



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

AGENDA

Society of Graduate and Professional Students' Council
Local 27 of the Canadian Federation of Students
Tuesday, April 13th 2010, 5:30pm
Room 241, JDUC

1. Presentations

2. Adoption of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION

04/13/10:1

Moved _____ Jess Hickey _____ / _____ Andrew Ross _____ BIRT the agenda for April 13th, 2010 be adopted.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell - There is a type-o.

Carried

MOTION

04/13/10:2

Moved _____ Jess Hickey _____ / _____ Bob Cockburn _____ BIRT the minutes for the March AGM be accepted.

Carried

3. Executive and Speaker Reports

a) President – Jawad Qureshy (report attached)

Excellent. Thank you. I would just like to say a few more points in addition to the report. Not many of you know me, but we can chat later. I would encourage the growth SGPS, to maintain a position at Queen's. There are some strategic minefields that I feel we should be mindful in the next year. I want to report to you what the state of the SGPS is at this moment. We have the ability to interact with faculty and the departments but this needs to be used better. We may get more seats at Senate, but we need to find other

good senators such as Andrew and we need a stronger graduate and professional students on campus. He is not here today, but please get to know Ben as well. There have been some places where we have not had good relations, this has been a failing, and needs to be rectified in the next year. As for the state of the SGPS, we have not been viable for TAs and RAs. As for the permanent staff, Sean is here and we are in good hands. We have had a very good year with the student advisors as well. This is going to be worked on as a priority. We need to develop the SGPS's infrastructure, there needs to be more social events, better advocacy, etc. We need to grow our voice and participate. We have had a historical role and I'd like to continue this and make our space even better. There are two immediate issues I'd like to specifically speak to: In regards to the motion for the housing authority, I was against it before, I am against it now. I am for services but those that are thought out and in line with our interests. We have another stake holder. Secondly, TAFE. If there are good people involved with TAFE, then that's great, if not, then we have a long road ahead of us. There are some deep changes to the government and university, so there have been questions raised about whether we have been consulted, but I feel like this is a long term issue that needs to be kept in mind. I look forward to discussing things later on. Thanks.

b) VP Graduate – Daniel Moore (report attached)

Two things to add- Jawad and I were on the graduate studies executive. The Council passed the delay option on the thesis option. Now it is five years and you only have to submit the request once. The Council is considering the option in making the TA and RAs as stipend funding rather than regular funding. It seems like there are pros and cons. International students would favour to be recognized as employers of the school. I would like to hear your response. If this goes forward, we would like to know how to accurately represent our members. The TAFE meeting is next week. Please come. There will be SSHRC president meetings. One thing to clarify- these changes will be changing faculty funding, not graduate, but does have to do with collaborative funding, so this could affect you. VP grad chair- I want to focus on short term projects, something like that, investigating RAs, etc, whatever the interests are of the committee members, so please come and talk to me after.

Patrick Cashin- Can you repeat when the TAFE meeting will be?

Daniel Moore- TAFE meeting is at 5:30pm in Chernoff hall on April 19th.

Heather Gainforth- SSHRC needs to change as to whether they will fund health studies. It might be a good thing to ask whether they will fund health, or if you have to go to CHR.

Namit Sharma- Where do we go for sending our T4 slips? Where should we put the citations for this form?

Daniel Moore- Come see me for this.

Andrew Pruszynski- One thing in relation to the stipend. In respect to paternal, maternal, family leave. Depending on how you get paid, you may not be eligible for government assistance after. If you had a stipend, it would systematically remove this fund. You could be left in the lurch, if this comes to pass. If you don't have external funding, then you wouldn't be privy to coverage by your stipend.

Andrew Stevens- With regards to the RAship. In other words, if the RA work that you do, if it relates to your thesis, you have the option of going to the stipend model, or not. They have hired a law firm to actually negotiate the legal ins and outs. It may be very straight forward and students could choose but we should keep track of this.

Daniel Moore- Although it may be an option, I'm not sure students may be entirely sure of their options.

Andrew Pruszynski- I think that optional would be the best. At least you would be able to save up your credits. Having an option is good in other countries. In Sweden, you can choose. In column A you can earn more in net pay, in column B, you have coverage. I agree with what Andrew and Daniel are saying in that we have to follow this closely. If there is a choice, then we need to see what the students will get if we choose this.

