



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, November 8th, 2011, 5:30pm

McLaughlin Room, JDUC

1. Presentations

- a. Academic Plan
 - Presented by Iain Reeve
 - Iain: Thanks for letting me come and talk again.
 - o Academic Plan arose when the current principal came into the university and looks at how to make decisions; Queen's doesn't actually have an academic plan, so he published a document called "Where Next?" and invited responses
 - 2nd document: "Imagining the Future" → took unit responses from "Where Next?" into account
 - Came to Senate → special task force made up of reps (1 grad student, 1 undergrad, 3 faculty, 1 dean, 1 staff, 1 chair)
 - Took in ideas about what should be in an academic plan
 - o Consultation vs finally completing a plan; initially Senate wanted to complete a plan by April (impossible). Now the plan is completed → balance has been struck that will allow University to move forward
 - o Problems with how specific to be; not wanting to be too prescriptive
 - o Struggle between generality + being mindful of economic difficulties
 - o What's in the plan for grad students?
 - 5 parts: "Main academic plan document – broadest recommendation" + 4 pillar document that link to the plan and provide detailed recommendations
 - Importance of quality in grad school; Queen's is not just an undergrad institution; it is a strong, research-based graduate institution as well
 - Importance of grad/professional students as students first and researchers/TAs second → here to get degrees first, research etc come second
 - 4 pillars each apply to grad studies as well
 - Fundamental academic skills: focus is on undergrad (so undergrads leave Queen's with strong communication skills) → however, these things are important at a graduate level as well

(grad students should leave knowing their degree carries high academic reputation)

- Interdisciplinarity/Disciplinarity → break down institutional blocks (blocking interdisciplinary study) → Queen's has a high institutional wall for collaboration
- Global focus for citizenship; students leaving with a greater exposure to the city/country/world → sensitivity to diversity and other international principles
- Community health and wellness; building a strong, cohesive community between grad studies and other parts of the university. Health and wellness support for all students and faculty who need it
 - This is *quite different* than where Queen's had traditionally been → higher place for Aboriginal students and studies at the university
- Tried to emphasize role of graduate students at Queen's while being mindful of financial/economic constraints, at the same time recognizing role of grad students at Queen's
- Think about the plan! Ask questions!
- The plan is only the first part of a continuing process → next goal of the university should be to develop an ongoing academic process
- Recommends that SGPS puts together a group to look closely at plan (assuming it passes); what kinds of things can we use out of this plan to achieve goals we think are worthwhile at this university?
 - Document as guidance for what the university should be doing → therefore, change and suggest things that you are concerned with!
- Daniel: You alluded to changes that the taskforce had made to the plan considering academic constraints... could you elaborate on them?
 - Iain: Anything in Senate that is significant has to have a month of notice in motion. 2 biggest things with most feedback: clauses about undergraduate TAs and blended learning
 - Undergraduate TAs exist; there is a lot of discomfort in this particularly in social studies → were worried that it could be forced upon them (this is not the aim of the plan at all). This was thus pulled out
 - Blended learning; (integrating virtual education) → a potentially very useful tool, could also be used as a cost cutting mechanism. Trying to be optimistic, but it will create problems. This was all pulled off of the plan

2. Adoption of the Agenda & Minutes

MOTION

11/08/11:1

Moved: Cody Yorke (vpp@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Anne-Marie Grondin (vpcca@sgps.ca)

BIRT the agenda for the November 8th, 2011 Council Meeting be adopted.

Motion Carries

MOTION

11/08/11:2

Moved: Cody Yorke (vpp@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Anne-Marie Grondin (vpcca@sgps.ca)

