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.

1. Presentations

A. Grace Kim – AMS Clubs Manager

Brief presentation about the new merged club system.

Questions:

Ciara: Who does this apply to? Anyone who would like to start some club involving only grad students, or undergrads as well? Is this info available on the AMS website?

Grace: We have eliminated that distinction. Any club through the office is open to any student. For example, Exercise is Medicine is primarily grad students but has undergraduate student involvement. All the information about the program is available on the AMS website.

Jared Houston: The paid positions within the clubs office - are they open to grad students to apply? What are your plans for advertising to grad students?

Grace: April recruiting will be posted on the Facebook page, Anastasiya Boika will be working with the office to help us promote to Grad Students.

II. Adoption of the Agenda and Minutes

A. Adoption of the Agenda   MOTION 09/13/16:1

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

BIRT SGPS Council adopt the Agenda for the September 13, 2016 Council Meeting.

Vote: Motion carries unanimously.

B. Adoption of the Council Minutes   MOTION 09/13/16:2

[SEE ATTACHED MINUTES]

Moved: Saba Forbodkia (president@sgps.ca)
Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)
BIRT SGPS Council adopt the Minutes for the August 16, 2016 Council Meeting.

Corrections to the minutes were noted and have been applied.

Vote: Unanimously in favour.
Executive & Speaker Reports

A. Executive Reports
   a. President – Saba Farbodkia (report attached) [nothing to add]
   b. VP Graduate – Sebastian Gorlewski (report attached)

   Sebastian: Continuing to work with SGS on a mentorship program for grad students. Most of the professional schools already do a good job at mentoring. Stay tuned for the 175 mentors program – it will connect grad students with the young alumni network to offer tangible skill advice. Also a new program to connect graduate students to community organizations to make a tangible contribution to the community and its development. I'm hiring a research assistant to make a report on mental health supports for grad students. Please contact us if you're interested. Also hiring researchers to investigate Aboriginal student issues, as well as time to completion. We're very excited to announce more student space available – in JDUC 236, going to be moving a board table and a pool table in there. Hopefully this will be a good place for students to mingle, and we'll have some work hours set. Hoping to get council to use the space after our meetings. Expected to be done in early October.

   c. VP Professional – Kishan Lakhani (no report submitted)

   Kishan: Some developments in my work recently. Year plan coming up, but I've had a significant restructuring therein. Going to be using a mentorship program as a support stream, so the 175 mentors can kick off with the SGPS' support. I'm going to be taking control of event sanctioning., and spearheading marketing and awareness campaigns for the SGPS, to improve communication with members. Human Resources are also within my portfolio.

   d. VP Finance & Services – Stuart Clark (report attached) [nothing to add]
   e. VP Campaigns & Community Affairs – Anastasiya Boika (report attached) [absent]

B. Speaker Report
   a. Speaker – Travis Skippon (report attached) [nothing to add]

C. Approval

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

   BIRT SGPS Council approve the Executive and Speaker Reports.

Debra MacKinnon: Saba thank you for meeting with the Director of Risk Management. Could you discuss the follow-up to the meeting?

Saba: We had a meeting with Kim. She promised that herself or someone else could come to Council to discuss event sanctioning. There might be a chance they would give a presentation, or
we could just put forward the names of councilors who are interested to meet. They haven't informed us which option they prefer.

**Stuart:** Just to follow-up, we've tentatively scheduled a presentation for the first meeting of October. Someone from the University will come explain their goals with what they wish to be done, and how to have a set of working groups and consultations. This is a cross campus thing. We hope to get council in o the ground floor on this. Kishan will be leading this and bringing everyone else in.

**Kishan:** Just to touch on that – you'll see more details on that in my year plan. In the mean time, if you have any questions or concerns, I welcome the feedback so that I can consolidate the issues for whoever comes to council. I will make sure to bring the info to the university.

**Sebastian:** People who were at august council – those questions have been passed along already.

**Jared:** When can we expect a report from the F&S standing committee? There was one due in September regarding Fee Structure.

**Stuart:** We are still in the process of doing this. We had to seek out a lot of technical details on people's feedback. You know how slow the University is about getting back to us on questions. I am adamant that, until we have these details and we have a discussion and the final result is all kosher with everyone, then we will have something done. We will be meeting over the next two weeks or so. I anticipate the final report to be in October.