Jess Hickey- I don't know about anyone else. We already have stipends, and it is fine.

c) VP Professional – Shaughnessy Hawkings (report attached)
Nothing to add.

d) VP Campaigns and Community Affairs – Anne-Marie Grondin (report attached)
We are about to hire and we are looking for volunteers. Please advertise this widely, we are not looking for people to campaign, but we want people to advocate for equity, sustainability and international students. Thanks.

e) VP Finance and Services – Jillian Burford-Grinnell (report attached)
Hi. Finance and Services committee is recommending renewing the QIUAA. The Grad Club fee renewal is up again. We came to a decision to recommend renewing this fee. I attended the AGM at the Grad Club. They are in a

process of discussing a business plan, which is a follow up from the last meeting. I am always looking for volunteers for the strategic planning committee, etc.

f) Speaker – Mark Rosner (no report)

MOTION

04/13/10:3

Moved Jess Hickey / 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)

Two issues to add. Senate and observation review committee met yesterday, I thought it would be easy, but now it has been revised to us asking for sets of principles and questions and will lead to a re-composition of Senate. It will not be expanding or decreasing Senate. But there will be questions of whether we should be open to expansion, what we are meeting for, etc. This meeting may be important. It turns out that the undergrad students enrolled in the consecutive Education program are in fact enrolled as arts and sciences students until their fifth year. If you are interested in attending Senate, I encourage you to do so. The second issue: the money is starting to trickle down from government. In 2006 and 2007, some money has been used for capital projects. That was a one time money instalment. The money given to the universities is a grant, so long as the university says that it is going to graduate Education. I am hoping that we can get some clarification about where this money is going and what it is doing. I am not going to continue in this position. I need to finish. If you are interested in this position, please let me know. We can have you in by mid-May.

Pat Welsh- Thanks Andrew. The SGPS has had the honour of having someone as passionate and knowledgeable as you. At one point, we had a discussion about the undergrad Education Senator. What has been CESA's opinion on this issue?

Andrew Stevens- I got the numbers. Senate is governed by a couple of regulations. It is also ruled by convention. We have also tried to advocate for the students. Historically the Senate and SORC has recognized the student Senate's right to elect senators. But for now we have to say- what is it that we are going to have as a rule? Convention, or figures? What is it that is going to determine representation? It is a matter of advocacy, but it is must also be a matter of principle.

Pat Welsh- Are the Education students fielding a candidate for a senator?

Andrew Stevens- They have. The CESA member is continually absent. There was an attempt to coordinate the elections. The leadership of CESA has changed and so has the Senate, so this is something we need to follow up in the summer.

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

c) Committee Reports

d) Commissioner Reports

i) Social Commissioner – Diala Habib (no report)

We are having our spring fling this weekend. We are only charging \$25. You can get your tickets online. Come on out.

Jerome James- So how do we get the tickets.

Diala Habib- Once you buy your tickets online, we put your name on a list. There are a lot of great prizes too. It will be fun.

ii) Communications Commissioner – Sean Richards (report attached)

iii) Equity Commissioner: Sophia Virani (no report)

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)

vii) Chief Returning Officer – Aniss Amdiss (no report)

viii) Departmental Reports

Marvin Ferrer- It says that Sophia has no report, but she does.

Mark Rosner- She submitted it late, that's why it wasn't attached.

Marvin Ferrer- She is not here, so I guess it wouldn't be good to ask her a question.

Mark Rosner- She's not here, so I think that it might be more effective to e-mail her.

MOTION

04/13/10:4

Moved _____ Pat Welsh _____ / _____ Andrew Pruszynski. _____ BIRT Senator/Board of Trustees/Commissioner/ Coordinator / Committee, and Other reports be accepted.

Carried

5. Question Period/Departmental Issues

Pat Cashin- In my department there were a lot of issues about the TAFE vote and not asking for ID at the polling station. Can someone speak to this and also, what is the working relationship with the SGPS and the TAFE committee?

Daniel Moore- It depends on those who voted and those who felt there were inconsistencies. You are referring to the *Journal* article that spoke to this issue. The Ontario labour board created the policies and how they administered the vote. No one at Queen's or TAFE had a say in that process. As for the relationship, that is still to be seen. There will be no real overlap. They will be our members, but they will be under the union (TAs and TEs) it will be productive to remain clear and communicate, that is why I encourage everyone to come to the meeting on April 19th.

Pat Cashin- Thanks.

