong position for the administration to negotiate, that's the risk. But this is not the question. If the question does not go to referendum, then they will not offer anything, because they have a mandate that says they have nothing to offer them. We want to give them a no. We can't do this if we are negotiating from a position. We do not want to pay for a building that you messed up building. I don't want to talk until they want to talk.

David Thompson- I am in favour of this motion as it stands now. There is no reason for this motion goes to referendum and it fails and there is still no reason why it can't go again. If we let it go to our membership now, and they speak on it now, then we can have a clearer mandate about our position. It won't end with this referendum. They want 4.5 million dollars from us.

Victoria Bae- If the referendum was to fail, would we lose the opportunity to strike a working group?

Mark Rosner- If the referendum failed, all this means is that we would not be able to ask this question to our membership for another 11 months.

Victoria Bae- We are not going to pay for it, at least we can go to administration and show what students are feeling. We can't afford it.

MOTION 02/09/10: +30min

Moved ___Jerome James/___Andrew Ross___BIRT the meeting be extended by a half an hour.

Carried

Jeff Welsh- Background information for vague questions about the Queen's Centre and for a more informed decision: There was never any documented arraignment indicating that there was the type of discussion that AMS president suggested was had. The only discussion that there was evidence of that there was the then SGPS president at the table when the AMS would bring the idea to the table. The only evidence we have as to what was agreed to, was that the then president agreed to consider it. There was some discussion at the time, but there was no motion brought to the table to levy this fee. The SGPS never, ever made this commitment to levy this fee. In terms of whether the SGPS can get anything from this fee, this is a levy, NOT a donation. This is a mandatory fee. What the SGPS council is asked to bring forward is a fee and a taxed. The AMS actually got screwed.

Leora Jackson- Point of personal privilege. This is irrelevant. Talking about other student organizations being screwed is inappropriate.

Mark Rosner- Noted by speaker. If you could use different language, please.

Jeff Welsh- Sure. The primary purpose of the AMS levying the fee was that the AMS would run the student centre on its own. But in the end the university reneged on this, because they had the money.

Morgan Campbell - I want to address the sentiment in the room. I want to applaud the positive mood for the amendment. This wouldn't be an SGPS decision alone. It would be a general student body decision. I think that a working group would be key. I think all of this can be done after the levy is passed. If it is not passed, then the motion cannot come up for another 2 years. The money will have less effect as the debt accumulates.

Heather Gainforth- I want to vote in favour of putting this on the referendum. There are still options. If we don't give it to them, we are alienating our graduate students and that is not fair to them.

Pat Welsh- I was wondering if a straw poll could be taken as to see how many would be interest in a working group. If there isn't interest then we can see.

Mark Rosner- It strikes me that a working group is possible regardless of the passing and/or failing of the motion.

Pat Welsh- would you rather put the motion to question now, or wait a year?

Jillian Burford-Grinnell- Clarification?

Pat Welsh- I don't want to vote no and not have any options.

Mark Rosner- Straw polls are non binding.

Amir Nosrat- This straw poll can be misleading. I may be for this working group and I

may be for the referendum.

Mark Rosner- It strikes me that the working group is possible whether the motion fails or passes.

Victoria Bae- Point of order- it is not explicit. This is a dangerous decision. We do not know if we have a working group.

Mark Rosner- This is not a point of order. We will have a straw poll. Pat can you clarify the issues?

Pat Welsh- Option A- who is interested in having a working group to redesign a new question to be put to referendum in a year from now?

Straw poll- non binding.

MOTION 02/09/10: 21: Call to question

Moved ___ Chris Harris/ ___ Andrew Ross ___ BIRT MOTION 02/09/10-21 be called to question

Victoria Bae- I don't think that we have discussed this enough. I don't think this should have been polled.

