



**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 April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015 @ 5:30PM**

**McLaughlin Room, JDUC**

[Voting cards distributed to voting members and proxies for a total of 37 votes.]

**1. Presentations**

---

N/A

**2. Adoption of the Agenda & Minutes**

---

**MOTION** **04/14/15:1**

Moved: Julian  
Seconded: Chris

BIRT the agenda for April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Council meeting be adopted.  
Motion carried.

**MOTION** **04/14/15:2**

Moved: Patrick  
Seconded: James

BIRT the minutes for March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Council meeting be accepted.  
Motion carried.

**MOTION** **04/14/15:3**

Moved: Peter  
Seconded: Julian

BIRT the minutes for March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015 General meeting be accepted.  
Motion carried.

### **3. Executive and Speaker Reports**

---

- a. President – Kevin Weiner (report attached)
- b. VP Graduate – Dinah Jansen (report attached)
- c. VP Professional – Thompson Hamilton (report attached)
- d. VP Campaigns & Community Affairs – Lorne Beswick (report attached)
- e. VP Finance & Services – Patrick Gajos (report attached)
- f. Executive Assistant – Andria Mahon
- g. Speaker – Max Ma (report attached)

Kevin: Met with AMS President to discuss the issue of dealing with space for the Sexual Health Resource Centre.

Thompson: SONAD meeting last week for a fraternity/sorority referral.

#### **MOTION**

**04/14/15:4**

Moved: Dinah

Seconded: Chris

BIRT the Executive and Speaker Reports be accepted.

Motion carried.

### **4. Senator, Trustee, Commission, Committee & Other Reports**

---

- a. Graduate Student Senator – Eric Rapos (report attached)
- b. Graduate Student Trustee – James MacLeod (report attached)
- c. Commission Reports
  - i. Communications Commissioner – Sean Richards (report attached)
  - ii. Equity Commissioner – Erica Baker
  - iii. International Students' Affairs Commissioner – Jhordan Layne (report attached)
  - iv. Social Commissioner – Ciara Bracken-Roche
  - v. Sustainability Coordinator – Megan MacCallum
- d. Committee Reports
- e. Other Reports
  - i. Rector – Mike Young
  - ii. Chief Returning Officer – Peter Charboneau
  - iii. Student Advisors (report attached)
  - iv. Departmental Reports

#### **MOTION**

**04/14/15:5**

Moved: Sarah

Seconded: Paul

BIRT the Senator, Trustee, Commission, Committee and Other Reports be accepted.  
Motion carried.

## **5. Question Period/Departmental Issues**

---

### a. Student Advisor Program – Hao Li (11hl27@queensu.ca)

Hao: I have two major concerns: A student in my department has been working with with two student advisors but they were recently fired. This student would like to know the reason why. The second issue is transitioning files to new advisors and how that will work without the advisors here to pass on their work to the new advisors.

Kevin: As interim supervisor of the Student Advisor program, I wish I could get into more details about your first issue, but since this is an internal human resources issue, any employer is restricted in what they can say publicly. So I can't confirm how the cessation of employment came about or the reasons behind it. I can tell you that all Executive members are aware of the reasons and felt the actions taken were necessary and had to be taken. The incoming Executive was also fully on board. Beyond that I simply can't get into more detail. If we moved to closed session I could possibly get into a little more detail, but even there, there are things that under the circumstances as an employer we owe a duty of privacy to a former employee. In terms of the transition issue, a statement was put up on our website last week and information was sent to stakeholders in the program. At this point the program does not have any active advisors but we are hiring new advisors on a permanent basis from May 1st to run until next April. There was already some discussion earlier in the year about changing the term from May to April. In the meantime, before now and May 15th when the new advisors would be trained, our Executive Assistant who helps prepare the training that the advisors receive is providing the services directly for students who would like it. We ran into a bit of a catch-22 because for any previous clients of the program, their information was confidential to their advisor so we didn't feel comfortable just moving that client's information to our Executive Assistant and new set of advisors. So to make sure clients maintain control over their own information, all emails in the advisor accounts has been sequestered and if a previous client of the program would like to continue receiving services either on interim basis or after May 15th, all they have to do is send an email asking to set up a meeting to sign a confidentiality form and then we can find their relevant information in the emails and pull just those relevant emails out without compromising confidentiality of any other clients. From there, the new advisor would be able to have a discussion with them about what's being done about their case and continue providing those services. I understand that not having active advisors right now is disruptive, but the entire Executive felt we did all that we could to reasonably avoid that disruption from happening. Ultimately, the decisions we made were ones we felt we had to make and we are doing everything we possibly can to avoid disruption as much as possible and make sure the program will come back as strong as ever by May 15th when we expect new advisors to complete their training.

## **6. Business Arising From the Minutes**

---

N/A

## **7. Main Motions**

---

### **MOTION**

**04/14/15:6**

Moved: Michael Carter (michael.carter@queensu.ca)  
Seconded: Jared Houston (jared.houston@gmail.com)

BIRT Council adopt the motion regarding the Student Advisor Program.  
[Simple majority to pass, see appendix]

Michael: [Reads the proposed motion in full].

Max: Within the Robert's Rules, each member will only be allowed to speak twice in one singular motion with a time limit of 10 minutes for each speech. I will be enforcing this rule for this motion. So keep that in mind.

Michael: This is a motion I am moving in support of the involvement and collaboration with members of the SGPS community and I think that is a straightforward request.

Jared: I would like to offer the floor to SGPS members Victoria Millious and Becky Pero who are not council members but may have some material information for council to consider.

Max: Jared asked me in advance to extend speaking rights to individuals who are not council members who may have material information they can provide to council in their decision-making process. I will grant that request, but bear in mind speaking rights at council for non-council members is not a right but a privilege. So you may provide information to help council in their decision-making process, but not make arguments.

