The Society of Graduate and Professional Students recognizes the traditional and ancestral territories of the Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee Nations on whose lands we gather on today.

I. Presentations

A. None

II. Adoption of the Agenda and Minutes

A. Adoption of the Agenda

MOTION 05/17/16:1

Moved: Saba Farbodkia (president@sgps.ca)
Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)

BIRT SGPS Council adopt the Agenda for the May 17, 2016 Council Meeting.

Travis: One change to the agenda. Agenda item Motion C (Main Motions) - the BIFRT statement is out of order. This statement calls for the executive to choose a director in time for August. This contradicts Policy P.3.1.2 which places the decision making authority for hiring in the hands of the hiring committee; Council does not have the authority to approve or deny hires. That BIFRT statement will be removed.

Motion: Appeal the decision of the chair.

Moved: Jared Houston
Seconded: Debra.

Travis: There is a motion to appeal that is brought. We now enter discussion on the motion to appeal.

Jared: Point of order: I believe this motion begins with the Speaker explaining their original justification.

Travis: Policy 3.3.1.2 outlines the way that office staff are to be hired. A hiring committee is formed, that committee will then advertise the position, collect applicants, conduct interviews, and make a decision. The individual selected by the committee is hired. There is no mention of Council in that policy, so the idea that the hiring committee must or ought to be approved by Council appears to contradict this policy, which places the authority for hiring solely within the committee.

Jared: I disagree with the ruling. There is a P.2.1 which outlines the role of the exec, to recognize and respond and take direction from Council. This motion requests that a hiring committee be struck to follow the policies as referenced and best practices, so that we can have a Formal ED in place for September operations. We regularly instruct committees to follow certain guidelines, e.g. the Finance
committee at April. I don’t see how this is out of order – it is an example of this Council directing the executive.

Debra: March meeting – Mark Asfar and I were discussing this issue at March meeting. This has been raised before.

Stuart: We can speak to some of the operational challenges … [Travis: Discussion out of order]

Travis: Want to make something clear. Not the entire motion being ruled out of order. The clause calling for the decision of the hiring committee to be subject to Council's approval is the only item being out of order. I did not rule that Council cannot task the Executive with this; the ruling is only that council cannot give itself additional power.

Jared: Is the ruling to strike Motion C, or just the BIFRT clause?

Travis: The entire BIFRT clause, not the motion.

**Vote** is called:

In favour (to overrule): 0

Opposed: Unanimous.

Decision stands.

Vote on main motion:

In favour: Unanimous.

Opposed: 0

**B. Adoption of the Council Minutes**

MOTION 05/17/16:2

[SEE ATTACHED MINUTES]

Moved: Saba Forbodkia (president@sgps.ca)
Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)

BIRT SGPS Council adopt the Minutes for the April 12, 2016 Council Meeting.

Vote:

In favour: Unanimous.
Opposed: 0

Motion carries.
Executive & Speaker Reports

A. Executive Reports
   a. President – Saba Farbodkia (report attached)
      i. Nothing to add.
   b. VP Graduate – Sebastian Gorlewski (report attached)
      i. Nothing to add.
   c. VP Professional – Kishan Lakhani (report attached)
      i. Not present.
   d. VP Finance & Services – Stuart Clark (report attached)
      i. Add that it's a pleasure to address the Council as the incoming Executive. We look forward to meeting everyone in the coming weeks and developing a nice working relationship. In the coming days, Andria and I will reach out to you individually, meet for coffee and learn concerns as Councillors. How can we serve you as Councillors? Is there anyone who did not receive the reports on the e-mail list? [Terry raises hand]
   e. VP Campaigns & Community Affairs – Anastasiya Boika (report attached)
      i. Nothing to add.

B. Speaker Report
   a. Speaker – Travis Skippon (report attached)
      i. Nothing to add.

C. Approval

MOTION 05/17/16:3
Moved: Saba Forbodkia (president@sgps.ca)
Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)

BIRT SGPS Council approve the Executive and Speaker Reports.

Emma Thompson: Sebastian – your report says that you are looking into rebranding SA program. What are you thinking this will look like?

Sebastian: More of an idea than a concrete plan right now. Has been some pressure from our insurance provider in terms of having a name change. The service is much more about empathetic non-judgmental listening and resource referral than giving professional advice to clients. The second is that, in terms of students outside of Council and the SGPS bubble, there is a lot of confusion about what the program actually is. We are not sure if "student advisor" conveys the message of what the program delivers as a
service. We’ve briefly discussed whether another name for the program may better describe the service. I would love to hear if anyone else had any ideas about how we can have a better impact with the program.