Jawad Qureshy - This is in response to the academic planning exercise that the Principal has put in his *what next vision statement*. Essentially what is going to happen is that there is a committee of six that is going to compile these responses. One thing that has become clear is that graduate students responses have not been included in any clear manner. I have suggested to the AMS and the Dean, is that there should be some student representation on that committee and not only faculty hand picked by the Principal. There should be three students and three faculty. I would like to see what your feelings about this are and what the mood is in your department about these issues. I would like to know how big of a problem this is. Have your voices been heard? Over the next six months, something is going to be implemented, so this is going to affect us. So how will this represent us is very important.

Heather Gainforth- Certainly in the SKHS- we feel that we have not been heard. The way to respond in bullet form, it is so bullet formatted; even our own responses are difficult to understand.

Michael Bravo- Essentially, taking some of the information from the student town halls, at that town hall, it was reported that there would be a 200 student decrease in the faculty of arts and sciences. Kinesiology was asked to give up

100 spots. They said that we would have to give up 150 spots, and that we would have to give up labs. Our faculty asked for money to hire a coordinator to handle new students and new streams. The University said that they would not give us more. So one of the major issues is, 1- is this academic planning an exercise to reduce the funds we are currently spending in our departments and 2- what does it say about communication between the Dean and the departments? Based on other conversations I have had with other people and other departments, sociology, physiology, psychology, etc, they have had little say and little communication. I don't know if this is a department thing- essentially I think that there has been an overall drop. I basically think that people don't know how to respond and get their voice out.

Heather Gainforth- The document is in bullet points. I think that this is important too. We wrote out really eloquent responses, that were reduced to bullet points. How do you get things across when they are in bullet points?

Jawad Qureshy - We will be sending out a formal letter that will petition the Principal to suggest that this committee be expanded. We have representation on all other committees, so then why on this very important committee, why have graduate students specifically been excluded?

Michael Lockett- With the Education department, we treated it as a working document and met as a committee, discussed the document together and offered revision.

Jawad Qureshy – I see that there seems to be a mixed vibe.

Mark Rosner- Please contact Jawad if you want to continue this discussion.

6. Business Arising from the Minutes

7. Main Motions

Fees Subject to Renewal By SGPS Council

MOTION

04/13/10:5

Moved _____Jillian__Burford-Grinnell_____ / _____Jess Hickey_____ BIRT the Grad Club Class A Optional Fee (not indexed to inflation) of \$20.00 be renewed.

Ryan Kelly- Hi, I'm the President of the Board of directors at the Grad Club. So just before I get to the fee renewal, I'd like to talk about the strategic plan. For our upcoming board, Jillian is sitting on this, and we would like to get her input and then resubmit this document for you before presenting you with the document now. For the fee renewal, we get \$20, administered by the SGPS which

represents about 20% of our operating costs. This is about creating a comfortable and inclusive fee. There is a 10% fee off for members, free room bookings, wine and cheeses, movies, etc. We also have a bursary of \$25, 000 available to students, ect. If we didn't have this fee, we would have to make up this loss of revenue in other places such as charging cover, lay offs, decrease in the quality of food, higher prices. We think that this is a valuable fee. Thanks.

Rob Church- Can the VP finance committee can go through this and the merits on voting for this or not?

Jillian Burford-Grinnell - I am the only member of the finance committee here. The discussion hinged on the same sorts of things that were brought to Council. The lack of strategic plan/business plan. It was indicated by Ryan that they have gotten the ball rolling and they would have something for the SGPS to share. There was some discussion. That was the only issue brought up. It was an anonymous vote to support the renewal.

Rob Church- At what stage is this strategic/ business plan? Is it possible to have a completed version of this plan to be sent out to the Council? To clarify, it is a lot of money, and to hear that you have a plan but you don't want to send it out, is not great to hear, to be honest.

Ryan Kelly- I don't know what the issue is. We haven't had a meeting as our own board yet. It seems strange to put out a plan that the SGPS has not had an input on yet. Jillian's comments would bring about concerns that the SGPS would have.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell – Just to reiterate, this is a Class A optional fee. Members do have the option to opt out of it.

Shaughnessy Hawkings - I think that beyond what you feel about the strategic plan, we pay towards a lot of AMS services that I think are ridiculous. I think that the Grad Club manages itself well and we haven't utilized it as well as we could have, we could publicize ourselves better. I think we get a lot out of this, certainly a lot more than we do on AMS services. It costs us a lot but we reap the benefit.

Pat Welsh- To speak to some of the historic problems between the SGPS and the Grad Club. It took a fee to get us all at the table. I think that it is important to stay at the table and to continue to communicate. I hope that the Grad Club will attempt to broaden the students that go there, and provide employment for Grad students.

Ryan Kelly- We do employ students. It is hard to employ when minimum wage is as low as it is, but we will continue to try.