**Vote:** Unanimous assent.

### IV. Senator, Trustee, Commissioner, Committee & Other Reports

#### A. **Senator Report** – Graduate Student Senator – Ciara Bracken-Roche (no report)

**Ciara:** Received Senate orientation yesterday. First meeting is at the end of this month. I should have a report at the next council. Otherwise, I should be able to keep everyone fully informed.

#### B. **Trustee Report** – Graduate Student Trustee – Adam Ali (report attached)

**Adam:** First meeting of the year is in a month. Should have a full report for October.

#### C. **Commissioner Reports**

- **a.** Athletics Commissioner – Dominic Kucharski (report attached) [absent]
- **b.** Equity & Diversity Commissioner – (vacant) (no report)
- **c.** International Students Affairs Commissioner – Sara SidAhmed (no report) [absent]
- **d.** Social Commissioner – Kyle Curlew (no report)
Kyle: I haven’t filed a report because it was so close after Orientation Week, and my hours were quite over at the moment. The events of O-Week were amazing. Everything but two events sold out. A lot of new and current students came out. Unfortunately the Semi formal had to be cancelled due to lack of tickets sold. The price of everything went up this year, so we had to increase the price to $50. However, I think it should definitely be reviewed for the next year. We also had to cancel an event due to an impending tornado. Some people did go out anyway, and we had a mini-event. Looking to reschedule that particular event. Much larger report for the next meeting.

Ciara: Point of Order: Does the limit on three consecutive missed meetings apply to Commissioners?

Travis: Speaker does not have power to remove Commissioners from their position. They have non-voting positions, but are not strictly Councilors.

D. Committee Reports
E. Other Reports
   a. University Rector – Cam Yung (no report) [absent]
   b. Chief Returning Officer – Vacant (no report)
F. Approval
   MOOTION 09/13/16:4
   Moved: Saba Forbodkia (president@sgps.ca)
   Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)

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

Vote: Unanimous consent.

V. Question Period & Departmental Issues

A. Questions for the Executive (submitted by Korey Pasch):
I ask that the executive clarify the SGPS’s departmental society registration process and specifically the form as found on the website:

1. What is the registration process for? I.e. is it solely an application for official recognition of a departmental society by the SGPS?
Stuart: I am happy to provide this in terms of writing afterwards. The process is simply to get contact information for a number of these departmental/faculty societies, so they can get access to event sanctioning system. The current events system only applies to people running events in these societies; it does not apply to groups outside the sgps. We want to create an application so that we can update every year the contact information for the society. Once the group fills out the form, it grants them access to the event sanctioning form.

2. What does official recognition by the SGPS entail (i.e. is it linked to the process by which departments have seats on Council)?

Stuart: The process is not linked to Council. It just gives us contact information for people running events and allows us to refresh our contact information every year. We do a bad job of people with whom we are supposed to have formalized relationships. The rationale was to create a method of updating annually our lists of executives or contacts so we know who to reach out to.

3. If the registration process provides official recognition for departmental graduate student societies from the SGPS why is it necessary for the SGPS to collect the person information of members of that society?

Stuart: We are not providing official recognition. It is just to make sure that the person submitting events from the faculty society is the person allowed to submit events from the faculty society. It gives us a firm pipeline that recognized groups can designate representatives and get events sanctioned.

4. Why is it necessary for the SGPS to collect results for elections held by departmental societies?

Stuart: Just to update the contact list. Ideally if this was done every year - we don't know when everyone has their elections – we would just keep a rolling list of whomever is the designated contact for the society.

Korey Pasch: I don’t want to take up too much time and we can discuss this later. This comes out of a larger narrative over me trying to register a Softball game.

Stuart: Dept. Society registration process is not actually affording official recognition of any particular dept. Society. Recognition is given under the constitution. For example: the LSS is a recognized group.

Ciara: From what I know, when you fill in your contact information, it has to be your personal contact information. Why would I not be able to use my Queen's email and my contact on campus?

Stuart: Some of these claims for injuries, for example, don't come down for months or years. We just need a way to get in contact with people, so if we’re sued, other people may be kept apprised of the situation.
Ciara: So, for me personally, I know when I leave Kingston, I’ll be losing that cell phone number. My Queens email will be more useful.

Stuart: The purpose is to ensure we can get into contact with people. If someone is hurt at a hypothetical softball game, but the claim doesn’t come for two years, we need a way to contact you. We are trying to fix this.