MOTION 02/09/10: 21: Call to question:

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: 21:

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10:22

Whereas Queen's senior administration has asked the SGPS Executive to levy a \$4.5 million Queen's Centre capital project fee; and
Whereas the SGPS is considering a referendum to pass a \$112.50 per person non-optional fee for 10 years to our membership until the \$4.5 million has been collected; and
Whereas the senior administration has threatened the SGPS Executive that it would be left out of the entire governance structure of the new Queen's Centre and told its representatives that it would neglect SGPS needs and concerns, including a new graduate and professional college, if it did not commit to pay the \$4.5 million; and
Whereas this \$4.5 million payment comes with no guaranteed benefits for the SGPS or its members;

Moved ___Thompson___ / ___Shauna Shiels___ BIRT SGPS Council assert that it is against supporting a mandatory fee to contribute to paying the debt of the Queen's Centre;
BIFRT SGPS Council condemn the use of threats of intimidation by officers of

Queen's University for the purposes of changing Society policies or levying student fees;
and
BIFRT SGPS Council support equal access and representation for SGPS on all governing
bodies at Queen's University regardless of financial contribution to any capital
commitment, as entitled to a member organization of the Queen's Community who
financially contributes to Queen's University through tuition fees, student activity fees
and other user fees of university facilities.

David Thompson- I won't talk long. This was crafted based on the question that we first
voted, would not allowed members to express pleasure or displeasure. Would give us a
clear mandate and a consensus. In response to various forms of intimidation expressed by
executives while negotiations. And in response to Principal Woolf.

Chris Harris- I am against the motion. If we think that this is going to get voted down
then the only way that we can all bargain with the administration is letting the
constituency vote on this.

Steve Osterberg- I am not sure if this is a point of information. I am concerned with the
second whereas clause. Rob is this libel or slander?

Rob Church- I don't know, I am conflicted. This is not defamatory.

Heather Gainforth- I think it is important that the school of Kinesiology students and
health students wrote a letter and in addition held a three hour meeting. Opposed to the
4.5 million dollar increase. Do not agree with the proposed fee increase. Budget cuts
affect our income and the quality of our departments. In addition to this, the admin is
asking the undergrads and grads to give more money. Economic mismanagement of the
ARC construction and that this should not fall on the backs of students.

Victoria Bae- Change- the SGPS word to demand.
Another potential amendment. The first clause would read this.

MOTION 02/09/10: 22- 1M

Moved ___ Steve Osterberg/ ___ David Thompson BIRT the wording in MOTION
02/09/10:22 be changed from *a* to *this* and from *support* to *demand*.

Mark Rosner- The amendment changes *a* to *this* in the 1st para. Change *support* to
demand in the third.

MOTION 02/09/10: +30min

Moved ___ Victoria Bae/ ___ Andrew Ross ___ BIRT the meeting be extended by a half
an hour.

Carried

Pat Welsh- Demand is a clear statement of aggression. Do we want to go down this road?

Steve Osterberg- Perhaps we can include a friendly amendment that we can include demand. There are two elements: One, the SGPS council is against supporting the fee. Two- the notion that senior administration bullied us to get here today, which they did. They have since retracted their threats and have behaved in a more friendly matter. I don't know if the second whereas clause is needed if we want to engage in a future relationship with the administration. I was going to include the appropriate action instead of equal.

Mark Rosner- Is everyone on board? Let's treat this to an amendment to an amendment. Steve moved to amend the amendment to change to 'appropriate' from 'equal'.

MOTION 02/09/10: 22- 1M

Moved ___ Steve Osterberg/ ___ David Thompson ___ BIRT the wording of MOTION 02/09/10: 22 be changed to 'appropriate' from 'equal' in the third para of the BIR clauses.

Carried

Clare Wasteneys- I do find that this clause is ambiguous. I am not sure what it means, there are several layers of words that are used that are ambiguous. Is it suggesting that threats of officers were used?

Mark Rosner- The general condemnation of the use of threats and intimidation.

Steve Osterberg- This is a type-o

Clare Wasteneys - Is the council saying that officers threatened the council?

Steve Osterberg- They threatened the executive.

Clare Wasteneys - Just to clarify, what was the intimidation? And what actually occurred is lost in the wording? The wording is ambiguous.

Mark Rosner- If you want to suggest an amendment, then go ahead.

Clare Wasteneys - This is simply a question.

Steve Osterberg- They threatened to lock us out of the governing structure. And to block us from negotiations.