Carried

MOTION

04/13/10:6

Moved ___Jillian Burford-Grinnell___ / ___Andrew Ross___
BIRT the Queen's University International Affairs Association Class A Optional Fee (not indexed to inflation) of \$1.00 be renewed.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell – I spoke to representatives of QUIAA. The finance and services committee, we all recommended that we renew this fee as well.

Marvin Ferrer- So the answers about what do they do for Grad students, is yes?

Jillian Burford-Grinnell - Yes, this is a student run facility. In terms of what they do specifically, I am not exactly sure.

Carried

2nd Reading

MOTION

04/13/10:7

Moved ___Jerome James___ / ___Andrew Ross___ BIRT the SGPS loan the SGPS Housing Authority \$90,000 from the SGPS reserves after such time that the Housing Authority has been incorporated.

Pat Cashin- I have prepared a statement. I am going to speak against this. I am coming at this from an economic point of view. The figure of \$ 250,000. They said that anywhere from \$250, 000- \$300, 000. We are now talking about \$ 90, 000. They say that \$200, 000 is going towards fees. I think we have lost relevance. I do not feel comfortable donating this money to a business plan that is not sound. If we partner up with another group and invest money, then there are some possibilities. The fact that we have strayed so far from the original business plan and until we have a coherent business plan, I do not feel comfortable giving this money up. It doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

Jerome James- Can you elaborate more about the loss of direction that you speak of other than then loss of investment?

Pat Cashin- The original business plan said \$250, 000- \$300, 000 dollars. If we now looked at a cheaper property, we no longer have the same criteria. We now have to purchase a smaller house, smaller rooms, farther away. I don't feel that the original idea, the idea in our minds, can be done anymore. We are trying to fit a different size peg into a different size hole.

Pat Welsh- I will also be speaking against this motion. Many people know that I feel this is a bold idea. There have been the significant change, the money, this gives us an opportunity to look at what we can do with this \$90, 000. We have a

lot of money that we can do with this money. We can do a lot for our constituents- this is a great chance for us to re-think, re-organize, rather than put our constituents and our executive on a path of destruction and the extension of very bad idea.

Andrew Pruszynski- I have prepared a statement that I would like to read:

I would like to start by saying that I value the work done by the former VP-Finance and the Housing Committee. They put in a great deal of effort into this project and moved us clearly towards providing services to the graduate and professional students at Queen's. In general, I support a move towards providing services.

Despite this effort, it is clear to that the proposed transfer of funds, \$90K, from our reserve fund, is not appropriate at the given time. I am not saying that it could not become appropriate given additional work. Therefore, I am speaking strongly against this motion at this point. I have three major issues: no clear business plan, possible damage to SGPS, lack of broad consultation. I speak to this point as someone who briefly ran a small start-up technology business. It is clear to me that the present proposal would not get this sort of funding from any private investor. We do not have a proper business plan. What we have is a consulting document / feasibility study. And even it was not supportive.

What did it say? "Ultimately it would not be in the SGPS's best interests to pursue either project using their current approach – investing without partnership or third-party assistance" Where is the clear indication that we are going to pursue this with a partner? We have rejected the notion of working with Queen's Housing. We have indication that it would not be possible to work with Science '44 Co-Op. Everything I heard to date seems to indicate we are now going at this project alone?

This is just one example, we have not been provided with any information about the feasibility of the project using the revised \$90K figure. How does this affect profitability?

What about other costs associated with actually running the Corporation?

From the above, I think it is perfectly clear that we must keep working on the business model. As of know, we are actively in opposition to even most basic statement of concern from the consulting report.

How can we be expected to provide this project money so much given the current plan? It would be irresponsible.

We were first told that we had \$250K to invest in this project.

This was then suddenly revised to \$90K because the SGPS needed a 'float' of reserves to keep running.

Are we sure that we \$140K is enough to keep the SGPS financially healthy? And are we sure that \$90K is enough for the housing authority to survive? Are we possibly heading for the worst of both worlds?

With that in mind, I direct the following question directly to Sean, who as Executive Director, we pay to manage the affairs of the SGPS:

Can you provide guidance and do you support a transfer of \$90K to the housing authority given the current information you have about the current housing authority plan and your intimate knowledge of the financial position of the SGPS?