Victoria: I am Victoria Millious. I am a third year PhD student in the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies. I will present a simple timeline of events that are relevant to the motion at hand and then I will pass the discussion back to council. I was a Student Advisor for over three years. Following departure of a Student Advisor in February, on March 3, the Executive met with the Student Advisors. The Advisors were informed that they would soon be consulted regarding the structure of the program, to discuss immediate steps as well as the possibility of future alternative arrangements. On March 13, the Advisors and members of the current and incoming Executive and staff members met to discuss proposed program changes that included the possibility of a centralized digital filing system, intake forms, a confidentiality release, and the inclusion of a staff member into the program. It was agreed at this meeting that Advisors would have until March 17 to provide additional feedback. On March 14 by email, Advisors

asked for additional time to provide initial feedback to the proposed changes. They agreed that moving forward and discussing possible improvements to the Advisor program was beneficial and that they welcomed such conversation. Because the proposed changes would make substantial alterations to the nature and day-to-day practices of the program, Advisors requested that they have one week to provide their initial feedback. They provided two key reasons for this request: First, that they had recently lost a colleague and were on the cusp of losing an additional. They needed to focus on transitioning clients and getting their recently rehired Advisor back up to speed. Second, they needed time to consult about these proposed changes, practitioner to practitioner with fellow Queen's employees who are involved in similar helping services campus-wide. On March 16, the Advisors received a broad-strokes written account of the proposed changes and were again asked to provide feedback by March 17. Just one day. On March 17 Advisors sent their initial broad-strokes feedback concerning the proposed changes to the Executive. On March 17 the Advisors also received approval from the VPG to proceed with a feedback plan that outlined the campus counterparts, for example the Human Rights Office, with whom the Advisors wished to consult with regards to the changes, and a timeline for such consultations. The Advisors then forwarded this plan to the Executive. Again the rationale for the feedback plan was to provide the best possible feedback drawing from practitioner perspectives. On March 19 the Advisors were told that the program changes had been approved by the Executive and that the changes included a centralized digital filing system, an intake form, a confidentiality release, and the inclusion of a staff member into the program. On March 21, Advisors were notified that President Kevin Wiener would take over the supervisory duties of the program as of March 23.

Kevin: Point of order: At this point in the timeline we have gone beyond when the changes were actually approved and into the detailed timeline that led to the human resources issues. Frankly, I don't think it is appropriate for us to be having a discussion about exactly what was said and when, and what exactly led to the human resources decisions. I don't think it is relevant towards this motion, which again, has to do with whether or not the proposed changes that were proposed by the Executive should be rescinded and setting up a committee to look into further changes. There is nothing in this motion that has anything to do with termination or resignation decisions or rescinding those and therefore any discussion of what led to those decisions would not be relevant to the actual motion being discussed.

Victoria: Again, I am simply giving a timeline of events because the motion does speak to the fact that there are currently no Advisors in the program, so I think it is germane.

Kevin: Point of order: A preamble to a motion is not part of the motion. It can be amended. And as I mentioned to the movers of this motion, I felt the part of the preamble that had to do with the fact that there are no Advisors was not relevant to the actual wording of the motion which again rescinds structural changes and creates a committee to consider the structure of the program. I requested that the movers either meet with me to discuss the fact that the preamble to the motion strayed dangerously into human resources issues that should not be part of a public forum or to at least remove those. While the mover of this motion said he would look into it, they were unwilling to meet with me and did not choose to remove that part

of the preamble. The preamble has no force in regards to the motion. The relevance for the actual passing of the motion has to do with the actions that are being taken, which, I would remind the Speaker and ask for a ruling on, relates to structural changes to the program and whether those structural changes will benefit the program and secondly for a larger review of the program should there be a committee struck to review that and who should be on that committee. Any further discussion of internal human resources issues, again, I do think exceeds the scope of the motion as it is written.

Max: Kevin's point of order is well taken. Your conversation must be limited to whatever is in the "Be it resolved" clause of this motion which relates to the structural and philosophical components of the program, not other things.

Victoria: On Tuesday, March 24, at the prior request of the VP Graduate, then-Student Advisor Becky Pero wrote a jointly-written Student Advisor report that updated councilors and SGPS members about the program changes and invited their concerns.

Kevin: Point of order: This is clearly as a matter of timeline going back into the human resources issues that are not relevant to the discussion. The changes that were decided on were decided earlier on March 18. How the Advisors respond to those changes and any human resources decisions that had to be taken in relation to that response and other issues going on in the program has no relevance to the structural changes made on March 18 and have not changed since that point.

Victoria: I think I've been heard. Thank you.

Jared: I would like to speak about what I see as the three main issues of this motion: First the alleged problem and changes the Executive put forward were not at all in a way that involved sufficient consultation and time for feedback from the now former Student Advisors, School of Graduate Studies, Human Rights Office, and council. Second, the Executive justified its unilateral implementation of the changes as though it was urgently required before April 30, but this deadline is contrived. The Executive has created a false sense of urgency to make these changes. Third, a committee needs to be struck to facilitate democratic discussions with all relevant stakeholders for these major program changes. On the first issue, council has only recently been informed of the great challenges facing the student advisor program. Executive reporting on the changes went from a few vague paragraphs over the past few months, to a full five pages in April. We believe councilors need more time to give due consideration to the Executive's program changes and listen to feedback from all other parties. Partners of the program, the Human Rights Office, and School of Graduate Studies are a part of the program. The Executive reports are unclear on whether and in what way these parties have been consulted in regards to these changes. The Advisors themselves have irreplaceable knowledge as they learn their jobs by assisting clients and working as a team. No other SGPS members have the understanding they do of their own program. Given recent events, we are now faced with the difficult task of eliciting feedback from former Advisors. Navigating this issue will take time. The motion requests more time for consultation and feedback from all these parties. On

the second issue, the Executive alleges there is a serious risk regarding client confidentiality. We argue the risk of client confidentiality must be balanced against the risk that the changes as a whole are not in the best interests of the Student Advisor program going forward. We believe this council should be prepared to take up the marginal risks of rescinding the Executive's changes to ensure the welfare of the whole program. The current Executive further justifies the need to pass these changes quickly as it would allow the incoming Executive to be better informed regarding the further changes they are to implement. This argument assumes that the new Executive, like the old, will enact changes unilaterally. But unilateral changes are exactly what need to be discussed here at council. On the final issue, major changes to an SGPS program should be discussed by all relevant stakeholders and approved by council. Core features of the program are at issue. Will the program remain peer-to-peer or will it become like other medicalized support services on campus? Will the program remain independent and student-run, by Advisors themselves, who until recently related to the SGPS Executive on the basis of a relationship of trust, or will the Executive implement a strict employee-supervisor structure, making Advisors the subordinates of the Executive? Will the partnerships that fund the program and help train Advisors be properly maintained, or will they be damaged by the recent lack of consultation? To be clear, the motion allows for the recent changes to be considered by the proposed committee, but these changes would only be approved if approved by the committee, council, and membership. This is in contrast to the Executive's current plan which is to have the changes unilaterally implemented. It is the responsibility of this council as the primary democratic body of the SGPS to ensure democratic oversight of the activities of the Executive. I hope you will join us today to fulfill that obligation in passing this motion.