BIRT the minutes for the October 11th, 2011 Council Meeting be accepted

3. Executive and Speaker Reports

- a. President – Jillian Burford-Grinnell (report attached)
- b. VP Graduate – Irene Karagiorgakis (report attached)
- c. VP Professional – Cody Yorke (report attached)
 - Congratulations to Jillian for receiving award!
- d. VP Campaigns & Community Affairs – Anne-Marie Grondin (report attached)
 - Anne-Marie went to Vancouver to attend Canadian Association of Graduate Studies
 - Graduate student Deans come together and talk about a national vision for where graduate studies are going to go
 - Student seat created because students need to participate in the discussion in 2005. Seat went to a representative of the (CFS) National Graduate Caucus and to a representative of the CNCS (the Quebec equivalent).
 - Board of Directors wanted to abolish the student seat (justification: there is no unified national student voice, seeing as the National Graduate Caucus does not represent all graduate student associations in Canada)
 - Anne-Marie wrote a letter in response, and argued that the National body currently represents, by far, the majority of graduate student associations across the country, and as such, that the SGPS recognized the National Grad Caucus as the student voice for graduates on CAGS.
 - President of CAGS wrote back to say that a much better, more inclusive forum would be a student roundtable, which he proposed as an alternative to the voting seat.
 - When students got to the promised roundtable, the agenda was dictated by the President of CAGS, who refused to address the proposed amendments which would lead to the elimination of the student seat. President then asked students to hash out who would be elected to be invited to the roundtable during the hour and a half that was supposed to be allotted to students to bring their concerns forward. President argued

- that a too many students at one roundtable would be unmanageable, which contradicted the reason why the idea of a roundtable was suggested in the first place.
- More realistically, the student seat was not abolished to make discussions more inclusive. It was abolished because students consistently opposed ideas raised by non-student members on the Board, and it became increasingly embarrassing for CAGS to present a vision for graduate studies that was not supported by students.
- Student seat was lost; very frustrating, and reflective of a trend for administrative bodies to eliminate student participation. This is a problem for two main reasons:
 - As administrative bodies become increasingly managerial in focus, barring student elimination means getting rid of any dissent
 - As dissenting voices are eliminated, the corporate model becomes further entrenched, as is the so-called “need” for universities to be administered in a top-down manner.
- e. VP Finance & Services – Andrea Phillipson (report attached)
- Last week, the provincial government of Manitoba agreed to allow international students on the Medicare plan
 - Will take affect in April 2012
 - Plan that international students and their spouses/dependents are on in Ontario is UHIP
 - Run by a steering committee located in the Council of Ontario University (this body has no student rep on it)
 - UHIP is quite expensive; international students used to be covered by OHIP until the mid 1990s when there was a push to deregulate health care costs
 - International students were kicked off of OHIP; before this time, international students were treated as valuable contributors (intellectual and economic contributions)
 - Many international students end up staying in Ontario post-graduate, and contribute to the economy in a long term way
 - It costs approx. \$100,000 to educate someone from kindergarten – grade 12; when we get other students from outside of Ontario, where other governments have paid for their education, we are actually saving money
 - COU – UHIP steering committee has no real plans to lobby the government for plans to reinstate OHIP for international students
 - CFS (Canadian Federation of Students) has been campaigning for international students to be re-instated on provincial health plans
 - In light of the Manitoba’s recent plan, now is a good time to consider this issue and recognize international students as valuable contributors to their university as they really are
- f. Speaker – Eric Rapos (report attached)

MOTION

11/08/11:3

Moved: Anne-Marie Grondin (vpcca@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Andrea Phillipson (vpfs@sgps.ca)

BIRT the Executive and Speaker Reports be accepted.