In my local experience, graduate students are generally not interested in committing so much of our reserves to this project. In fact, they are often not interested even before they hear that it will cost \$90K. Why? Because they doubt that they will be able to take advantage of the service. They do mention other things that they do want: Better Dental, Better Health Plan, Re-Location support, Daycare Services. Do we really know how best to invest this money? No, because the document we got from consultants only considered a coffee shop and a housing authority. Are the councillors here certain that they represent the wishes of their various departments? I think we need to ensure more consultation with the various stake-holders, by ensuring that any potential project has a clear mandate from the student body.

Based on the above, I therefore request that this vote is done via a "roll-call" where every councillor's name will be attached to their vote. At this point, I see this as the only mechanism to ensure accountability.

There is no urgency in starting this project today. Whatever service we ultimately commit to will develop over years and thus does not require action today.

We need to demand a proper plan before we hand over a substantial portion of our financial reserves. We also need to ensure proper consultation has taken place to ensure we have the support of our constituency when committing so much of their money. I think it is very telling that support for this project has fallen away as more information has been made available. Rose-colored glasses are often just that and may blind us to the realities of the investment we are being asked to make. I urge everyone to vote against this motion.

In my local experience, there have been many concerns. Many students were not interested in housing per se. This raises a flag. I am not sure how many students out there are really interested in housing. Students do mention things that they want and this varies a lot. I want to make sure that councillors take this into account while they are voting. I want them to take into concern the support of their membership. Based on this, I want the Speaker to vote on this via roll call. So that we can have some transparency. Sean- can you provide guidance, and can you provide support about whether this is a good idea?

Sean Richards- No.

Jerome James- When you asked these people, what type of person were talking to- an international student, a lower income student? Throwing out these numbers is not relevant. This is clouding the discussion. This doesn't give us trust in the assembly or in the process. It doesn't speak well to how we govern ourselves. Transferring money and scarring the assembly by using this type of language is not effective.

Amir Nosrat- This isn't so much of a motivation for or against. I don't feel like Council is ready to vote on a second reading. I don't have the capacity to table, but I would because the original plan- the QBC report was a feasibility report, not a business proposal. That business proposal was supposed to be created at this time. I was hoping that the transitioning executive would provide this document between the first and second reading. I am not sure about where the current executive stands. In regards for the third party representation, I would strongly disagree on this. There is an opinion of the membership which is in the report and I would suggest you refer to this. The context of these questions is in regards to what happened in January 2010- the detailed business plan was not going to be created until the organization was corporated and the executive was set up. The bylaws have been ratified (in march)- but not incorporated. But it has not been clarified how the current executive feels. In light of these concerns, I have prepared a statement as well as questions I would like the Executive to answer:

In January 2010, the Executive had proposed an initiation action plan that outlined on how to proceed with the initiation of the Housing Authority that is now under the broader framework of the SGPS student services corporation. An integral part of this action plan was the establishment of a working group whose mandate is now not as clear. Furthermore, Council had passed a motion in the same time charging the Executive to establish a not-for-profit corporation that is to provide a legal and institutional framework for which the Housing Authority was to operate in. The bylaws of this not for profit corporation have been ratified in March, yet the incorporation had been delayed by the former Executive to allow for the new Executive to iron out any final concerns. However, it has not been clarified how the current Executive plans to proceed with the Housing Authority. As such the following questions arise:

- 1- Will the Executive continue the Housing Authority initiation action plan as adopted by the SGPS Exec in January?
- 2- If not, will there be any alternative plans to proceed with the initiation?
- 3- What will become of the Housing Authority working group? Will it be altered or dissolved altogether?
- 4- Where does the Executive stand with respect to the Housing Authority? Four of the five Executive had campaigned on a platform to continue the Housing Authority initiation. Has this changed and if so, why?
- 5- In the event that the Executive and Council do not want to proceed with the Housing Authority as expressed in the second reading of the \$90,000 fund transfer to the new corporation, will the Executive establish the not-for-profit corporation as mandated by Council in two separate motions?

Mark Rosner- I do appreciate that people come with prepared statements, please send this to us for the meetings. We will go to the Speaker's list please.

Rob Church- Well, I look forward to the responses to the questions. I know that Amir has put a shit load of work into this. Tons of things have changed, money has gone down. Steve mentioned that the two houses that he was looking at were sold. It goes back to the idea that the Executive support is no longer there. Now that Amir is no longer on Exec is there and that there is no longer his support, I am not sure that we should be doing this. Even last meeting there was uncertainty about whether it should be for profit or not for profit. It really boils down about giving this money or not, do we think that this is a worth while idea. We don't think that this is a worthwhile idea.