Jared: As a follow-up, you mentioned there is pressure from our insurance provider. Can you explain what that pressure is? Is there a liability concern?

Sebastian: We don’t explicitly state that we offer counselling services anywhere – these programs are usually administered by a mental health professional. There are no clear liability issues at this time. I believe they would feel more comfortable if there was a more clear name on the outset – there is no immediate pressure to change it. As Peer Support Centre Director for the AMS, we had a similar issue with the insurer, but no immediate pressure to change how we market the service.

Vote:

In favour: unanimous.

Opposed: 0

Motion Carries.

Senator, Trustee, Commissioner, Committee & Other Reports

IV. Senator Report – Graduate Student Senator – Eric Rapos (no report)
   a. Not present.

B. Trustee Report – Graduate Student Trustee – James MacLeod (no report)
   a. Not Present

C. Commissioner Reports
   a. Athletics Commissioner – Dominic Kucharski (no report)
      i. Not present.
   b. Equity & Diversity Commissioner – Erica Baker (report attached)
      i. Not present.
   c. International Students Affairs Commissioner – Sara SidAhmed (report attached)
      i. Nothing to add.
   d. Social Commissioner – Kyle Curlew (report attached)
      i. Not present.

D. Committee Reports
   a. Commission Review Committee (report attached)
      i. No representative present.

E. Other Reports
a. University Rector – Cam Yung (no report)
   i. I did not submit a report because the e-mails sent reminding me were sent to the "Clutter" box... My name is Cam Yung, 35th rector of Queen's. Excited to work with all of you. What have I been doing this past month? Primarily getting to know the position and meeting with different bodies on campus. Admin – Principal (to discuss areas of focus moving forward), head of the Library (to discuss increasing student study space, especially graduate study space; any ideas on how to improve let me know). Office hours are currently dispersed, hope to have more solidified hours in the coming weeks and updated website. Lots of convocations ceremonies in the coming weeks. Meeting with a lot of student societies and groups to ensure clear communication, and good feedback between myself and admin. My focus is to be the voice for students at all levels of the university – Board of Trustees and Admin, having conversations with each of you will help me bring a clear concise voice to the top level and ensure that change is being made. If you have any ideas or something to discuss, contact me at rector@queensu.ca. I am on Twitter, Instagram and Facebook. Send me messages! I am really looking forward to the opportunity to meet with any of you.

b. Chief Returning Officer – Vacant (no report)
   i. None.

c. Departmental Reports (no reports)

F. Approval

MOTION 05/17/16:4
Moved: Saba Forbodkia (president@sgps.ca)
Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)

BIRT SGPS Council approve the Senator, Trustee, Commissioner, Committee & Other Reports.

Saba: Thanks to the committee for putting together the commissioner review report. They brought forward some good recommendations for consultation and transparency. We are very supportive of these ideas and hope to implement them in the future.

Stuart: The committee report is really good. If you care about student union governance, I recommend you have a look at it. Very much worth your time. Thanks to the committee for putting in the time and doing interviews to address this long-standing issue in the organization. Over the year, we want to improve internal controls to be a more thoughtful organization. When we pitch our year plans to you in August, we are going to try to build in consultative mechanisms from these reports to keep Council in.
One longstanding weakness of the organization, is the SGPS does a lot of "telling" but not a lot of "listening." We look forward to bringing some of these recommendations to you.

April Stapleton: All these people who it says "no report" will they ever send in a report? Is it a requirement to do a report?

Travis: Student Senator and Trustee will flip over in August – we can ask them what they do. Technically they are required to submit reports, but it doesn't happen every time.

Jared: Would like to add my thanks to this committee. I have a few comments on the content of the report. On p.8, speaking about the series of events leading up to the committee being struck, where the advocacy actions of individuals who had transparency concerns were characterized as an outburst – I feel this was an inappropriate attribution of the people's actions. An "outburst" seems to imply that there is something negative, but I don't think this was negative. The second – I want to point out something unclear to me – on p.9, the commissioners were found to be in a hands-off relationship with the executive, the sentences that follow try to explain that. It is unclear to me what this relationship was, and how it lead to inefficiencies in the operation. I would like to hear more about this. 14.4, role of HR committee: it is unclear to me what the HR committee is supposed to be doing. Last comment: on the suggestion that an oversight committee be created, suggestion #5 p18; while it is welcome that we explore formal methods for handling mediation, I don't think the creation of a committee is a way to do this. Oversight is already fulfilled by an appropriately informed and engaged council. This committee seems undemocratic – how would the committee be stacked and who would it be accountable to? We would be better off better empowering council to oversee the operations of the executive.

Debra: Do we have the ability to amend a report based on a Point of Personal privilege? Given the number of times transparency is discussed at Council.