Clare Wasteneys- Who?

Steve Osterberg- Principal Woolf and Janice Deakin.

Clare Wasteneys - What exactly goes on at the government at the Queen's Centre?

Mark Rosner- The JDUC, Queen's Centre, etc all sit on this council and discuss the considerations for the ARC. What kind of representation will the SGPS have for the ARC.

Clare Wasteneys - It seems as though there is more concern about the 2 and 3 phase buildings.

Ryan Bepalko- I propose an amendment to state our position and to make this statement later. State our position on how we think our constituents should decide on the referendum.

Mark Rosner- Ryan has moved that we separate the three clauses.
Secunder on the motion? Seeing none, the amendment is not in order.

Jillian- I would like to speak against it. We are voting on this so that we can go back to our membership. I think it is redundant if we separate, it is basically just us posting this on the website and it is not going to referendum.

Amir Nosrat- Point of information. Will this wordsmithing change the document?

Mark Rosner- This is not a point of information.

Victoria Bae- I support the motion to separate this motion. There is a difference between people supporting this fee and people supporting the motion.

Mark Rosner- Divide the first be it resolved clause and then vote on the last two clauses. The whereas' are not binding, they would not be apart of the SGPS policy.

Victoria Bae- Point of information- This is to fully launch a no campaign.

Amir Nosrat- Point of order, that is not a point of information.

Mark Rosner- Well taken. You cannot use point of information points to further a debate.

Rob Church- Point of information. Would the chair make the decision to create a committee?

Mark Rosner- The question as stated- whether the amendment would provide a mandate for a no campaign. Any member can support a campaign. Any councillor could have a legitimate mandate to have a no referendum committee

Rob Church- there would be no mandate for a SGPS supported committee....withdrawn...

Mark Rosner- My ruling is that does this provide a mandate, absolutely. This does not

oppose any one of you to strike up an opposing committee. If someone wants to challenge my ruling, that is fair.

MOTION 02/09/10: 22-3M

Moved ___Ryan Bespalko/ ___Bae ___BIRT the BIRT clauses in MOTION 02/09/10: 22 be split in two.

Not Carried

Steve Osterberg- Point of information. A vote in support of this motion would be a mandate for the VP to indulge in a no vote campaign?

Mark Rosner- That is hypothetical, I don't know.

Pat Welsh- I would like to speak against this motion in its entirety. The LLS unanimously does not support this motion. We can do better than this.

Bob- I do not support this. I don't find it productive. I don't know what the JDUC council does and why we care.

MOTION 02/09/10: 22-2M: Call to question

Moved ___Amir Nosrat/ ___Harris ___BIRT the MOTION 02/09/10: 22- 2M be called to question

Pat Welsh- I oppose this motion because there are only a few more people who would like to speak.

Steve Osterberg- I oppose this motion.

Victoria Bae- I oppose this.

Amir Nosrat- I think that the people who have spoken, we already know their opinions.

MOTION 02/09/10: 22-2M Call to question:

Not Carried

Leora Jackson - It has been said by a number of people, but I am against.

Victoria Bae- I have a question. I understand that an ordinary member can organize a yes campaign and a no campaign. What would this motion prohibit students from doing?

Mark Rosner- I don't know what that would mean. Everyone here is a councillor and a student. Would this prohibit one of you to start a campaign? I don't know if there would be a prohibition. Were council to endorse a no campaign, I don't think it would be

appropriate to change our decisions at a moment's notice. But any member can go to a CRO and start a no campaign. Frankly, I think this is the CRO's decision to make.

Victoria Bae- Point of information. Doesn't the CRO answers to the council? Doesn't that mean that the CRO were no able to engage in this campaign because the council has already mandated a position?

Mark Rosner- Reads the referendum committee rules.

This policy is silent on whether council can require, permit or omit council members to be apart of a campaign. It does not indicate whether a CRO can prohibit a member to participate a campaign.

Andrew Stevens- I thought this was clear. We are in against intimidation. This is saying that council is opposed to the tactics. Against intimidation and I am totally in support for this motion.