Marvin Ferrer- I want to speak against this motion. I want to thank Andrew for speaking about this lack of student consultation. I did ask the people in my department. They said no to both \$250, 000 and \$90, 000. It was a large range of spectrum. Four days ago there was an article about the chief of Royal Lapage in the Globe and Mail and the bank of Nova Scotia CEO said that banks have been raising mortgages, trends are that housing prices will stop rising and plummet soon. Now is probably a bad time to buy a house.

Chris Harris- I just want to make a comment about this. I was on the very original, original housing committee in August. I am not for or against, just simply because I have been out of this loop for so long. There has been a business plan since August. We have done more work than QBC- I think that the original investment was originally only \$20, 000. I can also say that the Biology faculty has been wholeheartedly for this, they have been wanting a housing authority and committee, with a house that is likely of cheaper rent, etc.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell - I want to address Amir's questions. We will continue to explore long term goals of the SGPS. I still support the idea of the housing project and providing housing for the members. This transfer of the loan, I think that it is too soon in the game for us to be doing this. I will address Amir's questions: The next motion answers these questions. The Executive has talked things over, there are loose ends and questions remaining in respects to the housing authority. We have to see the feasibility and must task the strategic planning committee concerning the feasibility project. The Executive will establish the Not-for-Profit Corporation. In April, everyone is in exams. Everything is ready to go; we just need to submit our names.

Logan Crowell - I disagree with Rob. This is not about whether housing is a good idea. This is about today, whether \$90, 000 should be given today. This doesn't end anything. This doesn't kill the housing authority. All that this does, we can

still vote and discuss. Voting this down now, this is not about the idea, it is about whether or not the Not-For-Profit organization, which has not yet been created should go through and \$90,000 should be given right now. If we can't say \$90,000 for what, then what are we saying? No one is worse off with more information. This money is not going to go anywhere. It is now, or later. Not now or never.

Jawad Qureshy - I appreciate the effort of the VP and I appreciate the effort to motivate against this. Last time I spoke- there is a confusion of the mandate. The Executive needs direction about whether this is a service or a money making venture. This is a fiduciary concern. This is also a matter of staff, not only money. At this point, all five Executive members are against the motion. This third thing, the plan was based on \$250,000 and the motion is based on \$90,000. It doesn't add up. In my mind, this is nothing more than fantasy. This would be the SGPS's equivalent of the Queen's Centre. The question has been put forth about whether we should table this motion. Absolutely not. It has already been passed. If it is tabled, then it means that \$90,000 can be passed in one reading. It needs to go through again with more information. I am troubled that I have to do this, but I do. On March 21st, we received an e-mail from an outgoing member of the Executive, the outgoing VP Finance and Services, saying that he was going to vote against the motion for the housing authority and stating his reasoning. Quotes from e-mail. This is public information if you want to see it. I agree that hard work went out into this, but there have been elements that should go for this to fail. I have asked Amir to be apart or the finance and services committee. I encourage other members to be apart of this committee. I would like you to vote this down.

MOTION

04/13/10: 7-Call to question

Moved ___Andrew Ross/___Patrick Cashin_____ BIRT Motion 04/13/10:7 be called to question.

Chris Harris- Roll call? If we are going to call to question, then are we doing to do the roll call?

Mark Rosner- If you ask for it, then I do it.

Carried

2nd Reading

MOTION

04/13/10:7

Moved ___Jerome James_____/___Andrew Ross_____ BIRT the SGPS loan the SGPS Housing Authority \$90,000 from the SGPS reserves after such time that the Housing Authority has been incorporated.

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstention</u>
Jerome James Namit Sharma	Logan Crowell Ryan Bespalko Jillian Burford-Grinnell Patrick Cashin Rob Church Bob Cockburn Catherine Copp Marvin Ferrer Heather Gainforth Anne-Marie Grondin Shaughnessy Hawkins Jess Hickey Mohammed Hussain Stephanie Kullick Michael Lockett Daniel Moore Hai-Yen Nguyen Eoin O'Dwyer Andrew Pruszyński Andrew Pursell Jawad Qureshy Charan Rainford Brittany Sargeant Andrew Ross Andrew Stevens Patrick Welsh	Chris Harris

Not Carried

Amir Nosrat- Point of Privilege. That was a confidential e-mail that was not supposed to be shared publicly.

Mark Rosner- One, I don't know what to say about the confidential aspect of that e-mail.

Amir Nosrat- If you could let me briefly explain, I will be fine. That e-mail was sent to specific people. I was asked to change my stance, because everyone was worried... To be accused that I was going against the housing authority as Jawad did, that I was...