Travis: Council can only accept or reject a report. This item was referred to the committee, so Council delegated that authority to deliberate on the issue to the Committee.

Stuart: Can we log people's reservations? Is there a practical impact of accepting or rejecting the report?

Travis: They are in the minutes. Accepting the report acknowledges that the committee completed the task as assigned.

Emma: Is there any way that this report could reappear when we meet again in August, to bring someone who is in the committee to Council to answer questions?

Travis: Council can move to postpone voting on this motion until the August meeting. We would neither accept nor reject this report and move the item to the August agenda.
Motion to postpone approval of the Committee Reports:

Moved: Emma Thompson
Seconded: Jared Houston

(no debate)

In favour: All
Opposed: none.

Motion Carries

Vote:
In favour: all
Opposed: none

Motion carries (reports are accepted).

V. Question Period & Departmental Issues

A. Question for the Speaker:

I ask that the speaker clarify the basis and process by which an agenda item is to be ruled out of order: What is the acceptable basis for such a ruling? Is the only acceptable basis of the out of order ruling the fact that the item violates Robert’s rules / bylaw and policy, or can its violating some other constraint (e.g. insurance policy) also be an acceptable basis?

Response:
Travis: I will do this one piece at a time.

Any motion that comes forward that violates bylaw or policy will be ruled out of order, as implied by the question. Roberts Rules has a few examples of why things might be ruled out of order. To summarize:

[The following is quoted from Robert’s Rules directly]

1. No motion is in order that conflicts with the constitution, by-laws, or standing rules or resolutions of the assembly, and if such a motion is adopted it is null and void.

1. A motion is not in order that conflicts with a resolution previously adopted by the Council during the same session (Oct. 1 to the following Sept. 30), or that has been introduced and has not been finally disposed of. If it is not too late the proper course is to reconsider the vote on the motion previously adopted,
and then amend it so as to express the desired idea. If it cannot be reconsidered, then by a two-thirds vote the old resolution may be rescinded when the new one can be introduced, or by giving notice it may be rescinded by a majority vote at the next meeting.

2. No main motion may cover an issue that has been temporarily disposed of. E.g. something that is referred to a committee cannot be discussed at Council before the Committee has returned the item to Council. Postponed motions may not be discussed prior to the time they were postponed.

3. Proposed action outside the scope of the corporation's scope, unless the assembly approve 2/3 majority. E.g. we try to implement some policy on student conduct at UofT – we have no control over this body.

Next part: can its violating some other constraint also be an acceptable basis?

In my opinion, yes, there are other constraints. Namely – legal constraints. E.g. a motion to demand the SGPS cease paying all taxes would be ruled out of order, as this would be against the law and the SGPS must abide by the laws of the land. I likely will not be able to fully guarantee that something is within the law, but if I feel or know that something is not, it is my responsibility to rule it out of order.

Another section of the question: what is the process by which things are ruled out of order?

Council can appeal decisions as they are made. If Council votes with 50%+1 majority, the decision can be overturned on anything ruled out of order.

Jared: To verify, a ruling out of order must happen at the meeting of the assembly?

Travis: I should apologize. Yes, they must. I got this wrong due to trying to act quickly, and misspoke over e-mail. I said something was out of order and couldn't appear on the agenda. I should have said that I will rule it out of order on the floor. If I receive a motion that I will rule out of order, I will try to bring this up prior to the meeting to try to help the mover adjust the motion. If they wish to stick with it as written, it will appear on the agenda, and can move to overturn my decision if they disagree with it.

Business Arising from the Minutes

A. SGPS Chief Returning Officer MOTION 05/17/16:5

Moved: Saba Farbodkia (president@sgps.ca)
Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)

BIRT SGPS Council elect [name] as the Chief Returning Officer for the 2016-17 year.

Travis: Are there any nominations for CRO?

[silence]
Stuart: Can we table this discussion and advertise for September? Unless we have a firm timeline for when we need a CRO, maybe we should advertise more widely and give it a few months. Maybe this will allow us to cultivate our options. This is an opportunity to engage more members.

Travis: The earliest we can deal with this is the August meeting. This gives people an option to scour their departments.

Motion to postpone until the next meeting of Council:

Move: Terry
Second: Stuart
In favour: unanimous
Opposed: 0
Item is postponed until August.

VII. Main Motions

A. Scheduling the August 2016 Meeting of Council

MOTION 05/17/16:6

Moved: Stuart Clark
Seconded: Saba Farbodkia

BIRT the August 2016 meeting of SGPS council take place on August 16th, 2016 at 5:30pm

No discussion.