Jeff Welsh- The whereas clauses disappear when the motions are approved. There is a large budget that is managed by the student life and our members pay a mandatory fee that our members pay into and it will probably have to be doubled next year. We would want to maintain some sort of oversight into how our money is allocated. The SGPS is allocated a certain number of club spaces, our membership would have some tangible loses if we did not have representation and could speak to these issues.

Steve Osterberg- I would like to speak in favour of this motion. This motion gives you an official voice.

Mark Rosner- Point of clarification. I did not make a ruling, I just interpreted the idea.

MOTION 02/09/10: +30min

Moved ___ Amir Nosrat/ ___ Andrew Ross ___ BIRT the meeting be extended by a half an hour.

Carried

Amir Nosrat- As operational costs, we essentially pay rent for these facilities. We have a binding agreement for this building, but we will prevent any contribution to the governance if we are not contributing to the Queen's centre

Lauren McNickol- I think that if we don't have a strong front, we are showing a weak front. To removed this context and soften this notion that we weren't bullied is not to accurately depict the circumstances. To soften this, is to misrepresent the circumstances to our constituents.

MOTION 02/09/10: 22-2M: Call to question

Moved ___ Victoria Bae/ Chris Harris ___ BIRT the MOTION 02/09/10:22- 2M be called

to question.

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: 22-2M (Motion as amended):

Carried

8. Other Business

Proposed SGPS Sustainability Action Fund Policy

MOTION 02/09/10:23

Moved _____ Steve Osterberg _____ / _____ Andrew Ross _____ BIRT the SGPS Council adopt the following as SGPS Policy 1.6:

1.6.1 - General

The SGPS Sustainability Action Fund (SAF) is an optional class B graduate student fee dedicated to sustainability-focused graduate and professional student initiatives at Queen's University as a part of the SGPS Sustainability's operational budget and shall be available in the form of grants for any graduate or professional student group. The fee of \$1.50, will generate approximately \$2,500 annually which will be made available in grants to any graduate or professional student group that focuses on campus energy efficiency, waste reduction or education on sustainability-related issues. Any project that reduces Queen's University's negative environmental impact and/or makes campus more sustainable is eligible for funding, including those projects initiated by the SGPS Sustainability Committee itself. Examples of the fund's use by the SGPS Sustainability committee are organizing workshops, bringing in speakers, running drives, supporting and collaborating with groups and initiatives at Queen's.

1.6.2 - Operational Budget and Governing of Funds

The Grant Coordinator may submit an annual budget request to the Sustainability Committee for approval of the funds to be used for operational expenses incurred by the Sustainability Coordinator in the performance of his/her duties.

1.6.2.1 Rules Governing SAF Funds

- a. Any funds not allocated to projects in a given year shall remain in the SGPS SAF fund account for future use.
- b. Funds allocated to a project that are not spent within the project's timeframe, as submitted in the project proposal, shall be returned to the Fund for reallocation.
- c. Standing funds of the SGPS SAF must be invested in a socially responsible manner.
- d. SGPS SAF funds are not to be used or reallocated for purposes other than those described in this document.
- e. The SGPS SAF shall continue to operate even after student fees are no longer being collected into the Fund, as long as sufficient funds remain in the SAF account.

1.6.3– Sustainability Action Fund Grants

Section 1.6.3.1 Duties of the Grant Coordinator

The SGPS Sustainability Coordinator will also serve as the Sustainability Grant Coordinator. The Grant Coordinator works at the direction of the whole Committee to meet the needs of the Committee and to carry out the administrative duties related to the Sustainability Action Fund.