Mark Rosner- That is not a point of privilege.

MOTION

04/13/10:8

Whereas the proposed budget submitted to Council by Queen's Business Consulting (QBC) was based on a \$250,000 down payment on a property for the Services Corporation; and

Whereas it came to the attention of Council after the QBC's budget that only \$90,000 should be withdrawn from SGPS reserves in order to maintain the financial security of our society; and

Whereas real estate prices have risen since Council received QBC's report; and

Whereas the SGPS executive team deems it appropriate to seek a new budget proposal for \$90,000; and

Whereas this motion does not contravene Council's mandate to create a Services Corporation.

Moved ___Daniel_Moore_____ / ___ Shaughnessy Hawkings _____ BIRT the Finances and Services Committee be charged with updating the Financial Analysis spreadsheet with \$90,000 as the working figure; and

BIFRT the Finances and Services Committee submit its new budget proposal to the Strategic Planning Special Committee (SPSC) and to Council; and

BIFRT the SPSC will report to Council in a timely fashion to put forward a recommendation concerning the feasibility of asking the Services Corporation to purchase a property and pay for all legal, labour, and other costs attached to that purchase with \$90,000.

Daniel Moore- I think that this has already been spoken about. Evaluating the \$90, 000, and the strategic Council committee.

Shaughnessy Hawkings - I hope that this reassures people that in fact we have been able to do this. We remain faithful to fulfilling Council's old mandate.

Pat Cashin- A statement and a question. Sean- what is the number that you are comfortable with?

Sean Richards- \$90 000.

Pat Welsh- I am wondering, whether or not it can be incorporated informally in the mandate of this motion. Is this broad enough for this motion? Is this motion broad enough?

Jawad Qureshy - The idea of the strategic planning document has a much larger mandate, so you can look at that.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell - I want to elaborate further. The strategic planning is checking out other projects, I welcome all of this participation and enthusiasm. We are always looking for interesting ideas.

Andrew Pruszynski- I think that this is a great motion and I would like to offer my services.

Shaughnessy Hawkings - I would caution us that making too many decisions over the summer is dangerous. I think that it would be bad to make too many decisions over the summer, as we did last summer with the housing authority and when we came back the law students were vehemently against the authority.

Marvin Ferrer- I want to speak against his motion. I asked my constituents, they said that they do not support this. The housing bubble will pop soon. I think a lot of what was said still applies.

MOTION

04/13/10:8- Call to question

Moved____Jillian Burford-Grinnell/____Chris Harris BIRT Motion 04/13/10:8 be called to question.

Carried

Jess Hickey- Point of information. What happens if this doesn't pass? What is this changing?

Mark Rosner- The motion states: require that the finance and services committee update their finances numbers, submit it and report in a timely fashion. None of that will be required if this fails. Anything can still occur if this doesn't pass.

Andrew Pruszynski- Point of order. Did you ask for debate when closing discussion? Are you supposed to?

Mark Rosner- No.

Andrew Pruszynski- Withdrawn.

Jerome James- Point of information. How can we have an analysis on what we were going to use if we said \$250, 000? Is \$90, 000 all we have in our banks?

Mark Rosner- There are approximately \$250, 000 in our reserves.

Jerome James- What does that mean, in our reserves?

Mark Rosner- We all pay membership fees, we get funds, in addition to that, we have reserves. Seeing as there is no more discussion, move to vote.

MOTION

04/13/10:8

Carried

MOTION

04/13/10:9

Moved _____ Jillian Burford-Grinnell _____ / _____ Shaughnessy Hawkings _____
BIRT the SGPS accept the resignation of Andrew Stevens from the position of
SGPS Graduate Student Senator.

Jillian Burford-Grinnell - Although it is with much sadness.

Mark Rosner- Presumably we will accept your resignation. But we have to fill this position. The next meeting is in May, and the next meeting is in August. A lot of people are not going to be around this summer.

BYLAW B.11- Vacancy of Office:

- a. If any office associated with the SGPS becomes vacant for any reason that office shall be filled as soon as possible.
- b. Council may choose to elect a replacement at its next regular meeting rather than holding an SGPS {wide election if less than six months remain in the term of office.
- c. In the event that a vacant position must be filled, the normal procedure for elections shall be followed according to [B.10](#) and the procedures below:
 - (1) No campaigning shall occur for this candidate;
 - (2) No vote by all SGPS members will be held; and
 - (3) The election of that candidate to the vacant office shall be decided by a vote at the next Council meeting. The candidate is elected to the vacant office by a majority vote of Council.