Korey: I want to express my concern about the speed with which the changes have been made and the difficulty I have with consulting with my colleagues in Political Studies. We won't have a meeting until next week and I have yet raise this issue with them at all, so it's difficult to get feedback from them about the changes. So the speed of the changes does concern me, just in terms of being able to report back and fulfill my role as a representative.

Kevin: I have prepared some documents to serve as examples of what we are looking to put in place that I think would be helpful to distribute.

Jared: Point of order: How are these documents relevant to the motion?

Kevin: The package includes examples of confidentiality agreements, screenshots of the filing system, the intake form, and examples of similar confidentiality agreements from other peer advisor services both at Queen's and elsewhere. Given that the discussion is itself over whether these things should remain in place, I think it would be beneficial if members of council could see what they actually are.

[2 minute recess taken to distribute and review documents.]

Kevin: I'm glad to see council take an active role in this discussion. I think council should continue to be involved. However, I do have some significant concerns about the way this

motion and preamble are worded and the effects that rescinding the changes will have on the program while we take more time to look at more changes. I put this in my report, but I want to reiterate it, the confidentiality form, the filing system, these things we put in place because we felt it had to be put in place right now because when you promise someone confidentiality, we should make sure that their information is actually secure and trackable. Can that be changed later? Of course, but we did it because we felt it was better than the status quo which didn't meet minimum standards we needed to have to have a confidential program. You can't keep notes in an unlocked desk drawer in a room that non-Advisors have keys to. We feel that having some kind of filing system and form that clarifies it is necessary for right now and then we can move forward and say later that we can look at it again and refine it. If anything, having information in these files will make it easier to move to a new system because everything will be organized. We moved quickly because we felt this had to be put in place now that can be changed later, but the status quo created unacceptable risks and did not mesh with the promise of confidentiality we were telling to clients. I think there is misconception being put forward that the Executive making changes to the program without council amending policies is something new and unprecedented. But in fact, compared to previous changes that have been made to the program without any consultation or debate by council, these are very modest. One example is all of the concern now around having an intake form, but the program used to have an intake form in May 2011, but the Advisors then stopped using it, and now we are looking at having it again. So from a purely logical perspective, if we can stop using the form without coming to council, we can presumably bring it back without bringing it to council. Council's job is to set policies that govern the program, but details around what a form looks like is precisely why you have the Executive and why you have the Executive in charge of the program to carry out those changes. The program is governed in two ways. First is the by-law and policy that talks about the policy and largely says VPG is chair of the coordinator committee and personnel committee. Talks about how advisors are hired, rehired, and annual evaluations for rehire. That is a small part of what governs the program. Most of what governs the program is in the Memorandum of Agreement between SGPS and SGS. Has a lot of details about what Advisors are supposed to be doing, what kind of advice they are supposed to give, that Advisors aren't supposed to sit on any committees that govern the program, things like that. In 2012, while Becky Pero was VPG, a new MOA was signed with the SGS that substantially changed the program in a number of ways – steering committee with various stakeholders was abolished, no longer makes amendments to the MOA, SGPS and SGS can bilaterally make changes to the MOA, and SGPS was given governance of the program. There were very large substantive changes that were signed by the previous VPG who is in fact now one of the people very upset about these current changes, but I can tell you that all that was ever reported to council was one sentence in the September 2012 report to council stating “This Fall I intend to further develop the SGPS by-laws and policies and SGPS-SGS Memorandum of Agreement that govern the Student Advisor Program in an effort to further solidify the Program and Advisor roles and responsibilities”. That's all that was ever reported to council before the new MOA was entered into.

Michael: Point of order: What is the relevance of this historical commentary to the motion?



Kevin: I am providing context as to what level of involvement council has historically had in making decisions about this program and how that contextualized what we brought to council and what we intended to bring to council and whether the Executive making decisions that would change the structure of the program is something that is historically acceptable or unacceptable.

Max: So Kevin is speaking about the historical relationship between council and the Executive concerning the structure and philosophical conditions of the program. The motion considers rescinding changes made by the Executive on this point so some history is relevant.

Kevin: So massive changes to the scope of the program, including what types of issues Advisors can deal with, to who can be an Advisor, and to who was in charge of the program because of the elimination of the steering committee were all unilaterally approved by a previous VPG who signed a new MOA.

Jared: Point of information: What is the source of the information you are discussing?

Kevin: The source of the information is that there is nothing in any Council agenda or Executive agenda that talks about the Memorandum of Agreement beyond the one sentence I read before, but there was a new Memorandum of Agreement entered into that replaced the previous one. It's possible it was discussed at Executive and not put down in any agenda or minutes. That's possible, but I'm saying that I have done a pretty exhaustive search of our records and I can't find anything in any record about the discussion that led up to those changes to the MOA and in fact our Executive Director who is part of every Executive meeting and has been at all the Council meetings did not realize there was a new 2012 MOA until it was brought to our attention. It came as a surprise to the Executive. So that is the source of my information. Anyways, council should be involved in this discussion, but all we are looking at right now is a new confidentiality program to be put in place which is not unusual at all. The decision was made by the Executive in principle. The Advisors were given the opportunity to design any kind of confidentiality form they wanted and any kind of filing system they wanted, but we felt that in principle there had to be something in place. Now that there are no Advisors, we obviously need to create these things ourselves. I'm happy to address any other further questions in my next speech.

Max: You are out of speaking time.

Tabitha: Point of order: Why do we need time limits? I want to hear all sides fully.

Max: Our policy stipulates that we govern council meetings in accordance with the Robert's Rules of Order. That book stipulates limits to discussion in deliberation of action items. Council members can motion to amend that limit to make it bigger or smaller, but without that, we will work within the limit imposed by Robert's Rules.