Vote:
In favour: All
Opposed: 0
Motion carries.

B. Motion to add P.2.2.3.b.6

MOTION 05/17/16:7
Moved: Debra Mackinnon
Seconded: Jared Houston

Whereas the social commission has an abundance of resources including budgets, event descriptions, event details, reports, and receipts.

Whereas it is important that incoming Social Commissioners have access to prior institutional history as a part of training.

BIRT council approves the changes to policy P.2.2.3.b.6 as seen in Appendix: Social.

Debra: Kyle's suggestion was, as he just came into the role and is meeting with a lot of people, in order to preserve institutional memory, this is one thing that can be done.

Andria: Unfortunately Kyle isn't here, but maybe Debra can speak to this. Institutionally, I am confused as to why this motion is coming to Council. We currently have access to Microsoft OneDrive, and all files are on the OneDrive. Why ask for utilization of a USB stick when we already have an internal method for this? Social files are already on the oneDrive, and I can look at Budgets. Institutional memory is important, which is why we moved to oneDrive in the first place.

Debra: To the best of my knowledge, when he explained it to me, oneDrive was relatively new to me. How long has the organization used oneDrive? [Andria: 16 days] When Kyle was planning events, he didn't have background. There is such a thing as a third delete – you can actually delete all your institutional memories.

Andria: So everyone here can understand – we underwent a complete IT shift within the organization. The former ED did all of the IT internally and literally built the e-mail system. It is an actual physical thing in the office. When he left, no one could maintain it, so we moved to MS Office365. The issue that Debra brought up regarding SquirrelMail – the formal VPGrad Mark Kellenberger did the switch; it was not communicated great. People are having to navigate an old e-mail account vs. Their new email account to get institutional memory. Once he left, IT responsibility came to me. Solidifying this is a high priority for me. In order to do this, I must yank e-mail access for a few hours. Scheduling this with transient staff is very difficult. I am glad that this motion came up – it speaks to a larger issue of conversation. This motion could have been a conversation that could have been explained, instead of discussing at Council - it's May and it's nice outside and everyone wants to go home. I 100% support the transition and institutional memory component – this is something we are trying to build on. Not sure an explicit policy with a prescriptive answer is good right now since we don't know how everything is
going to shake out. Maybe we'll all hate computers and go back to tablets tomorrow! Not sure a prescriptive motion is where we should go.

Stuart: This hits the nail on the head of one of our problems. B&P give us general guidelines on how to run the organization, but grey area on how to implement these systems. Many other sophisticated organizations have things like IT policies on how to track and who has access to data. One thing we'd like to do is determine these internal processes once we understand how everything works. Perhaps we could implement this into those later projects.

Debra: I don't know if this was drafted before the switch to oneDrive. The point that both raised, in the spirit of the motion, institutional memory needs to be upheld. It should be pointed out that we need a backup. Perhaps just the key documents ... is what are needed. This is a useful tool. I would be happy to amend the motion.

**MOTION:**
Files are to be stored on a second secure stable device, kept in safety and confidence.

Moved: Debra
Second: Jared

Point of information from Stuart: Might we change this to read that the entire organization must always have all the backups for all the files, then Debra's policy is extended to all of the organization.
Travis: This would be substantially different.
Faleh Altal: When you say oneDrive, what Is it?
Travis: Cloud storage.
Faleh: Then how is a physical backup better?

Sara SidAhmed: what is a secure stable device? What does this mean?
Andria: USB backup is policy. I used OneDrive because we are paying for it. We pay into the service, and are currently utilizing it. 100% agree, institutional memory. Whatever form that takes. If we want to do a second backup via USB stick, that is okay as well. We are just currently paying for something that is not acknowledged in the motion. [quotes from policy] OneDrive serves the purpose of the proposed USB. Automatically handed over, as it is tied to the social e-mail address.

Debra: Cloud's aren't stable. Information gets lost. The point we're trying to raise here is a second stable backup. oneDrive is notorious for not being stable.
Faleh: Do you have any specific examples?
Sebastian: I think before we can call a storage device 'unstable" there ought to be objective evidence to suggest or support that. The same thing can be said for a USB key. I would personally feel more comfortable voting on this at a later time.

Motion call the question:
Move: Korey
Seconded: Jared
In favour: Majority

Vote on amendment:
In favour: Majority
Opposed: 1
Motion amendment carries.

Jared: I would just like to speak in favour of the motion. It seems to me perfectly appropriate that the commissioners engage with the B&P to revise things as they see fit. If this policy is already covered, I don't see any issue in adding it. If it's already part of the normal responsibilities and they feel it should be enshrined in policy... If the practice can be expanded to other commissions, we can do it in the future.