It shall be the duties of the Grant Coordinator to:

- a. Assist the Granting Committee in publicizing and administering the grant program
- b. Coordinate the presentation of funding proposals to the Sustainability Committee
- c. Maintain the archives of the Sustainability Committee's grants
- d. Act as a liaison between the SGPS SAF and the University
- e. Work with the Sustainability Committee to monitor the progress of projects which have received SAF funding, via annual reports submitted by grant recipients
- f. Assist in the transition and orientation of new Committee members as necessary
- g. Administer the expenditure of funds approved by the Sustainability Committee

Section 1.6.3.2 - Powers and Voting

The fund management and granting process shall be the responsibility of the SGPS Sustainability Committee and the SGPS Sustainability Coordinator. All issues related to the allocation of the funds will be a part of the regular monthly meeting of the committee. The Sustainability Committee will operate as a consensus-based decision-making body, but when a consensus cannot be reached on a matter, a super majority (2/3) of Committee Members is required to allocate funds subject to a 2/3 voting majority. The SGPS Sustainability Coordinator will chair the SGPS Sustainability Committee and shall be accountable for the allocation of funds.

1.6.4. – Allocation of the Grants

As stated in Section 1.3.2, the Sustainability Committee shall determine the allocation of funds to applicant projects or initiatives by consensus or a 2/3 supermajority vote of the voting members of the Committee. The Committee may also elect to fund only a portion of a project where it sees fit. Any project that reduces Queen's University's negative environmental impact and makes campus more sustainable is eligible for funding. However, all projects to be considered for funding must meet the following criteria:

Section 1.6.4.1 - Grants and Funding Eligibility Criteria

- a. Projects must directly address environmental sustainability on the Queen's University campus, or in the capacity that on-campus activities influence sustainability off-campus.
- b. All proposed projects must have a clearly defined, measurable, and quantifiable outcome.
- c. Projects shall have direct graduate student involvement.
- d. Project proposals may be submitted by Queen's University students, staff, administrators, or faculty, provided that at least one graduate student is involved in the project in a managerial capacity.
- e. Individuals and groups not affiliated with Queen's University may not submit proposals.
- f. Projects must have received all the necessary written approval by applicable or appropriate campus officials prior to consideration by the SGPS Sustainability Committee.
- g. The funding shall not be allocated to projects already mandated by law or by Queen's University policy directive, as Queen's University is already obligated to allocate funds

towards such projects.

h. The SGPS Sustainability Action Fund will only fund projects that go above and beyond established minimum requirements and that are unable to gain full funding from other sources.

i. All project selected for funding shall have a mechanism for measurement, evaluation, and follow-up after funding has been allocated. At minimum, a project plan must include the creation of a report made to the SGPS Sustainability Committee after successful (or unsuccessful) implementation.

j. If a project is expected to have ongoing benefits, such as ongoing annual cost savings, the project plan submitted must include a mechanism for tracking, recording, and reporting these benefits back to the SGPS Sustainability Committee on an (at least) annual basis.

k. Project shall have publicity, education, and outreach components. Preference will be given for projects with long term benefits.

l. Projects requesting less than \$100 in funding shall not be considered.

1.6.5. – Student Involvement in Applicant Projects

All SAF funds dispersed by the Sustainability Committee for projects each year shall be allocated to projects with direct graduate student involvement. Such projects include, but are not limited to: internships, initiatives which include students in their oversight bodies, student research, and project proposed and to be managed by graduate students.

1.6.6 – Accountability, Records, and Reports to the Student Body

The SGPS Sustainability Action Fund, as overseen by the Sustainability Committee and the Sustainability Coordinator, shall remain accountable to the student body and therefore shall:

a. Make all records of the SGPS SAF available to the public through publicly accessible financial records and Granting Committee meeting minutes.

b. Issue an annual report of its activities to the SGPS VP Finance and Services.

c. Submit an annual report to the SGPS Annual General Meeting

Ivana Zelenika - A policy to recommend SGPS sustainability. Have our own sustainability run fund. Class C fund. Act as a sustainability fund. 1.50\$ fee. Work with organizations around campus. Grants and eligibility material. It will be up to sustainability to award grants, etc. Educational, speakers, proposing events, etc. There is an amendment- change from a class B fee to a class C fee. Voting to allocate the funds. Projects under 50\$ shall not be considered. Should there be minimum funding? The fee would act mainly as a source of grants. The SGPS committee would need to use these fees as well. Should we have something in there that say that some other committee could not use our money for other reasons. (paraphrased). Should there be a clause to divvy the funds proportionally- a percentage, etc.

Mark Rosner- This eliminates the position of grant coordinator. This doesn't actually change anything substantive.