Motion Carries

4. Senator, Board of Trustees, Commissioner, Committee & Other Reports

- a. Graduate Student Senator – Daniel Moore (report attached)
 - At last senate, 2 issues were brought up: Senators asked not to support the plan
 - 2 key moments in the plan; 8th core principal and on page 20 -21 are the two spots in which graduate students are highlighted in the Academic Plan
 - Encourages discussion and questions from SGPS about the plan
- b. Graduate Student Trustee – Benjamin Grant (no report)
- c. Committee Reports
- d. Commissioner Reports
 - i. Social Commissioner – Abdullah Abunafeesa (no report)
 - Thank you for attending events last month!
 - Record was set at PhD movie event; more than 300 people attended
 - Please approach with new ideas for events
 - Pool tournament at the Grizzly Grill tonight... 2 more events coming this month
 - ii. Communications Commissioner – Sean Richards (report attached)
 - Nothing to add
 - iii. Equity Commissioner: Elizabeth Amirault (no report)
 - iv. International Students' Affairs Commissioner: Becky Pero (report attached)
- e. Other Reports
 - i. Equity Coordinator – Aliya Kassam (no report)
 - ii. International Students' Affairs Coordinator: Holly McIndoe (combined with International Students' Affairs Commissioner Report)
 - iii. Sustainability Coordinator – Ivana Zelenika (report attached)
 - iv. Athletics Coordinator – Meaghan Frauts (no report)
 - v. Logistics Coordinator – Chris Groten (no report)
 - vi. Planning Coordinator – Cassandra Kuyvenhoven (no report)
 - vii. Rector – Nick Francis (no report)
 - Recently elected into position; busy and excited to start the Rector position
 - Highlight campaign period; all candidates put a lot of effort into the campaign → lots of work. Encourages everyone to commend other candidates if you see them on campus

- 3 part vision for the position:
 - Physical office – a positive space for any student, approach Nick with any concerns
 - Ceremonial role of the Rector
 - Advocacy role; sitting on a number of important committees – please bring forward any concerns so that he can appropriately represent you
 - Facebook page: “Office of the Rector” → online presence will be increasing
- viii. Chief Returning Officer – Mikhail Kellawan (no report)
- ix. Departmental Reports

MOTION

11/08/11:4

Moved: Anne-Marie Grondin (vpcca@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Andrea Phillipson (vpfs@sgps.ca)

BIRT the Senator, Board of Trustees, Commissioner, Committee and Other Reports be accepted.

Motion Carries

5. Question Period/Departmental Issues

- Daniel: (introduction of the primary core principles of the academic plan)
 - Note recommendation about students as students or contributors to the research environment (does this division exist?)
 - Research is not just a source of revenue? The Plan tries to talk about graduate students as students first
 - Is this plan satisfactory?
- Anne-Marie: It’s important to put our individual learning needs forward. As a graduate student, I felt rewarded at this University because I am a researcher → in order to do my work, I need an office/phone/access to the internet/funding etc
 - Students sometimes get dismissed as ‘just students’ ... “this is only an internship”
- Daniel: I also wonder if this recommendation is drawing on a hierarchy that doesn’t exist between students and non students
 - Graduate students as peers to faculty → this relationship is not reflected in the plan (particularly in departments where collaboration on papers is common)
 - Does this recommendation not give acknowledgement to the real collaboration that happens between students and faculty?
- Matt: Strong feelings on that particular point...how do you intend on voting in the next week (Daniel)? Ironing out the edges and strong problems in the future – both motions seem to allow for future input but Senator Morelli’s motion has emphasized that much more strongly

- Daniel: It will be very difficult to vote against the plan and convince Senate to reject this plan (process has been going on for a long time – there is a certain sentiment to just be done with the plan at this point)
 - o Not reasonable to expect Senate to reject the plan at this point
 - o Not fair to task force to reject it (they have responded to concerns about undergrad TAs and blended learning)
 - o Wisest to ask for a clear statement from Provost about how they intend to implement the ongoing academic planning process → both motions put this forward in pretty clear terms
 - o In best interest right now to support it?
- Anne-Marie: Could you (Daniel) talk to the motives behind Senator Morelli’s motions?
 - o Do you have any knowledge about why certain things were supported over others?
- Daniel: Senator Morelli’s motion suggests that we should vote on the pillars separately → are those changes really representative of the Queen’s community?
 - o Which draft is most representative of the Queen’s community, when there are 3 or 4 drafts of all of these pillars
 - o Senator Morelli asks for a voting on previous drafts
- Anne-Marie: I’m assuming you’re looking for direction on this...consider putting a motion at Senate to consider all aspects of the plan separately and vote on them separately, beyond the pillars
 - o Senator Morelli’s motion does not really do that → first clause says that we should reject the academic plan period
- Daniel: Each pillar has key recommendations in it... you could write a motion that would break that down. I would be happy to make a motion like that if council is interested... ?
- Queenie: I would agree with passing that motion
- Nick: Provost’s role in implementation of that plan... strike a new task force to implement the plan?
- Daniel: Provost is responsible for monitoring the plan and spearheading the review of the plan itself
 - o Nick: Will this be debated at the next Senate meeting?
 - o Daniel: No
 - o Nick: If that passes, will the provost get to decide on his own?
 - o Daniel: No decision on how that will happen... I can ask questions about who will be responsible for monitoring the plan in the future
- Nick: There was a recommendation about a mandatory reading/writing course for both 1st year undergrad and grad students. Is this still in plan?
- Daniel: Not sure – thought it was only for undergrad students. There is a fine line between describing a new vision and holding departments to do things they don’t want to do
 - o There is no force in charge of monitoring this; departments that agree with certain parts of the plan will implement those plans
 - o That suggestion does not seem to have been worded in a way that it would be implemented in right away