And

- e. Until an election is held for a vacated office, the duties of:
 - (5) the Graduate Student Senator shall remain vacant

So: I don't want to make a ruling right away. I am casting out for advice. Andrew is resigning by May 31st. Elections, whatever kind we have- whether Council elects or all the membership elects.

Sean Richards- That is not true. Graduate students only elect.

Mark Rosner- That is correct. Only students registered in the School of Graduate studies can elect. We can have a by-election for the term of this election. Normally we can do this no problem. So, I want to make sure, now that Andrew has noted that it is important for someone to be around this summer. Are departments ready for another election? This will inform me as to whether Council at the next meeting should vote.

Chris Harris- For the Biology faculty, the summer is field season and most will not be around.

Marvin Ferrer- In Anatomy, most people stay for the summer. The reading seems pretty clear.

Andrew Pruszynski- We wouldn't be that much around.

Rob Church- Law students are not eligible for the seat. It is important for someone to be around for the summer. If you hold a vote in the fall and make this democratic. Given that Logan will be around and will be a smarter representative than I was, you will get a feel about the debates.

Michael Bravo- I think that things can get muddled.

Mark Rosner- There is no provision for an interim. Whoever is elected will serve out that term, at which point a new senator will be elected.

Andrew Stevens- Rob is right. The eligibility for Senate positions is important. I am not concerned about the votes. I would be more than happy to sit down with anyone who is interested. We can have a transition before the election.

Logan Crowell- I would gladly speak on your behalf if that is what you want. There is a possibility for a proxy. An election could be held afterwards and have an acting proxy. Issues of knowledge of the Senate is a different thing, but certainly you can have a proxy.

Shaughnessy Hawkings - We also have a number of observer seats. If you are worried about advocacy, a number of graduate student Execs can come and be vocal.

Mark Rosner- Andrew resigns at Senate, if you want to proxy, OK- but it strikes me that people seem most amenable to have these by elections in the fall so that people will be around.

Logan Crowell- So that we will state that you can't have an election until the fall.

Mark Rosner- Yes. I do not want to have no candidates, bad turn out, etc.

Logan Crowell- You could accept this motion and hold elections when you feel comfortable.

Mark Rosner- Thanks, I appreciate this. Move to vote, with regret. Thanks Andrew for all of your time and efforts at the SGPS.

Carried

8. Other Business

Election of New Speaker

Mark- We need to elect a new Speaker. Michael, you expressed an interest. We decide as a body, did you want to say anything about yourself?

Michael Bravo- Ok, yeah, I don't mind. So, I am also known as the guy who lost to Daniel Moore. A fire has been lit underneath me recently. At U of T I was either Speaker or chair of many committees and boards. Last year I was Speaker of the SKHS Grad Council. I moderated the only student run town hall last week. I think that I did this relatively effectively, despite the efforts of some to override the meeting. Mark has really well done. I have a lot of experience to run this body effectively. I have a copy of Robert's rulebook in my backpack. I have spent more time on this than any of my respective girlfriends, which says a lot. I am a fun person, but I am not afraid in shutting you down, getting things on track or redirecting the discussion. I see the value in discussion, but in the same way, I think that we need to keep things concise. I think I have a good idea of how things are discussed and how we come to decisions. If you have any questions, please come and talk to me.

MOTION

04/13/10: Election of Speaker

Moved ___ Logan Crowell ___ / ___ Heather Gainforth BIRT Michael Bravo be elected as Speaker of the SGPS Council for the 2010-2011 academic year.

*Carried
(unanimously)*

Mark Rosner- I would like to thank you all. It was a fun year.

9. Notice of Motions/Announcements

Reports and Motions for the next regular Council meeting are due Tuesday, May 4th, 2010.

The next regular SGPS Council meeting will be on Tuesday, May 11th, 2010.

Mark Rosner- One final announcement. I will gladly buy anyone a drink at the Grad Club, if they like.

10. Adjournment

MOTION

04/13/10:10

Moved _____Jillian Burford-Grinnell _____ / _____Andrew Ross_____ BIRT the SGPS Council meeting be adjourned.

Carried

04/13/10

MR

CFS-27

Attached:

AGM Minutes

Attendance March AGM Meeting

April Reports

Appendix 1 – Resignation letter of SGPS Graduate Student Senator Andrew Stevens

Appendix 2 – Letter outlining concerns regarding changes to the SSHRC funding procedures and structure

Appendix 3 – University Planning Committee Proposal from Senate Operations Review Committee