Ivana Zelenika - Because this position does not actually exist.

MOTION 02/09/10: 23- 1M

Moved ___ Steve Osterberg/ ___ Andrew Ross ___ BIRT for policy 1.6 to read:

Mission Statement

Institutions of knowledge have always been at the forefront of social and technological innovation and development; today is no different. In light of pressing environmental challenges it is essential that university campuses and students play an important role in leading the way to a more integrated and sustainable operations. As such, the SGPS Sustainability Committee is committed to expanding education and awareness of environmental issues on Queen's campus. We strive to challenge those in this community to change their attitudes and behaviors as it concerns our natural environment toward a more sustainable lifestyle.

Proposed SGPS Sustainability Action Fund Policy

1.1 - General

The SGPS Sustainability Action Fund (SAF) is an optional class C graduate student fee dedicated to sustainability-focused graduate and professional student initiatives at Queen's University as a part of the SGPS Sustainability's operational budget and shall be available in the form of grants for any graduate or professional student group. The fee of \$1.50, will generate approximately \$2,500 annually which will be made available in grants to any graduate or professional student group that focuses on campus energy efficiency, waste reduction or education on sustainability-related issues. Any project that reduces Queen's University's negative environmental impact and/or makes campus more sustainable is eligible for funding, including those projects initiated by the SGPS Sustainability Committee itself. Examples of the fund's use by the SGPS Sustainability committee are organizing workshops, bringing in speakers, running drives, supporting and collaborating with groups and initiatives at Queen's.

1.2 - Operational Budget and Governing of Funds

The Sustainability Coordinator may submit an annual budget request to the Sustainability Committee for approval of the funds to be used for operational expenses incurred by the Sustainability Coordinator in the performance of his/her duties.

1.2.1 Rules Governing SAF Funds

1. Any funds not allocated to projects in a given year shall remain in the SGPS SAF fund account for future use.
2. Funds allocated to a project that are not spent within the project's timeframe, as submitted in the project proposal, shall be returned to the Fund for reallocation.
3. Standing funds of the SGPS SAF must be invested in a socially responsible manner.
4. SGPS SAF funds are not to be used or reallocated for purposes other than those described in this document.

5. The SGPS SAF shall continue to operate even after student fees are no longer being collected into the Fund, as long as sufficient funds remain in the SAF account.

1.3– Sustainability Action Fund Grants

Section 1.3.1 Duties of the Sustainability Coordinator

The SGPS Sustainability Coordinator will be responsible for the allocation of the funds and will work at the direction of the whole Sustainability Committee to meet the needs of the committee and to carry out the administrative duties related to the Sustainability Action Fund.

It shall be the duties of the Sustainability Coordinator to:

1. assist the Sustainability Committee in publicizing and administering the grant program; and
2. coordinate the presentation of funding proposals to the Sustainability Committee; and
3. maintain the archives of the Sustainability Committee's grants; and
4. act as a liaison between the SGPS SAF and the University; and
5. work with the Sustainability Committee to monitor the progress of projects which have received SAF funding, via annual reports submitted by grant recipients ; and
6. assist in the transition and orientation of new Committee members as necessary; and
7. administer the expenditure of funds approved by the Sustainability Committee; and

Section 1.3.2 Powers and Voting

The fund management and granting process shall be the responsibility of the SGPS Sustainability Committee and the SGPS Sustainability Coordinator. All issues related to the allocation of the funds will be a part of the regular monthly meeting of the committee. The Sustainability Committee will operate as a consensus-based decision-making body, but when a consensus cannot be reached on a matter, a super majority (2/3) of committee members is required to allocate funds. The SGPS Sustainability Coordinator will chair the SGPS Sustainability Committee and shall be accountable for the allocation of funds.