Vote:
In favour: 10
Opposed: 2
Motion carries.

C. Director Hiring

MOTION 05/17/16:8

Moved: Jared Houston, Philosophy
Seconded: Emma Thompson, Kinesiology

Whereas the new executive term commenced on May 1st 2016, and whereas the former executive postponed the hiring of an Executive Director until the new executive took office.

Whereas no recruitment, selection or hiring has occurred for the vacant position of Director (see P.3.1.2 'Staff Hiring' and SGPS Hiring Policy and Procedures Manual).
Whereas the SGPS has no permanent Executive Director and Andria Burke has been doing the workload of two positions, maintaining her role as Assistant Director of Networking in addition to the Interim Director role.

Whereas hiring a Director as soon as possible would allow time for them to get up to speed with the workings of the SGPS and its membership prior to September and would allow lots of overlap with the Interim Director so as to protect institutional memory.

**BIRT the Executive begin the Hiring Process for a Director.**

Jared: The basic spirit of the motion is that we should follow best practices as outlined in B&P and hire for this position. We should have a Director to help with September operations, which I understand is a busy time of year.

Stuart: Would like to thank Jared again; good to see people engaged in the operations of the union. I will speak to some of the operational difficulties in acting on this timeline, and looking at the workload of four staff. We have a review process in place to assess the distribution of work between Andria, Sandy (new finance director), as well as other permanent staff in the office. I am only comfortable engaging this process for hiring Director once we have completed this review, and we have seen the operations for another six months. This motion brings us into a difficult operational zone. I think we should table this discussion for now, and bring Council in once we've done the review of the position and SGPS. Come October or November, when this discussion comes to pass, we can start the hiring to fill the Director position. One problem we've found already, because Sandy is here, a lot of tasks normally done by the ED are covered by him, thanks to his specialized skills. We need to see how this new framework will operate before we hire a new person to be in charge. If there are problems, we will report back. We don't think it's the best idea to engage in this process immediately.

**Point of information:**

Terry: This would be somebody that would be taking something off of Andria's plate? Does Andria feel like she is overworked?

Andria: I will be incredibly honest. I am very uncomfortable that this issue was brought to Council. My personal employment has been brought to a public discussion without asking me about it first. I don't feel overworked. I agree with Stuart. Our former ED did a lot of things that an ED would actually do, and we didn't know the full scope of his duties until he left. Once Sandy came in, he took a lot of stuff away from other staff positions. All the roles and what we did were 'thrown in a blender' and because of problems (e.g. insurance) we haven't had time to settle and see who should be doing what. A lot of stuff on the fly. Stuff the EA traditionally did has been delegated out, nothing concrete. Working with student government, you need a full year cycle to see what happens and who should be doing what. For example, we don't know what the ED did during orientation week. We'll find this out in August.
Currently we're just working things out. I do not feel overworked, I feel very supported by this and the previous executive, as well as the staff. This is an internal issue we are trying to work through.

Jared: I move to amend the motion:

MOTION:

BIFRT the Executive choose a Director by Sept. 1, 2016.

Moved: Jared
Second: Debra

Saba: Could we change this to October? September is a very busy time with orientation and welcoming people. Would this be too late?

Stuart: Overall, I appreciate where this is coming from, but we need to go through the full review process. Previous exec got 6 months with Andria in IED, and the new exec will. The process will be done November. This is the earliest we could consider the hiring process - this takes a couple of months. The earliest we could begin the process, would be November. I would be more comfortable if we did this after finishing the review process. Whether we need a fifth position, less positions, student positions, etc. are questions that need to be answered. Only then can we come back to council with a fully informed opinion about what to do moving forward. Thank you for keeping the welfare of the staff in mind. I don't think it's appropriate to engage in the process so early in the year. I suggest we table this discussion to at least October once we can go through September.

Korey Pasch: The ED position... is that mandated by B&P? What is the actual wording around that position in our B&P?

Andria: In terms of corporate structure, an ED is required to oversee operations. For background, there are essentially two arms – the governance arm, President and Council are in charge of governance. The operational arm, e.g. health and dental, event sanctioning, are operational and occurs in office. In terms of student unions, because the executive is transient, you need permanent staff as a point of contact, and the ED serves as the "if something goes really south, I get in trouble" role. As to our B&P...

Stuart: Who occupies the position of ED right now? [POI]

Andria: Technically, I occupy the position of Interim Director. There is no ED position, it is just Director now. According to Bylaw: [quotes from Director bylaw]
Debra: POI – Andria; I realize after the previous ED left, there was a situation of emergency, in which you filled the role. What was the process by which you were given that position? Mark talked about the hiring process at a previous meeting. Were you hired? Do you have stability? What happens after interim?