- Nick: In the last draft, there was something about increasing undergrad TAs and decreasing grad TAs, can you confirm that?
- Daniel: They eliminated this part – the plan still has one lingering reference to “different forms of peer tutoring to enrich learning experience in different ways” (this is quite vague)
- Andrea: Could we also look at the section of the plan that is specifically about the graduate program?
 - o (This is put up on the overhead)
- Daniel: This was in my report as a section that was pretty important for members; the first line signals that most of the plan is about the undergraduate program. This section specifically spells out issues regarding the graduate program (a problem that was already raised in senate)
 - o This part tries to describe the career aspirations of grad students; suggests that there are not many opportunities for an academic career that the grad program traditionally leads to
 - o Still overly optimistic about the ability of departments to tweak their program in such a way that their students will be able to find non academic work
 - o Suggests drafting a motion to bring to Senate...
- Anne-Marie: Let’s discuss SGPS concerns further. There is 1 motion going forward to Senate saying that SGPS approves the academic plan. There is another motion put forward at senate by Senator Morelli saying we reject the plan/we want to vote on all pillars separately/we want this to be a consultative process/we want this to be reviewed annually
- Matthew Schuster: Concerns that if we pass this right away... council with the Provost, ability to modify. We should have the ability to change at will if we decide that whatever we pass is not adequate.
- Nick: Remember these recommendations are pilot programs – they will be tested in different areas. Perhaps have the committee be more a part of the implementation of these pilot programs and bringing this back to council.
 - o There is a lack of reference to the graduate population in the actual plan.
 - o Still feels like they might be hinting at reducing graduate TA opportunities and increasing undergraduate TA opportunities
 - Look at the wording; what are they actually trying to say with their vision?
 - o Essentially, within the implementation of these pilot programs, if the SGPS decides to strike up some kind of committee, the committee should have the power to be a part of the implementation of pilot programs
 - What does it mean if just faculty implement it? Will there be student representation in the committees that implement these pilot programs?
- Anne-Marie: Idea that Iain brought forward of having a committee; council cannot have a committee that is going to have any direct consequence to the Provost’s office. Just a word of caution → this is a strategic planning vision. The Principal was putting this together as a 4 year plan; the reaction of the community was outrage at recommendations being put forward, wanted to be a part of the process

- Likes that Senator Morelli's proposal talks about a continual review process to make sure that the plan can be revised in any way possible → we can either support Senator Morelli's motion or put forward a different motion that would have something about that in there?
- Ryan: We're either going to accept/deny/propose our own changes
 - Changes: vote on each portion separately, but if we're going to choose that path, we need to suggest what we're going to change
 - Changes: vote on plan review/changes annually
 - Problem is that 1 year is not enough time to implement a plan so large; people will have problems if they don't see results in 1 year
 - Keep these potential problems in mind
- Cody: A lot of the major concerns for grad/professional students have already been addressed and removed from the plan
 - The biggest concern now is how the plan will be implemented and ensuring that we have a continuing voice in that process
 - Focus on trying to ensure that we have a presence in the process going forward
- Nick: What Cody said is very important – perhaps motion towards having a rep in whatever committee they have for the implementation process
 - Dependent on how they decide to implement it
- Daniel: No serious or pressing concerns about the plan itself, but about how the plan will be implemented
 - Draft a question to propose to Senate and Provost about how the plan will go forward
 - Perhaps submit a question in writing first and then submit a motion to Senate
- Queenie: Agree with Daniel's proposal of a question – should we think about a timeline for how the plan should move through? Assessment and evaluation is focused on large scale classes – not enough focus on grad classes and formative evaluation
- Daniel: Good point

