

# Minutes for the Council Meeting October 11

Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Kim Murphy:

- Speaking about university insurance
- Murray an external consulting firm, did a review on Queen's policy on campus group event sanctioning. Their report was presented to the Board of Trustees in 2013 who were concerned about liability associated with events for students organizing the events and their affiliation with the university.
- These concerns were brought to the AMS and SGPS. In 2013, the SGPS passed a motion through council to establish an event sanctioning process for student run events. This was not implemented until this year.
- A big question that is often asked is why is it necessary? Kim sees it as a 3-way protection, plan for the university, the SGPS, and most importantly, the individuals organizing the event.

Question Period:

Ciara Bracken Roche, Graduate Student Senator: how do you balance the interests of both the university and the student needs?

Kim: Process is work in progress. Communication is very important in making the process more efficient.

Nima, LSS President: Nima expressed the sentiment of being strong-armed during the summer to implement this policy. This is a two-tier system where many events that would be useful cannot be sanctioned in time before implementation. Is upset about 2 week approval timeline involved. Two other issues he'd like to question is: 1) Is there any policy regarding event sanctioning? 2: Have insurance premiums gone up now that Queen's and the SGPS are covering that extra liability of sanctioning events? Is this added cost paid for by the students?

Kim: There is no policy and working group will work on this. Board understands that this a valid concern and will work to create one. Kim feels it's better to put something in place and work out the kinks before implementing a rigid policy.

Kim: With respect to the Queen's premium policy, Queen's insurance premiums are not going up and therefore students aren't paying an extra financial burden.

Valerie from Geography: Has Queen's looked at other university policies in implementing these changes? The university of Guelph has a much more clearly outlined process.

Kim: No but they will be looking at some within the working group that is being assembled.

Nima: If there is no policy, is the entire process of sanctioning events completely arbitrary?

Debra: Who sits on the working group and how do we access it? Did board consider that the makeup of SGPS and AMS members are entirely different so a blanket policy for both groups is unacceptable?

Kim: Event Sanctioning working group's make up is currently ongoing. In contact with the SGPS and AMS to recommend student members of the group.

Stuart: Addressing Nima's and Debra's concerns. Decisions were not being made arbitrarily, decision making that was used over the summer, was borrowed from the AMS policy on event sanctioning with the understanding that graduate students can handle more responsibility so there was some added leniency. For example, the wet-event boat cruise is something the AMS would not sanction.

Adoption of the agenda- all in favour.

Tabled the motion to approve minutes as they weren't attached- approved by all to approve minutes along with October 11<sup>th</sup> minutes at the November Council Meeting.

Executive Reports approved by all. Request to add a motion to the docket by VP Campaigns denied based on previous use of Robert's Rules. Moved to November Council.

Senator Report (Ciara):

Senate discussion on faculty renewal- need to hire 200 new positions; concerns around equity; not sure how to have our voices heard

Updates on the university's standing in general- enrollment, research etc.

Some discussion of the 175-year anniversary

Discussion about equity- open letter to the senate by undergrad student; lack of diversity in their department; topics offered in department Eurocentric; equity committee dismissed that letter- few key profs who asked questions- part of ongoing discussion; will be submitting a report for next council

Trustee Report (Adam):

Highlights from the first meeting of the Queen's Board of Trustees in the report; key point doctoral student experience- engagement rates, statistics that are being used have gone down- 62 percent of students have ranked their experience as positive; keeping a close eye on that; financially in a couple of holes right now- 185 million under; Echo Ciara's faculty renewal commentary; deferred maintenance cost- 253 million; announcement today that the government pledged 35 million dollars as part of the innovation of the wellness center and Botterell Hall; president spoke very well at the meeting- brought up a couple of good things like enrollment numbers and diversity in the faculty

Commissioner Reports (None)

Student Policy Committee Review:

Stuart:

At the last GM Finance and Services Committee tasked with the adoption of student fees onto the fee slate; new protocol to govern student activity fees; update the SGPS rules to go in line with the new policy to run a modern fee system; original policy was defeated at council as there were a number of issues with it; lack of communication from the exec about why those were necessary; taken original proposal back and broken it up into a series of chunks to be reviewed by Council

1. Eligibility of groups to receive fees (who is entitled to funding)
2. Classification of mandatory vs optional fees
3. Reporting obligations (how money being spent, programming for members, consistent manner of use of the student fees)
4. Suspension and cancellation of fees (reduce discretionary power of the VPFS; added processes, hearings and reviews)
5. Look at whether or not the SGPS policy and the student activity fees policy could align together (rel. to charity groups?)