Alexandra Pedersen: My question relates to whether or not the current actions were done in full faith and transparency? I don't understand how the history of this program relates to the transparency of the current Executive's decisions.

Jennifer: I have a statement on behalf of the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies. We wish to express disapproval over significant changes to the student advisor program which has not been transparent. Disturbing that actions were taken without any deliberation of council or consultation with wider membership. SGPS is democratic and we deserve and insist upon transparency in all of the Executive's decisions. Students deserve peer-to-peer support promised by the program, not from a staff member, so we support this motion.

Adam: I have a statement from the Graduate English Society, which expresses disapproval over recent termination of Advisors and the implementation of the recent structural changes to the program without appropriate consultation. While we are not inherently opposed to changes, we recognize that these are substantial changes that require thoughtful consideration and execution. Implementing such changes in a two week time period shows a lack of awareness of and concern for the impact these changes will have on members. Furthermore, the fact that the Executive saw fit to terminate Advisors without consulting the parties served by the program, like clients and the SGS, which is in violation of SGPS by-laws, is also deeply troubling. While we accept the confidentiality of issues of termination, we are concerned that the cause of the terminations seems to have been the Advisors questioning changes, the Executive, and the changes the Executive was going to make. Students consulting with advisors have been suddenly left without help, the program has lost Advisors with years of experience, which puts the program and members at risk.

Kevin: Point of order: Again, the termination decision, if there was a termination, issue is not relevant to the motion. I understand councilors may be reading preexisting letters, but ultimately, I don't think it does a service to debate to conflate the two issues.

Adam: I will skip those sections then. The Executive seems to have put a desire for expedited changes ahead of proper consultation, consensus building, due process, and the wellbeing of SGPS membership. Once again, we express disapproval of the actions of the Executive and our membership fully supports the reversal of these actions.

Emily: I don't necessarily have a problem with these decisions being made without council voting on it, but in this situation we have a major structural change to the program. Many decisions are made without council voting on them. But for a major structural change to the program, we don't have Advisors to work with council and I think it would be appropriate to take more time to do this properly. At the March General Meeting we discussed why there was a timeline and one reason was that it was to expedite changes before the change of the Executive but I haven't heard anything about that since. There are many ways to make these changes and it would be valuable to take more than a couple weeks to decide on it.

Mark: I'm fairly confused about the discussion this evening. The debate here seems to be over the structural changes that have been implemented for this program. While everyone seems to be disappointed in these changes, I can't understand why, because when I look at them, they make a lot of common sense. The Executive is elected by students exactly for the purpose of handling things like this. The day-to-day nitty gritty of making sure the SGPS is not liable, that it fulfills responsibilities, delivers services, and fulfilling promises. That seems to be what the current Executive is doing. The changes are straightforward. They implement confidentiality, ensuring oversight, ensuring smoother transitions. They only seem to do benefit to clients. So that confidentiality is actually protected, information is actually secure, especially after that has been promised by Advisors. It also looks like it will benefit Advisors moving forward because it clarifies duties to members. It will make things easier for the whole SGPS because it makes transitioning easier. These all seem like very basic things, and without them, if we undo these changes, we become wildly liable and telling our clients we have a confidential and beneficial service, but without transitioning, without oversight, and without real confidentiality. That doesn't make sense to me. Somebody please tell me why these structural changes are bad. The Executive saw problems and acted quickly to ensure they do not continue rather than debating the issue for months while confidentiality was at risk seems like common sense. I think this is reasonable. These changes protect the program. If people have nuanced changes, we can add them on later, but rescinding things now means you will have months where we are not properly fulfilling our job. Please illuminate my perspective.

Julian: The reality is we are looking at what is a bad situation. There aren't Advisors currently in the program but we need to accept the fact that we are here. It is unfortunate that this has occurred but the damage has already been done so we might as well look at whether the changes make sense and what would be the most expedient way to move forward. So the Executive does have the power to make these kinds of decisions. As council we have the power to review these changes, but we should focus on the changes as we proceed forward. We should try to keep out of it whatever may have happened with HR issues. So we should focus on the actual functional changes and it doesn't make sense to me to roll back these changes only to then have to go and reimplement them later, further compounding the issue we are now in. Confidentiality, tracking files, and oversight are not substantial changes and in fact I would want them if I was signing up to have advice. I would want it to be clear on how my information was going to be used. Since we are looking at hiring new Advisors soon, I think it would be beneficial for council to consider the changes and have them set in place before the new Advisors start, so that their training will be useful and not have to be revised later on.

[Meeting extended 30 minutes to 8:00]

Thompson: I think it's important to ground the discussion in what the substance of the motion before us today is and that is these three changes in principle that we made. I can see that these are changes to the program, but I'm not sure I would characterize them as major or significant changes. I can honestly say that this was discussed at length with the Executive initially, two meetings with Advisors, and originally we came to the Advisors with five proposed changes, but two were dropped after consultation with the Advisors. We put time and research

into making these changes. To this day I still think they are extremely reasonable. I was surprised at the amount of negative response to this first from the Advisors and now from council members. I stand by our decisions and it involved discussions at length with the Executive, we did reach out to Advisors, and we even brought in the incoming Executive into this discussion because they will pick up where we leave off. When you vote tonight, ground the vote in the changes we made to the program, because that is where we are at now. It's unfortunate that we've ended up with no advisors now, but it's important for council to know that the SGPS is still committed to the Advisor program and we want to get it back up and running, and these three simple changes are well-researched, well-intentioned, and they are for the benefit of clients. I don't remember the exact dates in the timeline here, but the changes came up and were then considered and approved two or three weeks later, which is actually quite a bit of time for the Executive. We've made other changes to things in less time than that and I would stand by those decisions as well. We meet every week and in the time between meetings we work on things back and forth. I don't see this timeline as unreasonable which is another concern brought up here. So yes, we made changes. They are not major. The changes were made with an eye to improving the program and helping clients. I don't see any problems with the timeline. We took the time we needed and when we were sure we had changes that were acceptable and addressed the immediate concerns we had, we voted to approve those changes. The changes on their face are reasonable and it doesn't need to be overly debated. We don't need to put so much time into debating these reasonable changes. Please remember what we are voting on tonight. If you are unhappy with how some other things were handled, I'm sorry, but please vote with the program and its clients in mind here so that we can move forward with these changes.