1.4. – Allocation of the Grants

As stated in Section 1.3.2, the Sustainability Committee shall determine the allocation of funds to applicant projects or initiatives by consensus or a 2/3 supermajority vote of the voting members of the Committee. The Committee may also elect to fund only a portion of a project where it sees fit. Any project that reduces Queen’s University’s negative environmental impact and makes campus more sustainable is eligible for funding. However, all projects to be considered for funding must meet the following criteria:

Section 1.4.1 Grants and Funding Eligibility Criteria

1. Projects must directly address environmental sustainability on the Queen's University campus, or in the capacity that on-campus activities influence sustainability off-campus.
2. All proposed projects must have a clearly defined, measurable, and qualitative outcome.
3. Projects shall have direct graduate or professional student involvement.
4. Project proposals may be submitted by Queen's University students, staff, administrators, or faculty, provided that at least one graduate or professional student is involved in the project in a managerial capacity.
5. Individuals and groups not affiliated with Queen's University may not submit proposals.
6. Projects must have received all the necessary written approval by applicable or appropriate campus officials prior to consideration by the SGPS Sustainability Committee.
7. The funding shall not be allocated to projects already mandated by law or by Queen's University policy directive, as Queen's University is already obligated to allocate funds towards such projects.
8. The SGPS Sustainability Action Fund will only fund projects that go above and beyond established minimum requirements and that are unable to gain full funding from other sources.
9. All project selected for funding shall have a mechanism for measurement, evaluation, and follow-up after funding has been allocated. At minimum, a project plan must include the creation of a report made to the SGPS Sustainability Committee after successful (or unsuccessful) implementation.
10. If a project is expected to have ongoing benefits, such as ongoing annual cost savings, the project plan submitted must include a mechanism for tracking, recording, and reporting these benefits back to the SGPS Sustainability Committee on an (at least) annual basis.
11. Project shall have publicity, education, and outreach components. Preference will be given for projects with long term benefits.
12. Projects requesting less than \$50 in funding shall not be considered.

1.5 – Accountability, Records, and Reports to the Student Body

The SGPS Sustainability Action Fund, as overseen by the Sustainability Committee and the Sustainability Coordinator, shall remain accountable to the student body and therefore shall:

1. Make all records of the SGPS SAF available to the public through publicly accessible financial records and Granting Committee meeting minutes.
2. Issue an annual report of its activities to the SGPS VP Finance and Services and the VP Campaigns and Community Affairs.
3. Submit an annual report to the SGPS Annual General Meeting

Steve Osterberg- I like the way it sits. I don't think you need any specific governance. You are responsible, and so are your predecessors. There is already oversight.

Amir Nosrat- I just want to say that I spent about a half and hour with Ivana wordsmithing this, and if there is anything else, let's meet outside of council. I speak in favour of this, I think it's a great idea.

MOTION 02/09/10: 23- 1M (Amendment)

Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: 23- 1M (Motion as amended):

Carried

Steve Osterberg- I'd like to introduce an Emergency motion.

MOTION 02/09/10: Emergency Motion

Moved ___Steve Osterberg/ ___David Thompson___ BIRT the SGPS Council donate \$500 to Doctors Without Borders to aid in the earthquake relief efforts in Haiti.

Marvin Ferrer- I will speak against this motion. This is a popular, faddy, thing to donate to. I can think of hundreds of things to donate to. I would vote no, at this point.

Amir Nosrat- I would like to also speak against this. 500 dollars is better spent locally that sending a doctor to Haiti. We don't know where 500 dollars is going to go. I think we should give this Kingston poverty fund.

Jerome James- I would like to up this to 1000 dollars. I think this attitude of conservatism is nauseating.

MOTION 02/09/10: Emergency Motion -1M

Moved ___Chris Harris/ ___Steve Osterberg___ BIRT the SGPS Council increase the amount to \$1000

Carried

Steve Osterberg: The fact that this is faddy, is the point. This is an emergency. That is why it is an emergency motion. Therefore it must be topical. I must take personal offensive to Amir's point. Haitian people deserve relief that Kingstonians, whites, any people also do. Our vision should not be limited to this campus.

Chris Harris- So, Amir, how much can we possibly give?

Amir Nosrat- I have the mandate to give you 1000 dollars, but we will be 500 dollars

down from our reserves.

Marvin Ferrer- A few weeks ago, a slum was devastated in the Philippines and 4000 people were devastated. I do not mean to seem heartless, but this is fated.