Very pleased with the work of the committee- 5 months to do; 5-6 drafts, several hours of committee meetings; once get into the motions can get into the specifics of how the meetings and process went

Lauren (Masters of Ed): Why Healthcare and Dental are combined? Taking money out of student pockets

Stuart: Admin change to combine the two line items; process of opting out is the same

Lauren: All or nothing opt out

Stuart: Will look into it- my understanding that in the previous system you couldn't opt out of one or the other separately

(Didn't provide name): Report not there for the Committee

Speaker: Mistake on my part

(Same as above- didn't provide name): In the minutes for the next meeting could we continue asking questions on the review? Discussion point for next meeting

Stuart: Delaying three weeks would not be helpful as this document needs to be available by November

Sebastian: Renegotiation of the insurance deal; the insurance premiums went up because there were more people filing claims; in previous years people had to take it directly to the office whereas last year there was added an online option; new dental office opened in the JDUC and when renegotiating the new deal, they believed that would also lead to an increased premium so lack of flexibility on the dental and health fees is to get more money into the plan; sucks that it's not as flexible, but something that needed to be done to get money into the plan; feedback will be considered

Lauren: Not really benefitting grad students

Sebastian: It is benefitting as students have more access to the insurance via online; did get quotes from other insurance companies and got the best deal that was available to us; was in consultation with others

Corey: Follow up for Sebastian; previous exec looking at quotes from other insurance; was flexibility of the plan a way of evaluating competing quotes? Did the plan we ended up on (all or nothing) ....

Kishan: Question for the reports? BIRT that the Council approve reports

All in favour- motion is carried; move onto the main motions- Student Fees; Stuart into the motion

Stuart- first policy goal of the committee was what kinds of these could exist; class a, b, c or d fee; changed names and cleaned up the language; explanation of the mandatory and optional fees; largely, the differences between the old and new policy are negligible but cleaned up language, named what the types of fees are supposed to be- only certain fees that can be labeled as SGPS fee vs clubs fee vs something else; ease of processing and differentiating of what is going towards what; clarify over which groups are able to get which fees and determine which fees who would get; SGPS fees remain mandatory; clubs are given the remaining optional designation; weird situation of clubs on campus having an optional fee then winning a mandatory fee and amount of fees increasing overnight which made it difficult to figure out who was spending what and the level of protection

Adam: Great work to everyone on the committee; question is about wording- section 1.2.2 part a and b; wondering why 'cancel a fee' is not included in the b part of that section

Stuart: How the process works right now is that fees are held for three years; have to apply every three years to renew; aren't permanent, get approved for the fee slate, that is how groups are held accountable; have to win referendum; the fee comes off after the prescribed period

Move to committee of the whole- Stuart seconded by Adam: All in favour

Adam: Why is it included in a? Why is cancel included in a if its not included in b?

Stuart: Context paragraphs; in the old policy and tried to hew as closely as possible to the old language; refers to the existence of how they are cancelled or increased; there's a process for council to do that but doesn't speak to the system of the renewal of the fees every three years

Kishan: Move to votes for the motion

Motion is the classification of student fees- amend p1.2.1 and p1.2.2 to read as outlined in the appendix: All in favour- motion is carried

Second motion- motion 5; eligibility of student fees- 1.2.3 to read as in the appendix

Stuart: speaks to what groups are eligible to have access to the fees in the first place; for example if you're a bank or for profit business, you shouldn't have access to mandatory fees; SGPS fees are mandatory fees related to upkeep of organization, University fees keeping up with services, Clubs as optional and fourth category are charities etc; mainly to create principled divisions to ensure that student fees are spent per the wishes of students and the mandate; debate over this particular section- eligibility of charities to get access to the funding; built system to define the squares that the fees can fall into; old system didn't have principled reasons to define why fee was mandatory or optional- way it works under our new system is that only certain groups can get mandatory fees; questions?

Nima: Agree with the process- nitpicky comment; p.1.2.3ca- the language is not correct; categorization requirements

Stuart: When people apply they don't apply as SGPS or external fee; would slot into one of the four squares by Committee in order to meet all of the conditions for one of the four squares; happy to take suggestions for how to clear that up

Nima: Amendment to p.1.2.3ca- "The group shall satisfy each of the requirements for their respective category of fees"; friendly motion  
Follow up- are you guys getting rid of the entire classification of fees as class a, class b etc.

Stuart: Yes, those will be retired

Adam: Under the new groups, are there any groups that currently do not fill the requirements?