Sarah: A part of what is problematic is it seems like this has been approached by the Executive rather aggressively and we don't know what is going on with the Advisors leaving. That is where the level of passion is coming from and why it looks so unreasonable to us from the outside. But we do need to now do something to move the program forward. And it might be heavyhanded to rescind all of the changes because we need to look out for the needs of the SGPS.

Korey: Point of information: Would you consider striking a committee to examine the viability of the changes the Executive has proposed?

Sarah: Parts of the proposed motion are valuable. To reassess what has been done is not damaging and could be helpful, so I would even consider amending this motion, but fully rescinding the moves that have been made does seem a little bit hasty. The changes made are reasonable on their face, but I think that needs to be done in concert with the people running the program and for the Executive to just come in and change it without proper consultation that clearly broke the relationship, I think that is problematic.

Emily: Confidentiality agreement is valid and should be there. I have no problem with Executive trying to make the changes that are on the whole valid. But the characterization that these changes are simple, I disagree with. They are not simple.

James: Point of information: Should council really be dealing with these kinds of liability and structural issues? Isn't that something that the Executive should be dealing with? That's what they were elected for isn't it?

Emily: Actually I think that's what the Student Advisors should be doing because that's what they were hired for and what they deal with day-to-day.

Leah Sarson (non-member from political studies graduate student association): Concerned with the expedited process that didn't allow us time to schedule a meeting in time to consult our membership. My hope would be that all structural changes would reflect the experience, professionalism, and integrity of the Advisors.

Mark: As incoming VPG and overseer of this program in the future, I think improving the filing system is extremely important for statistical collection. This motion will effectively shut down the program for the whole summer which is unacceptable to our members. These changes were put in place because they were the bare minimum of what was needed to protect our clients in the best way possible. Confidentiality is part of the program's foundation. The current structure of the program does not protect it, nor does it allow easy transition. There has been no real way to transfer cases when Advisors graduate and move on. That is unacceptable. These changes solidify the confidentiality, they are reasonable, simple, changes, that I believe need to be implemented for this program to run smoothly.

Jhordan: The Advisor program is very important for international students. We have been speaking a lot about the structural changes, but the motion also mentions philosophical changes, and I wanted to ask specifically what are the philosophical changes that have been mentioned, because I think that is a large part of the issue that we are really not getting at here. And that is a question directed at Jared, to explain what the philosophical changes are.

## **MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:6A**

Moved: Ian

Seconded: James

BIRT the first "Be it resolved clause", considering the rescindment of the Executive's changes to the program, be struck from the motion.

Ian: It sounds like most people are concerned about procedures about how the decisions were made, not the actual substance of the decisions, so the first "Be it resolved" clause doesn't seem to be needed. I think it is the second clause that seems more important to people to set up consultation moving forward. I've worked for a similar program at University of Alberta. The changes are quite consistent with best practices for programs like this. Finally, I am concerned about the scope of liability that our program is facing with this current structure without the changes implemented. I worry we are putting ourselves in a position where there

might be a lot of legal liability. As much as I appreciate the desire for consultation, there is no consultation needed to understand that we need to avoid putting ourselves in a position where we will be liable. That is why it is necessary to keep the changes already put in place.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THE MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:6B**

Moved: James  
Seconded: Sean

Move to call the question on this amendment to the main motion.  
[Requires 2/3 majority to pass]

In favour: 26. Opposed: 11.  
Motion carried.

**BACK TO MOTION TO AMEND**

Motion carried.  
Jared, Michael, Kyle, Jennifer, Robert, Korey, Mark oppose.  
Tabitha abstains.

**BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

Alexandra: I would like to draw attention to a recent petition asking to support due diligence about the Student Advisor program. Had over 100 signatures in just four days. I would also like to ask and point out that our very own VPG has not made any statements up to this point and until recently was in control of this program, so I would very much like to hear about what Dinah has to say and if she doesn't wish to speak, maybe there are reasons behind that. As the only woman on the Executive and as a woman member, I think it's important to hear her voice.

Dinah: Point of personal privilege: To address what Alexandra said, I think moving forward the Student Advisor program needs greater administration. I know that it's been quite difficult for me to be able to manage day-to-day supervisory responsibilities while also trying to navigate priorities at the School of Graduate Studies, which is where the VPG's priorities really are supposed to be. Part of the conversation about the administration of the program has in fact been ongoing for quite some time, and it's just a matter of trying to figure out the implementation of this. In terms of the changes that are happening right now, I think it is necessary to have a confidentiality agreement, filing system, and any other changes will be worked out with the next Executive on a cooperative basis.

Chris: Originally I was going to speak against this motion, but seeing that it has now been amended I would now like to speak in favour of the motion. The complaint I hear is that nobody was consulted, but the motion now as written offers an opportunity to move forward with consultation through council members and other stakeholders in this program.

**MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:6C**

Moved: Kevin  
Seconded: Patrick

BIRT the entire preamble (all “whereas” clauses) be struck from the motion.

Kevin: A number of whereas clauses make factual statements about what did or did not happen with the Advisors. I don’t want to open the can of worms about who said what and when and how people may have responded to certain proposed changes. I think now that we have gotten rid of the rescission clause and we are looking at who will be in charge moving forward, the whereas clauses are unnecessary and potentially divisive. I might be happy to support this motion moving forward to have a committee look into these things outside of the Executive, but I am not comfortable to endorse what some of the preamble says about the actions of the Executive because I do not think that they are a fair summary of what transpired over the last month.

Patrick: I have similar thoughts. All the whereas statements have a negative undertone which we don’t want to be addressing, while the “be it resolved” clauses could be supported after further discussion.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THE MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:6D**

Moved: Mark  
Seconded: Julian

Move to call the question on this amendment to the main motion.  
[Requires 2/3 majority to pass]

In favour: 23. Opposed: 11.  
Motion carried.

**BACK TO MOTION TO AMEND**

Motion carried.  
Michael, Jared, Kyle, Jennifer, Mark, Rudy, Adam opposed.  
Tabitha, David, Erin, Christina, Sarah abstain.

**BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

Patrick: Striking a committee for future changes could be a good idea. Not sure about the composition of the committee though, so I would be interested in everyone’s input. As I see it

now, I would like to hear more discussion before I actually take a position on this. My only real problem before was with the preamble and the first “be it resolved” clause.