MOTION

11/08/11:E1

Moved: Cody Yorke (vpp@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Anne-Marie Grondin (vpfs@sgps.ca)

BIRT SGPS Council task Daniel Moore and Jillian Burford-Grinnell to submit a formal question to the Provost via Senate to clarify how he envisions the "continuous cycle of planning, implementation, and monitoring" of the academic plan under his leadership.

- Lauren: Addition of "graduate students"?
- Daniel: Not sure if it needs to be limited to graduate students? Many senators will be interested in his response to this, no matter what the concern is.
 - Matt: Also wondering if it is necessary to put "as it pertains to graduate students"
 - Nick: Initial question with a follow up question... this question pertains to implementation for undergrads as well

- Ask the question as it now and perhaps add a follow up question (specifically how will this work for graduate and professional programs)
- Daniel: We're going to ask this question so it has a written answer
 - We're more interested in how the Provost will be held responsible for implementing the continuous cycle of planning? How will faculty and students be involved? (the graduate question is part of that, perhaps it is too specific right now)
 - This question would introduce a lot of interest
- Cody: We should add the words "Academic plan" in somewhere (added)

Motion carries

- Biomedical Announcement: New engineering building – for mechanical engineering and new lab spaces for civil
 - First new research space the engineering faculty since the 1980s; interested in representatives from civil and mechanical engineering
- Queenie: Education symposium is looking for papers for presentation and roundtables, anybody interested should submit a paper (rbjse@queensu.ca)
- Lauren: A workshop is being held on Tues Nov 15, JDUC in the International Centre → a follow up to the one last month about supervisor/student relationship
 - All departmental reps are encouraged to go (attendance will be taken) → can better assist colleagues with departmental problems and supervisors
 - Tuesday Nov 15, 7-8.30pm in the JDUC, will be interactive and there will be food!
- Daniella: Small problem in the art department; hiring freeze for professors
 - Paper/art conservation professor will be retiring soon and his position will not be filled; we are trying to move on and are not sure how this will turn out
 - Is there any other program with similar issues? Students not informed with what was going on
- Matt: Hiring is a big problem right now... it's a pretty general problem. Not sure what we can do about it
- Anne-Marie: There is a hiring freeze that has been imposed; CRC may be hired, but those are the only departments that are hiring
 - Problem for many students; pool of faculty available to supervise students and sit on different committees has decreased, whereas number of graduate students has increased
 - Trying to advocate for no more hiring freeze
- Daniella: How long is the hiring freeze?
- Anne-Marie: It's not a ban on hiring, but it has trickled down from the top, because there have been limitations to budgets. This is something that has been going on for several years; there is no indication that this trend will be removed → University continually looking for contractual postdocs and graduate students to teach, rather than full time. Encouraged to get involved in campaigns if you have something to say about it!

- Matt: One thing that the English department has done with success is to cross appoint people from other departments
 - o This is something the academic plan encourages with interdisciplinary collaboration
 - o If the problem is with graduate supervision, perhaps people who would normally seek this outgoing professor, perhaps they could go somewhere else in the university?
- Daniella: it's a big problem, there's no other professor in Canada with this speciality
- Nick: For this particular issue, it is very unfortunate that this is also the only program in Canada
 - o Sept 23 board trustee meeting: the Provost will be balancing the books this year → by the end of this year, he will have made some serious changes
 - o There are going to be serious changes → use your voice, let us know what is happening

6. Business Arising From the Minutes

7. Main Motions

MOTION

11/08/11:5

Moved: Andrea Phillipson (vpfs@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Anne-Marie Grondin (vpcca@sgps.ca)

Whereas the Special Awards Standing Committee is to be Chaired by a Member of Council,

Whereas Vanessa Powell Cavell, Judicael Zounmevo, Sarah Allux, Ryan Dhillon, Sarah Martz, Nikoo Najand and Brock Criger are the Council Members on the Committee,

BIRT SGPS Council appoint <insert name here> as the Chair of the Special Awards Standing Committee for the 2011 – 2012 year.