Andria: State for the record: Employment contracts are not supposed to be discussed, within the legal context.

**Motion** to enter closed session:

   Moved by: Stuart
   Seconded by: Korey

Vote in favour: All
Opposed: None.

[Council enters closed session.]

[Council leaves closed session.]

Report from Closed Session: Council discussed clarifying information on Director hiring process.

Rise from closed session motioned by Terry, Seconded by Stuart.

Travis: [restates the amendment]

Vote:

   In favour: 0
   Opposed: 9

Amendment is defeated.

**Motion** to postpone the motion:

   Moved: Jared
   Seconded: Stuart

Stuart: Report should be done by November. Table until then, and we can decide then if we wish to postpone further.
[Procedural, no discussion]

Vote:

In favour: 10

Opposed: less than 10.

Motion carries. Motion 05/17/16:8 is postponed.

VIII. Other Business

A. New Event Sanctioning System: Update From the Executive Director

Andria: Good news everyone! We are unveiling the first step of the SGPS Event Sanctioning System. First thing we are doing – aiding departments in forming their own graduate student societies. If you are in a department that you currently have a society, please register with us. If you don't have one and want to form one, we have some sample constitutions and FAQs. Please form one and register with us. The reason we do this… This is the FIRST stage. We need to know who we are sanctioning events for. We need static contacts. The event sanctioning piece is about having static contacts and lines of communication about event sanctioning. The 2nd piece, for the future, is tying the newly formed Societies directly to Council. Currently, some societies have specific reps voted into their position (e.g. education). The path of reps to Council is currently up to departments. This will streamline the process and bring better communication between the governance and operational sides of the organization. Go to our website now – there's a blog post up (new website is streamlined with Facebook and Twitter). If you have any questions or concerns, let me know. The event sanctioning process is something that the AMS does, and SGPS has never done, but Queen's has directly requested that we do it. We have an agreement with Queen's to do it, we have insurance to do it, and we want it set up in time for September.

Stuart: Does this mean that our insurance goes to departments trying to organize orientation events?

Andria: Event sanctioning is a different process, with a different form. Not all events will be sanctioned. There are borders around what we can sanction. E.g. if you want to do a pre-drink or kegger, we cannot sanction them (I'm sorry) One caveat for sanctioning, alcohol must be in a licensed establishment. Other restrictions exist on travel. We are trying to get this going now so that we can have a discussion with societies about what they can do, and what we can sanction. If an event isn't sanctioned by us, you can still have the event, but it's just not insured by us. The organizers of the event are personally liable for
things (e.g. injuries). My personal goal with this is to negotiate with GSS's so that we are able to work together to sanction events. This is the first stage of a long but rewarding process for the SGPS.

Debra: What does "static" mean? Where does the social commissioner fit in to this?

Andria: Static means that there is one group that we are consistently dealing with, and there are positions within that group that we are consistently dealing with. One piece of this is – what month do your positions start? So we can, annually, make sure that we know who to contact and when. It simplifies the process going forward. This is outside of the realm of the commissioners. All SGPS events must be sanctioned as per insurer's instructions. Internally this is operational, but we're not making it public until this period of registration is complete. Commissioners need to go through the insurance process, but they are not part of the approval process. There is a legal liability component, and I don't feel it is fair to push that legal liability to a transient student position.

Jared: To clarify – departmental grad student societies have the option of having their events sanctioned, if concerns so compel them. The system you are suggesting does not require this?

Andria: Right now, this registration is just phase one of the sanctioning process. In order to be sanctioned, you must go through the event sanctioning process. If a GSS chooses not to go through the process, that is their decision. If they choose not to, the legal liability is on the organizers of the event, personally.

Korey: How does this relate to monies given to events that are hosted by a GSS, such as a conference? Is there any relation to that, with respect to sanctioning?

Stuart: As a result of the new process, does this impede our ability to hand out money by the grant system?

Andria: We hadn't considered that – conferences etc are not on our radar. Orientation events we are more focused on – e.g. amazing race type events.

Korey: What motivates my questions is that the Political Studies department recently had a conference, that we received money from the SGPS on. Someone fell down the stairs at that conference. Just curious if the new policy interacts with this type of situation.

Andria: It comes down to personal choice. If your GSS consents to taking on the liability, then you can choose not to have the event sanctioned. If you are not comfortable with that, you can come to the SGPS for insurance. There are horror stories of things happening at events involving massive law suits. When I was a grad student, I wouldn't be able to support this. We heard the membership wanted this, so we did it. Do we have something that states it impacts the bursary system? No. Does it make sense to look into it? Yes.
Stuart: One of my projects for the next week is figuring out how the grants system fits in with what Andria's discussed. I will be sending out a backgrounder to the F&S Committee to discuss this. I don't know if we want to couple grant money to sanctioning, or whether giving money gives some implied liability. We will have to ask our lawyer.