### **MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION**

**04/14/15:6E**

Moved: Julian

Seconded: Peter

Move to call the question on the main motion as amended.

[Requires 2/3 majority to pass]

Motion failed.

### **BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

Kevin: The motion as it stands right now I don't have an issue with. I don't think it's something for the current Executive to have much of a standce on because it is more to do with the incoming Executive looking towards future changes. There are about 16 days left in our term, I'm not sure if that's something the Executive should take on for this amount of time, rather than having the new Executive deal with this when they come in. Council may want to consider this when considering striking this committee, though I don't take a position on it one way or the other.

Jennifer: Point of information: How would the consultation process considered in this motion be any different from the prior consultation that led to the current difficult situation we are in now?

Kevin: What happened before was largely based on needing to put things in place urgently so that the new Executive can come in and make informed decisions about program structure. When we did our consultation, we did so knowing that we were approaching the end of the term, which is why we did not proceed with other changes that the Advisors took issue with. The only reason we went forward with the changes we did is because we felt we urgently needed them in place.

[Motion to extend meeting 30 minutes to 8:30]

Jared: The second “be it resolved” clause, now the first clause since the motion was amended, requires that the consultation committee include membership from former Advisors and other members of the Queen's committee including from the School of Graduate Studies, so my question is directed to the incoming Vice President Graduate, Mark. I wanted to know if the SGS has communicated to the Executive that they are fully on board in support of the program changes that the recent amendment has approved of, because the SGS will be required to be a member of the committee. Also, it will be difficult to include former Advisors on this committee given that the motion they sponsored has been amended.



James: Having no knowledge of the HR issues here, I'm not sure that it would be advisable to have former Advisors on the committee. It concerns me to have them on the committee because of the uncertainty we have around the HR issues. Perhaps we should amend this in some manner.

Kevin: Point of information: Were you aware that a longstanding part of the MOA and contracts for existing Advisors is that Advisors are not allowed to sit in a voting capacity on committees concerning the program?

James: I was not aware.

Jhordan: I think the former Advisors don't need to vote on the committee to provide important information to the committee that would be regretful to lose. So they should be included.

**MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:6F**

Moved: James

Second: Julian

BIRT in the clause concerning the creation of a committee, the words "former advisors" be struck from the second line and add "in consultation with former advisors from the SGPS program" at the end of the clause.

James: Without making this amendment, it would seem like a major conflict of interest would be present on the committee.

Julian: This deals with the issue of voting or non-voting membership on the committee. This way it is an advisory capacity and not actually sitting on the committee. It ensures they are heard without contravening the MOA.

Emily: This sounds great. I would just be curious about whether new Advisors would be included in this consultation and if we can find a way to do that?

Paul: I wonder when this committee would terminate? Because there will be a time when former Advisors are no longer going to be here and current Advisors might need to take over in the process, so perhaps the wording should be for former and current Advisors.

Kevin: Since this is a special committee, when they report back to council in August, it will automatically dissolve unless council reconstitutes it.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT**

**04/14/15:6G**

Moved: Kevin

Seconded: James

BIRT the amendment add the words “current and” before “former advisors”.

Motion carried.

### **BACK TO MOTION TO AMEND**

Motion carried.

Jared, Michael, Jennifer, Mark oppose.

### **BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

### **MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:6H**

Moved: Chris

Seconded: James

BIRT the words “members of the Queen’s community, including [stakeholders considered in the motion]” be struck and add this same text to the end of the clause where the consultation from current and former advisors was added earlier.

Chris: In general this committee should meet and if you want a committee to meet then it should generally have the majority of the members be able to attend. It might be difficult to get members of the Queen’s community to always attend a number of meetings since this committee has a short lifespan over the summer. By removing them from membership of the committee, we avoid the availability issues, but by adding them in for forced consultation, we will still get to hear their voice.

Jared: Point of information: What do you mean by “forced consultation”?

Chris: That the committee must attempt to consult with them.

Jared: Given that the Student Advisor program is a partner program, the SGS and Human Rights Office, which fund it and provide training for it, should have equal standing on the committee and not second-tier standing.

James: That’s a fair point, but I think with the timeline we have, that just might not be practical.

Emily: I understand that during the summer there aren’t as many people around, but there should still be room to contact some people within the partner organizations who will make time to sit on the committee.

Kevin: I get that concern, but the SGS isn't going to be frozen out of this process because they are in charge of \$24,000 in funding. If they are going to continue to be the mechanism by which the program is funded, they have to sign any revised MOA, so council can't force them to sign it. So this committee is about determining what the SGPS wants the program to look like, then the VPG will move forward to discuss it with the SGS. It doesn't make sense for the SGS to be on this committee and be part of the discussion about how we subsequently approach the SGS.

Chris: We as council can strike committees to dictate what the VPG must do, but we don't have authority over members of the SGS and Human Rights Office. So we can strike a committee and say that the membership of it must include certain people, but we have no power over those people to force them to actually participate. We do have power to task the VPG to have a committee that has our members in it though.

Motion carried.

Jared, Michael, Jennifer, Mark opposed.

Adam abstains.

## **BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

[motion to extend for 30 minutes to 9:00]

Tabitha: We have changed the original motion. How does the camp that made this motion feel about it that it has been amended so significantly? Are you guys comfortable with these changes that were made?

Michael: I feel that the motion was made in good faith and it was put forward to respond to what I think has happened this evening perhaps that should have occurred much earlier in time.

Tabitha: Now that we are going to be hiring new advisors, what is the plan for running the program over summer while the committee is trying to figure things out?

Mark: For summer, the plan is to hire new advisors by May 1, train by May 15, working from then on throughout summer. Over summer we will consult with this committee and based on what they come back with in August we can move forward from there.

Jared: Point of information: Does this hiring process follow the MOA?

Mark: Yes, there is a hiring committee that has been struck in accordance with the MOA.

Motion, as amended, carried.

Jared, Michael, Jennifer, Robert oppose.

## **MOTION**

Moved: Kevin Wiener (president@sgps.ca)

**04/14/15:7**

Seconded: Julian

BIRT Council adopt changes to P.1 Financial.  
[2/3 majority to pass, see appendix]

Kevin: P.1.1.2 financial policy changes to clarify how audits work, organizes fees and funds, helps to arrange investments, allows budget allocation issues to be dealt with simpler, helps with better classification of student fees, and summer fee slate, and finally reapproval of fees being shifted from being automatic if council reapproves to going to referendum instead every three years.

**MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:7A**

Moved: Julian  
Second: Peter

BIRT in P.1.1.5.c, rather than stating “the health plan fund”, state “the health and dental plan fund” instead.

Motion carried.

**MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:7B**

Moved: Julian  
Second: Chris

BIRT in P.1.1.6.b, strike out “treasury bills issue by US government and/or its agencies”.

Julian: This introduces currency exposure which is desirable for longer term holdings, but can increase investment risk in the short term. Since this section is about day-to-day investment, I think it should be taken out.

Kevin: I just copied this from the restrictions in the University’s investment policy so I have no problem removing it.

Motion carried.  
Rudy opposes.

**MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:7C**

Moved: Julian  
Seconded: Thompson

BIRT in P.1.1.8, a. and b. should be changed to read “\$1,000” instead of “\$1,500”.

Julian: A lot of budget lines aren't much larger than \$1,500, so \$1,000 sounds like a more reasonable figure for the policy threshold for when the Executive must bring the budget allocation change to council.

Motion carried.

### **BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

Motion carried.

### **MOTION**

**04/14/15:8**

Moved: Kevin Wiener (president@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Thompson

BIRT Schedule 7 (Grants and Bursaries) of the 2014-2015 Budget be amended by increasing the International Student Reimbursement line from \$10,000 to \$15,000, increasing the Contingency line from \$1,000 to \$6,000 and increasing the Unallocated line from \$1,000 to \$6,000.

BIFRT SGPS Revenues in the 2014-2015 Budget be amended by adding a new revenue line of 'Cold Beverages Fund' at \$15,000.

[Since Council adopted changes to P.1 Financial in the preceding motion, a simple majority is needed to pass]

Kevin: This is a budget amendment based on the now authorized budget authority that we have to increase the international student reimbursement.

Motion carried.

### **MOTION**

**04/14/15:9**

Moved: Kevin Wiener (president@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Thompson

BIRT notwithstanding any investment restrictions in Policy, the Executive is authorized to invest up to \$350,000 of the SGPS's net assets in a loan to the Student Life Centre through the Alma Mater Society in accordance with the terms endorsed by the SLC Finance and Operations Committee.

[2/3 majority to pass, see appendix]

Kevin: Let's us loan money to the student life center to renovate the washrooms in this building. SLC budget doesn't have enough to do this improvement on its own, so its better for us to do this loan now instead with reasonable rate of return and low risk.

Allison (AMS president): This is a reasonable rate of return for a low-risk investment.

Troy (AMS Student Centre Officer): This has been a major issue. Hasn't been updated in 20+ years. Also want to add a new accessible gender-neutral washroom. Hope to start building in summer and complete everything hopefully by end of next summer.

Chris: Any chance someone could default on this loan?

Troy: In short, no.

Kevin: It's not so much that we need the money to get paid back, it's that we basically would just withhold spending further on other things later to make the money back. So it's very low risk.

Motion carried.

[motion to extend meeting by 30 minutes to 9:30]

**MOTION**

**04/14/15:10**

Moved: Kevin Wiener (president@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Julian

BIRT the following SGPS fees be included in the Summer Fee Slate for the Spring/Summer 2015 term and remain thereafter until removed from the Summer Fee Slate by Council or until the underlying fee is terminated:

Athletics and Recreation  
Health Counselling Disability

BIFRT the following SGPS fees be included in the Summer Fee Slate for the Spring/Summer 2016 term and remain thereafter until removed from the Summer Fee Slate by Council or until the underlying fee is terminated:

Bus-It  
[Simple majority to pass]

Kevin: This creates the summer fee slate for needed services, while keeping the fee as minimal as possible.

Motion carried.

**MOTION**

**04/14/15:11**

Moved: Kevin Wiener (president@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Christina

Whereas ESS members have historically been charged SGPS fees at a 50% rate, in recognition that the BEd program is an eight-month program where students are in practicum for a significant duration of the program;

Whereas starting in May 2015, ESS members in Consecutive Education program will be moving from an 8-month to 16-month program, and will be on campus for a similar amount of time as SGPS members who pay full fees; and

Whereas ESS members in the Concurrent Education program will still only be on campus for 8 months for the next four years and should still be charged a reduced fee slate

Therefore BIRT starting in September 2015, the reduced SGPS fee slate charged to ESS members be limited only to ESS members who are in the Concurrent Education program, and that ESS members who are in the Consecutive Education program be charged the ordinary SGPS fee slate.

[Simple majority to pass]

Kevin: Not sure how I feel either way about this motion, but thought it was an important issue for council to discuss.

Christina: I am in agreement with the motion. It makes sense since the majority of the students will not be on campus. The one thing is that some concurrent education students may be on campus for the second summer that they won't be able to confirm until partway through the year. Maybe they can pay an additional fee later.

Kevin: I am aware of that. From an administrative perspective it would be hard to do though. Might need to take a look again in four years when enough students have gone through and we can look into pro rating. For now it's easier to just charge for two terms.

Julian: How does this interact with the prior motion for the summer fee slate?

Kevin: The only fees in the summer slate are fees that aren't internal SGPS fees. So all external fees are already charged 100%. The only ones charged 50% are those internal to SGPS and those aren't on the summer fee slate, so there wouldn't be any overlap at all.

Motion carried.

**MOTION**

Moved: Kevin Wiener (president@sgps.ca)

**04/14/15:12**

Seconded: Julian

BIRT Council adopt the list of recognized societies.

[Simple majority to pass, see appendix]

Kevin: Committee got some requests to amend the list, some were approved and some were not. We are now reporting this list back for either amendment or final approval. Keep in mind the only thing we are approving now is the list, not the numbers of representatives for each group, because that is just done by formula.

**MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:12A**

Moved: Sarah

Seconded: Michael

BIRT art conservation and art history be recognized as separate groups on this list.

Sarah: Art conservation and art history have two different governing bodies so I think we should be separated on the list.

Kevin: How are they separate?

Sarah: We have totally separate elections.

Emily: We are in the same department but have totally different programs.

Julian: SGS also lists them as separate programs.

Motion carried.

**BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

Jennifer: How many groups came to ask for separation? We have ideological and epistemological differences within SKHS. Academically we have different comprehensive exams. We are split along arts and science lines and it creates a contentious environment to only send one representative to council for both groups. Our request to be viewed as separate societies was denied by the committee. The spirit of this policy was to encourage representation, not downsize. With the history SKHS has of sending both of our representatives to all meetings (or with proxies), I think we should be viewed as separate bodies on this list.

Kevin: I'm sympathetic to the desire for separate representation. However, SKHS has one graduate student council, so I thought only one person should come from it. If SKHS wants two



representatives, then I think they should probably have two different graduate student councils to represent that. Otherwise there isn't truly proportionate representation here. So SKHS needs to decide internally how to deal with this I think and then we can move forward from there.

Jared: I don't think we need to look for a specific type of student organization to justify SKHS ability to split into two groups with their own representative. They have active representation on council and support from their constituents to do this.

Jennifer: While we might not have different societies for the arts and science stream, there are different academic streams in the program. These students in each stream need their own representation.

[motion to extend meeting 15 minutes to 9:45]

Julian: A recognized group includes different programs within a department, so it is possible to have exceptions like with art history and art conservation. However, in this case it comes down to how distinct the arts and science sides are in the SKHS here. Can a distinct nature be identified here to justify two different identified groups?

**MOTION TO AMEND**

**04/14/15:12B**

Moved: Jennifer

Second: Mark

BIRT Kinesiology and Health Studies arts and Kinesiology and Health Studies sciences be recognized as two different groups on this list.

Jennifer: The related policy was brought forward to recognize societies that did not feel that they were being represented. We feel here that SKHS needs two votes not based on numbers but based on proper representation of two different groups of students in SKHS, one in arts and one in sciences.

Mark: We have two groups of students that have fundamental differences and should be viewed as such on the list.

Kevin: Is the current structure that arts and science students vote separately for representatives? One of the conditions is that each representative needs to be elected separately. All SKHS reps can't vote for both representatives together. They need to be in two different votes from SKHS science students and SKHS arts students. They can't all vote in the same council election and then get double representation on council unless their numbers justify having more than one representative, which is not the SKHS case. If this is part of an ongoing discussion, it may be worthwhile to go back to the committee to consider this further after the SKHS comes up with the proper internal voting framework to do so.

Jared: My interpretation of this bylaw is that the SKHS application was rejected. A rejected application can be appealed to the council. So I think it's now up to council to simply decide whether or not to amend the list based on the appeal.

Julian: This isn't really the appeal because that requires the application to be brought to council for everyone to consider. I would need more information and actually see the formal appeal. According to SGS, the SKHS is considered as all one entity, so from the University's perspective, SKHS is not viewed as distinct groups for arts and sciences streams.

Michael: Could SKHS demonstrate for council the sense of urgency to have this determined versus giving time to review a proper appeal?

Jennifer: I don't think we have a sense of urgency for time, just concern that our application is denied. I want to see this pushed forward because I won't necessarily be elected again next year and I want to make sure this is done before any possible further future delays.

[motion to extend meeting 15 minutes to 10:00]

Chris: I am against this motion because it has to do with expanding the number of representatives for the department, which goes against the formula we have for calculating appropriate representation.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION**

**04/14/15:12C**

Moved: Sarah  
Seconded: Mark

Move to call the question on the proposed amendment.

Motion carried.

**BACK TO AMENDMENT**

11 in favour. 11 opposed.  
Speaker votes as tiebreaker in favour of the amendment.

Motion carried.

**BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION**

**04/14/15:12D**

Moved: Sarah  
Seconded: Kevin

Move to call the question on the motion.

Motion carried.

## **BACK TO MAIN MOTION**

Motion, as amended, carried.

## **8. Other Business**

---

N/A

## **9. Notice of Motions & Announcements**

---

Julian: I would like to thank the Executive for all of their hard work this year. This has been an extremely productive Executive.

## **10. Adjournment**

---

### **MOTION**

**04/14/15:13**

Moved: Kevin

Seconded: Lorne

BIRT the SGPS Council Meeting be adjourned.

Motion carried at 9:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Max Z. Ma, Speaker

---

Jonathan Samosh, Deputy Speaker

### April Meeting Attendance

<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Dinah Jansen	History	Present
Sean Richards	SGPS	Present
Tabitha Renaud	History	Present
Lorne Beswick	VPCCA	Present
Mark Kellenberger	Mechanical and Materials Eng	Present
Sean Coughlin	Law	Present
Peter Gilbert	Chemical Engineering	Present
Julian Chesterman	Biomedical Engineering	Present
James MacLeod	Board of Trustees	Present
Jackie Leonard	Pathology	Present
Piriya YogaNathan	Pathology	Present
Jared Houston	Philosophy	Present
Michael Carter	Geography	Present
Ian Moore	Law	Present
Erin Eisen	ESS	Present
Kyle Stepa	French	Present
Nash Amoah	Mining	Present
Alexander Cushing	Mining	Present
Hao Li	Electrical and Computer Eng	Present
Dave Northeast	Physics	Present
Christina Hoffman	Education	Present
Jenn Wigglesworth	SKHS	Present
Robert Bentley	SKHS	Present
Megan Rueckwald	Urban Planning	Present
Korey Pasch	Political Studies	Present
Sarah Budd	Art History	Present
Mark Ramsay	Sociology	Present
Paul Warchuk	Law	Present
Rudy Schueder	Civil Engineering	Present
Chris Cochrane	Mechanical Engineering	Present
Emily Cloutier	Art Conservation	Present
Adam Drysdale	English	Present
Jhordan Layne	International Student Affairs	Present
Patrick Gajos	VPFS	Present
Christina Huber	Incoming VPFS	Present
Mark Asfar	Incoming VPP	Present
Thompson Hamilton	VPP	Present
Kevin Wiener	President	Present
Eric Rapos	Senate	Proxy

Kirk Maijala	Law	Proxy
Rebecca Torrance	Law	Proxy
Fallon Bowman	Classics	Regrets
Lorraine Godden	Education	Regrets
Ciara Bracken-Roche	Social Commissioner	Regrets
Erica Baker	Equity Commissioner	Regrets
All Other Council Members	All Other Council Members	Absent