Jerome James- Let's give for other ideas. Haiti is the poorest country. There is a history of colonization. I would be very proud as a council member to put surplus to this motion.

Amir Nosrat- I don't mean to be nauseating, I would encourage you two to go the development studies. Haitians can fend for themselves. Humans have the ability to fend for themselves. The development industry has done far worse than good.

Bob- if everyone is so concerned to not donating to these other donations. I think that we can donate 200 000 dollars to housing, we can discuss this again.

Lauren- I don't think that this is the appropriate discussion this late at night when everyone is tired. I urge you all to educate yourselves of the politics of philanthropy and development. It is faddy and Bono-like, and I think it is a bigger discussion for this time.

Mark Rosner- Do people want to comment on the substantive merits of this discussion?

Victoria Bae- It would be the politically correct thing to pass this.

Steve Osterberg- I challenge anyone in this room to suggest that this is a bad thing to do. It might not be the best thing, but that it is a bad thing.

Amir Nosrat- I'll take that challenge after the meeting is done.

Catherine Copp- I move to table this until next meeting.

MOTION 02/09/10: Emergency Motion- 1M (Tabling)

Moved ___ Catherine Copp/ ___ Jillian Burford-Grinnell ___ BIRT the SGPS Council table this motion until next meeting.

Mark Rosner- Any discussion to tabling?

Victoria Bae- I want to move to call the question.

Mark Rosner- No. We haven't even had a discussion.

Catherine Copp- I thought she had a great point that we should look into this further and the more tangible solutions. They will still need help in a month, they will still need doctors, I think we need to discuss this further.

Ivana Zelenika - This is a gut feeling. This is doctors without borders. Can they wait a month, maybe? But they may be dying, and I don't want this on my conscience.

Mark Rosner- It strikes me that we are re-debating this motion. Do people want to table this until next month?

MOTION 02/09/10: Emergency Motion- 1M (Tabling):

Not Carried

MOTION 02/09/10: Emergency Motion- 1M (Motion as amended):

Carried

Motion 02/09/10: Adoption of new Deputy Speaker

Moved __Victoria Bae__ / __Steve Osterberg__ BIRT the SGPS Council accept Neil Irvine's resignation as Deputy Speaker.

BIFRT Michelle Rosner be named as Deputy Speaker

Carried

9. Notice of Motions/Announcements

Reports and Motions for the next regular Council meeting are due Tuesday, March 2nd, 2010.

The next regular SGPS Council meeting will be on Tuesday, March 9, 2010.

10. Adjournment

MOTION

02/09/10:23

Moved ____Steve Osterberg____ / ____Andrew Ross____ BIRT the SGPS Council meeting be adjourned.

02/09/10

MR

CFS-27

Attached:

January Minutes

Attendance January Meeting

Reports

Appendix 1 – Executive Assistant Job Description

Appendix 2 – Letter to VP Dean of Grad Studies from Elisabeth Oliver

Appendix 3 – Andrew Stevens Question to Senate Regarding vacant staff positions

Appendix 4 – Response to SGPS Senator Stevens inquiry into number of TA's hired Fall/Winter

Appendix 5 – Principal's Vision Statement

Appendix 6 – Service Agreement between AMS and SGPS

Appendix 7 – Housing Authority Bylaws

Appendix 8 – Finance Committee Report

Attendance**DATE: Tuesday, February 9th, 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	
BIOLOGY	Chris Harris	X
BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING	<i>vacant</i>	
BIostatistics	<i>vacant</i>	
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	Bob Cockburn	X
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	
ENGLISH	Andrew Bingham	
ENV STUDIES	Nicole Mcdonald	X
FRENCH	Usha Rungoo	
GENDER STUDIES	Katherine Mazurok	
GEOGRAPHY	Vivian Wasiuta	X
GEOGRAPHY	Clare Wasteney	X
GEOLOGY & GEO ENGINEERING	<i>vacant</i>	
GERMAN	Stefanie Kullick	X
GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT	<i>vacant</i>	
HISTORY	Josh Cole	
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	Vacant	

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