Stuart: Every year you submit a package; satisfy the requirements; larger discussion that takes place with the Committee; entire point is to remove the ability of myself to make decisions alone; as I said before, any group that currently has a fee won't have to abide by new rules until they go to referendum; the rules that they were elected under will govern for three years

Michael (Philosophy): Pertaining to the requirement about the salary of the employee; wondering if it would be illegitimate of the SGPS to fund charitable organizations with salaried employees

Stuart: Original policy written in March said that any amount of compensation towards employees at all; tried to be a little more balanced with that and allow for support with a few employees that are salaried; one of the reasons that compensation is allowed to continue is that if you are at the point where you have a salaried employee, you really don't need access to the student fees

Terry: These organizations that have the ability to apply for student fees and get them, we shouldn't be funding core operating fees but outreach costs; distinction between those

Michael: Examples of charitable organizations with salaried full time employees; not certain that contributing to their overall operating budget is something we don't want to do; might want to support vital operational costs of these organizations

Terry: Only precludes the payment of employees

(Student did not provide name): Friendly motion to remove the 'salaried' element of the motion; are we going to determine the amount that should be put into a specific fund? Hate to see that as something that excludes people

Emma (Kinesiology): Not sure want to remove it completely but can understand the logic being discussed; voicing opinion; should be some way to address that

Stuart: Good policy concerns on both sides of this; sharpen the language- say it is important that money received by these groups goes towards outreach programming; has to be spent on stuff that's done

Corey moved to continue debate- motion carries by majority

Virginia (History): Clarify the language could be as simple as saying that the proposed fee does not get used to fund the employee??

Corey: Not a fan of the restriction; do appreciate the debate that was had in committee; goes towards Adam's initial question- talked in Committee a great deal about the effects to groups currently receiving funding but don't recall whether group ineligible after reapplication following three-year term

Stuart: Didn't look at it case by case

Kishan: Speaking rights

Adam: If we amend this motion to say that funds have to go to operations, opens the door to big corporate organizations to now apply; could then maybe take funds away from groups in Kingston that need to fund one employee to keep it running

Stuart: Divided evenly on student choice vs gatekeeping by the SGPS; students are pretty good judges of where their money should be going at the end of the day; could allow students to make the choice for themselves if they want to fund branch plant organizations or local organizations

Michael: What are we addressing?

Kishan: p.1.2.3

Michael: All SGPS members shall be able to be involved in the groups/able to get access to the services; what about specific situations where there is a group of SGPS members that couldn't benefit or participate in the programming?

Stuart: Construed how it will be interpreted very broadly; battered woman's shelter as hypothetical; indirect work that could be helped with; at the end of the day, groups that we fund

with SGPS student money need to be open and inclusive to our members, who are putting the money into it

Kishan: Move to vote on the motion

Stuart: Straw poll on the salary eligibility requirement; strike it as written and amend; do we favour removing the salary language? People want to get rid of the ban on salary (majority)

Nima: Liability issue; don't want money to suggest to employer that it goes to SGPS funding salaries; caution that it is reasonable protection

Terry: Is it possible to have in the agreement that every organization signs that SGPS is not employer/funding agent for the employee?

Stuart: Theoretical possible; can ask our lawyer; amend the motion to strike the requirement; p.1.2.3.c.a.3.2.b and everything under that; text removing would be: amending club and external organization (p.1.2.3.c.a.3.4.b)

Michael: strike the salary amendment from both

Corey: Why asked the question to do with the amendment; concern only over external fees; have no problem with the Clubs section

Adam: talking about external groups

Stuart: Solely remove the external fees

Kishan: Motion for both clubs and external groups- vote

Stuart: Declaring own amendment friendly

Deborah: Friendly and omnibus the two of them

Kishan: Rule it as ok

Stuart: Motioning to amend?

Stuart: amend to strike the section under groups fee as eligible external fee funding salaried employee... (wording)

Michael: Clarification- external fees

Kishan: Eligibility for external fees; everyone understand motion: Nima against; all others in favour- motion carries

Motion for the amendment to reword p.1.2.3ca to change wording as previously discussed;  
p.1.2.3c.a.4.2.b- to be struck (?)

All in favour of motion- all in favour

Amend p.1.2.4 to read as in amendment

Stuart: Important differences- entire section is same as previous policy but few important changes- dropped requirements to get onto ballot; easier for students to get into referendum but now need a 2/3 majority to actually get the fee; built in safety measure to prevent the passing of dubious capital projects (Queen's Centre) where fees were proposed to be levied on the ARC onto students; went over budget but through vote of attrition something went 51/49 and students who hadn't benefitted from the new building were forced to pay fee

Dylan (Biology): 2/3 majority of all students or council?