- Nominations for chair
 - o Vanessa: I'm on the committee but I'm only here ½ the year
 - o Nikoo: I'm on the committee, but not interested in being the chair
 - o Sarah Martz: What are the time constraints, what is involved?
 - Sean: The chair of the committee sends out email to set up meeting time and facilitates discussion that helps to select who wins the award
 - Sarah: So someone just gives you all the nominees?

- Sean: I already have all the nominations – the chair just picks them up and brings them to the committee meeting
- Sarah: I can be the chair.

MOTION

11/08/11:5 M-1

Moved: Andrea Phillipson (vpfs@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Cody Yorke (vpp@sgps.ca)

BIRT SPGS Council change <insert name here> to Sarah Martz

Motion carries

MOTION

11/08/11:5

Motion carries as amended

MOTION

11/08/11:6

Moved: Andrea Phillipson (vpfs@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Cody Yorke (vpp@sgps.ca)

Whereas the SGPS is committed to ethical purchasing practices, as per section P.9.1 of SGPS policy, which addresses issues of "equitable labour" and "sustainable operating practices";

Whereas these are appropriate topics for the consideration of the SGPS Equity Issues Standing Committee and the SGPS Sustainability Standing Committee;

Whereas section P.9.1.8 of SGPS policy charges the VP Finance and Services and the Finance and Services Standing Committee with conducting an annual review of the ethical purchasing policy and suggesting policy changes to the Bylaw and Policy Revisions Standing Committee;

BIRT section P.9.1.8 of SGPS policy entitled "Policy Review" be amended to read:

The Equity Issues Standing Committee and the Sustainability Standing Committee shall each conduct an annual review of the Ethical Purchasing policy and suggest policy changes to the Bylaw and Policy Revisions Standing Committee no later than January 15th of each year.

- Andrea: This motion came about after a member with the finance and services standing committee, and they are in agreement with it
 - The reason why the VP finance and services committee was charged with doing this was because there was originally no equity committee
 - Now that these things exist, they should be the people to deal with it

Motion Carries

8. Other Business

9. Notice of Motions & Announcements

- a. Reports and Motions for the next regular SGPS Council Meeting are due on Tuesday December 6th, 2011.
- b. The next regular SGPS Council Meeting will be on Tuesday, December 13th, 2011.

10. Adjournment

MOTION

11/08/11:7

Moved: Andrea Phillipson (vpfs@sgps.ca)

Seconded: Daniel Moore (senator@sgps.ca)

BIRT the SGPS Council Meeting be adjourned.

Motion carries

11/08/11

EJR

CFS-27

Attached:

October Council Meeting Minutes

Attendance October Council Meeting

November Reports

Appendices to Motions

SGPS Council Attendance - November			
Name		Represents	
Vacant	Vacant	Aboriginal Rep	
Marvin	Ferrer	Anatomy & Cell Biology	
Daniela	Vogel	Art Conservation	
Chantal	Valkenborg	Art History	
Johanna	Plant	Art History	
Namit	Sharma	Biochemistry	
Derek	Gray	Biology	
Celia	Symons	Biology	
Julian	Chesterman	Biomedical Engineering	X
Vacant	Vacant	Biostatistics	