Ciara: As incoming Senator. Within our department, we don't have a GSS. Year after year we have tried, but it's difficult. We occasionally run conferences or have events. In order to get sanctioned, do we have to have an executive?

Andria: Yes. That is what we are currently putting in place. For instance, to get sanctioning through the AMS, you must be established in some way or form (club or faculty society) so there is a clear line of communication and line of responsibility if something should go wrong. My MA is in Gender Studies. There were 7 students there – the entire student body would be the executive. I understand the difficulties. In order for us to meet our legal liabilities and ensure the system will be successful, we need to put something in place. This has been proven to work. While this may be inconvenient, we have to go this route.

Ciara: Is it possible to change this from an executive, to "one event a year"?

Andria: We would have to follow up with the lawyer and insurance company. If this is something that SGPS members are involved in or we are granting money to.... we have to know where the liability lies.

Emma: In terms of semantics, in SKHS we are a Council, not a Society. Does this matter?

Andria: No.

B. Student Fee Suspension/Cancelation Policy & Update on Kingston Coalition Against Poverty.

STUART: Would like to thank a few people. Debra, for raising the issue. Terry, for sitting on finance and going through the process for this issue. I'll speak a bit of background. Internally, when we have discussion, we will prepare a written background for everyone.

As you know, Student Unions collect opt-outable student fees. Through a referendum process, groups are approved for a fee. This list of groups ten goes to the Board of Trustees to go on the fee slate. The Fee Slate identifies which fees are to be put onto people's Solus account through the opt-out process. Once we determine which fees are approved, we submit that list to the Board of Trustees, which is then placed on people's SOLUS accounts.

For a few months, the VPFS and F&S Committee investigated the KCAP. It was felt that they did not, at the time meet their reporting obligations to the society. They were suspended, which means they are not eligible to collect their fee. There were issues with getting positive contact with the group. As a result,
VPFS felt it was appropriate to suspend the fee. The cancellation policy for a student fee: "Policy P.1.2.7 Cancellation of Student Fees"

[Stuart reads the policy out.]

My predecessor VPFS believed that the group collecting the fees stopped existing. Overtures from the SGPS were made and it was impossible to confirm the group existed. We were unable to get a hold of the individuals. The F&S Committee went through a process to try to meet with the group and identify whether they existed. The problem is... Debra did some research around the April Council. There are grey areas around the policy of how we deal with these fees. The timing is up in the air. The real issue that we have today is that the Fee Slate was submitted to the Board of Trustees with KCAP excluded to the Board's May meeting. As a result, their fee will not be collected in the fall, despite the reservations that we have.

Travis: The time is 7:30. Is there a motion to extend the meeting?

**Motion** to extend the meeting by 30 minutes.

- Move: Jared
- Second: Stuart
- Vote:
- In favour: 12

Meeting is extended by 30 minutes.

Debra: I think there are two things in what this discussion was meant to be. How do we go about dealing with cancellation? In the fee slate, it wasn't that they were removed, it was a note that they were cancelled. We were not following our own policy in this procedure. I understand the timing/sensitivity of the matter, but if we don't follow our own policies then the actions are out of order. I have a report of my interactions with KCAP, and was able to quite quickly find their contact information. We as an organization need to do our due diligence. I have documentation suggesting that the former VPFS did not follow this process.

Andria: Just want to bring something up – we were under a time crunch with the fees. The May meeting of the Board occurred the first week of May. When we do fees, they go through numerous bodies – Student Affairs, to the Provost Office, to the Board of Trustees. This process takes over a month. Our BoT fees were due April 1, we got an extension to April 4. At that time, the KCAP situation was very much up in the air. I am simply supplying information about what was happening, not trying to defend any action.
Korey: Out of curiosity – can Debra's report be put into the minutes of the meeting? I understand the time crunch issue, but I don't understand why decisions were made. If a decision was made, unilaterally, in contravention of our B&P, in a fluid situation, was it necessary to take any decision at that point? I don't understand why that decision was made at that point in time.

Jared: I would like to know whether KCAP will be receiving equivalent financial support if they had made the fee slate?