Stuart: 2/3 majority of those who vote- how its been counted; if you don't show up you don't get a vote on that

Michael: Point of info- currently 50% plus one; so how many of our current fees would have not passed according to new metric?

Stuart: Didn't take a look at that

Kishan: Move to vote on the motion; motion 6 p.1.2.4 read as in appendix  
All in favour (abstentions Michael and Nima)- Motion carries

Next motion is reporting obligations- p.1.2.5 read as outlined in the appendix

Stuart: Outline policy for the way that groups with fees update the committee on how fees have been used; balance accountability of how student dollars are spent with the accessibility of different groups to provide information year after year; no one expects small groups to provide audits but bigger org. like registered non for profits should provide that info; Finance and Services Committee can update council on how money spent; difference is that groups that receive a fee now have to file a simple report on how they spent the money from the SGPS to ensure that money being spent same way as was applied for under referendum rules

Dylan: Would this info be available online?

Stuart: Clarify- once the committee has collected the reports or access to what the committee sees? (second one) Our hope that info that is not HR or financially sensitive can be uploaded online and can be accessible to the membership; referendum section- application process/package will be made available to students year to year with whatever info collected

Adam: Template will be created that will be a universal template; is it possible to get some sort of reminder that is sent out a few months in advance?

Stuart: Going to host a series of town halls and see the groups individually and walk them through the process; not bringing down the gavel- want fees to succeed; going to try and walk people through the process and hope that successors do the same; create transition documents to allow this to happen year after year

Kishan: Move to vote on reporting obligations p.1.2.5 to read as in the appendix  
All in favour- motion carries

Suspension, cancellation and appeals- p.1.2.5 to read as the appendix for this portion

Stuart: Process for suspending, cancelling and appealing fees; old policy was 'hilariously lopsided'; people who occupied VPFS position last year could kick groups off the fee slate unilaterally; no process; what tried to do here is to stratify the process in simply that remove the discretionary power to the committee to make recommendations and put hard power of cancelling fees to council only after recommendation been made; made system more accountable

Kishan: Move to vote on the motion; amend p.1.2.5 as appendix  
All in favour- motion carries

Final motion- reporting obligations; Stuart and Saba- remove p.1.2.6-p.1.2.8

Stuart: Strike old student fee policy from the document; had to renumber things because things were consolidated; largely just housekeeping

Kishan: Move to vote on the motion- reporting obl. Remove p.1.2.6-p.1.2.8 as outlined in appendix

All in favour- motion carries

Adjournment- all in favour

# SGPS Council Attendance.

Name	Faculty / Dep.	Position
Stuart Clark	VPPS - Exee	VPPS
KISHAN LAKHANI	VPP / sitting speaker - EXEC	VPP
Saba Farbodkin	<del>President</del>	President
Sebastian Gorkenski	UPG	<del>UPG</del> UPG
Adam Ali	Graduate Trustee	Grad Trustee.
Emma Thompson	Vinesiology & health Studies (Arts)	council member
MARISSA MONETTE	ART CONSERVATION	Council Member
Zylm Sora	Biology	Council Member
Michael Luoma	Philosophy	Council Member
Joanna Rees	School of Urban + Regional Planning	Council Member
Valerie Freemantle	Geography and planning	Council Member
Natasha Stirrett	Indigenous student rep	Council member
VICTORIA ZEFKIC	Public Health <del>Student</del> Science Association	Council member
Kate Withers	LAW <del>(Dep)</del>	Council member
Nura Hojjah	Law	President
Gianluca Sampieri	DBMS <del>Grad</del>	Grad Rep ↳ Council Member
Terry Soleas	Faculty of Education	PhD Representative EGSS
Lauren Brick	Faculty of Education	Masters of Ed representative EGSS
Alisha Esteves	Faculty of Education	External Represent of the ESS
Keegan Turner-Wood	DBMS GSC BCH Rep	

# SGPS Council Attendance.

Name	Faculty / Dep.	Position
Rose Brown	Art History	Council Member
Cecilia Yang	Law	SGPS Rep
Camille Galindez	Industrial Relations	SGPS Rep
Virginia Vandenberg	History	SGPS Rep
Timothy Ng	Computing	SGPS Rep
Kris Jones	Sociology (need name tag)	SGPS Rep
Debra Mackinnon	<del>from sociology</del> sociology	outgoing rep.
Ciara Bracken-Roche	Grad Student Senator Sociology	→
Korey Pasch	Political Studies	SGPS Rep.
Fiona Serack	biomedical engineering	SGPS Rep
Sharmaine Luk	Chemical Engineering	SGPS Rep
Anastasiya Boika	History PhD	UP Campaigns.