Ben	Grant	Board of Trustees Rep	
Vacant	Vacant	Chem Eng (CEGSA) President	
Eric	Peterson	Chemical Engineering	X
Matthew	Schuster	Chemistry	
Jack	Wallace	Civil Engineering	
Vacant	Vacant	Classics	
David	Wallace	Community Health and Epidemiology	X
Katie	Killorn	Community Health and Epidemiology	
Melissa	Trezise	Computing Science	
Haroon	Malik	Computing Science	
Jaspreet	Bal	Cultural Studies	
Patrick	Alexander	Economics	
Allison	Chapman	Education - Graduate - President	
Queenie	Wong	Education - Graduate M.Ed	X
Miao	Li	Education - Graduate PhD	
Chris	Fiorentino	Electrical and Computer Engineering	
Matthew	Scribner	English	
Patricia	Oprea	English	
Mike	McHugh	Environmental Studies	
Vacant	Vacant	ESS	
Rebecca	ReginorId	ESS	
Sunny	Moondi	ESS	
Soraya	Vitorino	SGPS/ESS Educational Liaison	X
Tyler	Kenopic	ESS President	
Sarah	Jacoba	French	X
Judicael	Zounmevo	GECE President	
Kaleigh	Alkenbrack	Gender Studies	X
Gentry	Hanks	Geography	X
Sarah	Allux	Geography	X
Ryan	Dhillon	Geology	X
Corina	Fonyodi-Szarka	German	
Hayley	Morgan	Global Development	
Daniel	Moore	Graduate Senator	
Doug	Nesbitt	History	
Minoo	Kianizad	Industrial Relations	
Sima	Zakani	International Rep	
Holly	McIndoe	International Rep	
Gifferd	Ko	Kinesiology and Health Studies	
Stefanie	Kullick	Languages, Literatures & Cultures	

Stephanie	Timerman	Law	
Brittany	Sargent	Law	
David	Faour	Law	X
Jeremy	D'Souza	Law	
Jie	Tang	Law - Graduate	X
Mathew	Mezciems	Law - LSS President	
Logan	Crowell	Law Senator	
Vacant	Vacant	Management	
Saeed	Akhavan Astaneh	Math and Stats	
Vacant	Vacant	Mature Student Rep	
Jerome	James	Mechanical and Material Engineering	
Sarah	Martz	Microbiology	X
Andrew	Pursell	Microbiology	
Brett	Owens	Mining Engineering	
Brandon	Chambers	Mining Engineering	
Raynold	Alorse	MPA	X
Ethan	Zhao	Neuroscience	
Stacey	Karp	Nursing	
Lisa	Hughes	Part Time Rep	
Victoria	Hoskins	Pathology	
Dulcie	Lai	Pathology	
Yohan	D'Souza	Pharmacology	
Nikoo	Najand	Philosophy	X
Nathalie	Ouellette	Physics	X
Andrea	Mimee	Physiology	
Steffan	Alexander	Political Studies	X
Brock	Criger	Psychology	
Megan	Jaquith	Public Health	
Nick	Francis	Rector	X
Janice	Phe	Rehab Sciences (Professional)	
Ian	Gilchrist	Rehab Sciences (Research)	
Vacant	Vacant	Rehabilitation Therapy	
Caleigh	Lyn-Piluso	Religious Studies	
Gillian	Bankas	Sociology	
Vacant	Vacant	Theology	
Darin	MacKinnon	Theology Senator	
Tony	Gkotsis	Urban and Regional Planning	
Sean	Richards	Executive Director	
Jillian	Burford-Grinnell	President	

Andrea	Phillipson	VP Finance	X
Anne-Marie	Grondin	VP Campaigns & Community Affairs	X
Irene	Karagiorgakis	VP Graduate	X
Cody	Yorke	VP Professional	X
Abdullah	Abunafeesa	Social Commissioner	X
Meaghan	Frauts	Athletics Coordinator	
Chris	Groten	Logistics Coordinator	
Cassandra	Kuyvenhoven	Planning Coordinator	
Elizabeth	Amirault	Equity Commissioner	
Aliya	Kassam	Equity Coordinator	X
Becky	Pero	International Students' Affairs Commissioner	
Holly	McIndoe	International Students' Affairs Coordinator	
Ivana	Zelinka	Sustainability Coordinator	
Daniel	Moore	Graduate Student Senator	
Eric	Rapos	Speaker	
James	MacLean	Deputy Speaker	X
Mikhail	Kellawan	Chief Returning Officer	
Other Attendees			
Lauren	McNicol	Student Advisor	X