Stuart: Yes – it was our mistake as an organization. I think Debra is right to point out that, when we sent a final motion to the BoT, it was viewed as a cancellation, and may have appeared as the SGPS acting in that way and going against our bylaws. When I create the itemized budget for the August Council meeting, we will set aside an equivalent amount of money in support if they are unsuspended by that time. I take great respect for Korey's remarks – we need clear rules for this specific process. One of the biggest problems we have seen: nothing is spelled out, and there are no clear guidelines for how to move through these processes. I would like to apologize to the group on behalf of the organization. The larger thing we need is a set of clear defined roles and checks and a list for how to go about this. As I understand, the cancellation procedure has never been invoked. I would say that Terry could perhaps speak to the process.

Andria: To Korey's point – the issue with submitting fees is that we have to submit them when we are told to submit them, so they can be approved and put on tuition for September. This Fee Slate includes mandatory fees as well (e.g. Health and Dental). We send one document, and it's all together. If we could have sent it separately, that would have been much better. It does not speak to why this occurred, but does speak to the pressure we were under to submit to the board. In the future, this responsibility will fall on either the Director or Ass. Director of Finance to deal with this directly. We need checks and balances, and paid staff members deal with the consequences in a different way from the exec.

Terry: This was a weird situation. Normally F&S committee meetings are looking over bursaries. We are normally voting on things that we have good evidence for, supplied by the VPFS. We look at the evidence and make decisions based on that. A meeting was set on a short deadline, on whether the fee would be suspended or not; we did not discuss cancelling the fee. We were informed that KCAP was invited to this meeting. What we know now, is that we do not know if they received this. We used the e-mail that was on record. They did not show up. We looked them up, and tried to search on Google for the group. Looking at the facts, we said the fee should be suspended, pending sufficient information is delivered. Until we received additional information, we voted to suspend the fee. We did not vote to cancel.

Emma: If you voted to suspend the fee, how suddenly did the terminology get flipped to cancellation?

Terry: We voted to suspend the fee. No one breathed the word cancellation. I do not know how this happened.
Debra: Can I get some information? I am interested in your research. I tried to contact Christina, but I guess I should've been in contact with you. The date of the meeting that you are first referring to... [Terry: would've been late April?] I am talking about the 2016/2017 fee slate, where the terminology becomes remove vs. Cancel.

Stuart: moving forward, when we choose that a fee is suspended, the fee should not be removed from the slate, but the money should not be delivered. In order to cancel a fee by our rules, we need to bring it to Council and get a 2/3 majority vote. Another thing, the F&S committee has a special mandate to do a report on the student fee policy over the summer to present some items in the fall. I would like a report on what happened in the grey areas of the policy, to colour our avenues of investigation. I am open to hearing everybody's feedback. Once we have these rules codified that we can send out to people who received our fees, these problems go away. we've just never had these rules in place before.

Terry: There wasn't a clear process for actually going about reviewing fees. We really do need one, so we can avoid something like this again. The committee said suspend, and cancellation came out the other end of the telephone. This makes the committee look bad, and we did good work last year. I don't like the way that looks, and we need to formalize the process that we go through, something that Council says "yes this is the framework".

Korey: I agree with that. If a fee is suspended, it can be sent forward for approval on the fee slate, and can be suspended again. I look forward to working with F&S on this in the future. If there's such a press for BoT Fee Slate, perhaps we should have an internal deadline for which cancellation is permitted, and only suspension is allowed thereafter. We need a process for handling this.

Andria: This situation is unfortunate. In a way, it is oddly good that it happened, because it highlights a massive issues about fees. We are collecting student/member money. From my own experience, the total for optional fees is like, $90. Think about what $90 can do for you personally. Groceries, cell phone, rent. This is actual money that our members can use. We need a process. Currently, we don't know what any of the groups collecting fees do with the money. There has never been a full-scale process to investigate where this money is going. Unfortunately for KCAP, they brought this issue to light, and had to suffer for it. Now we can take this information, and do something with it. This lets us learn about where the money is going, and perhaps align member interests with them. We have no contacts with these organizations, even though we are cutting them cheques for thousands of dollars. This is a great opportunity for us to patch up a massive hole in our organization and do great work for the membership. This has led us to a place where we can do good work.

Stuart: A final thought. An idea of the process – a repeatable, fair, open annual process by which groups can establish fees. What's funny about our organization, we don't do much on our own, but do a lot of connecting. Allowing our members to make better use of the time they're at Queen's. This is a tremendous opportunity, and we can build it into something that is transparent and fully accountable. This will substantially increase the value of student fees, and the value returned to our membership.
IX. Notices of Motion & Announcements

X. Adjournment

A. Adjournment  
Motion 05/17/16:8

Moved: Saba Forbodkia (president@sgps.ca)  
Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)

BIRT this meeting of SGPS Council be adjourned.

In favour: everyone.