Korey: Really what this came down to is that... this requirement for personal information... I'm co-chair/secretary of the society, and it actually makes more sense to have this registered to the department, because we are stepping down. My whole purpose with these questions was just to get a clear understanding on record of what this process is for. It was unclear to me based on the form on the website, along with the need to collect electoral results. I appreciate your clarification.

Stuart: I will take a lot of this feedback back, to modify the form itself and include why we want information. We put a lot of these forms out and ask for information, and don't always justify why we want to do it.

Korey: What ended up happening: we didn't get registration and couldn't get our insurance. We ended up getting it with the City of Kingston as a private organizer. This was really frustrating, and I felt like the society wasn't doing my department justice.

B: Other Issues:

Ciara: Our department was broken into on the labour day weekend, and we were not informed about it. The department head was not informed by security. So, all of our offices were accessed – whoever broke in stole the master key. I know QUIC was broken into that same weekend as well. Don't leave laptops in your office. I would love if Campus Security would let people know when this sort of thing happens.

VI. Business Arising from the Minutes

VII. Main Motions

A. 2016/2017 Budget (First Reading)  
MOTION 09/13/16:7
Moved: Stuart Clark
Seconded: Saba Farbodka
BIRT Council approve a first reading of the presented budget (see appendix) for the 2016/2017 year.

**Stuart:** Everything you need in terms of evaluating SGPS finances is in the package. I want to thank everyone from F&S for helping me make this package more accessible this year. I hope we have a discussion about the numbers themselves: Why did they change? What do some of these means? What are some expenses that will come out on the horizon? I wanted to understand what depth Council expects out of the budget process itself. We are trying to find new ways for Council to participate in the main processes of governance, and the budget is a great way to do it. What kind of info do you want? Do you want quarterly updates? At the November GM, do you want a report on the bursary expenditures, etc.? I hope to take all of your feedback and figure out a better process at the end of the day. I am not an accountant myself, and a lot of these statements can be opaque. Anything we can do to help you understand this and make it more useful is something that we want.

**Ciara:** Social events. Does that cover Social and Athletic? How is it divided? I know Social has done more events so far this year.

**Stuart:** It is a combined item. If Athletics runs an event, it goes to that line. The division isn't set, it's how much money we expect to spend on those items. We hope to be monitoring our expenditures in real time this year. We have Sandy now, a skilled accountant, and he can help us get budget information in real time. This way we can correct mid-course.

**Jared:** This is an improvement over last year, visually and in terms of the information presented. Under Revenue, I see the H&D plan there, including the contribution from PSAC. I don't see any expenditures for paying the insurance company for the coverage.

**Stuart:** When we collected H&D money, it comes in to the SGPS and is not in there. When there is a surplus, that money comes back. I'm not entirely sure why that's not reflected in the expenses. I can look into it and give you an answer in writing or bring it to the next Council.

**Jared:** In terms of places I'd like to see an extra level of resolution - executive conferences and personal development. What is the distribution and how this goes to the different members? Is this on-site training or travel for the different members?
**Stuart:** It's my understanding from last year - I think the VPP underwent a HR course. I can present these to you next week. In terms of going for the future, I hope we move towards a departmental budget model, wherein the different commissioners make a programmatic year plan and break down the, e.g., $30k they are going to spend over the months. That way you can hold the year plan and the finances directly to account. We can definitely blow that up and provide actuals. In terms of other information, is there a demand for visual aids? Do you want to see pie charts e.g. on student spending vs. administration? We can go in many different directions on this.

**Adam:** One question. 2015-2016 estimated costs and revenue. Are those estimated as of last September, or made more recent?

**Stuart:** These are estimates as of three days off the year end, as close to the actuals as we can actually get. Sandy will be closing the books this week. Check out the SGPS financials tab on the SGPS website, where you can compare the budgets to the actuals for last year. I think they hit 2/3 for the estimate for bursaries. The numbers leading up to this year are as close as we can get to year end.

**Emma:** Under Interest income/other - between 2015/2016, there was about $22000, and this year only $4200. What is the reason for this seemingly large deviation?

**Stuart:** I am not sure myself. I can pull those numbers directly and bring them next week. It depends on how we fund events, are we charging students. Revenue changes considerably year to year. In the past, different expenses were filed under different line items. E.g. if the executives underwent a food expense at a conference, does that go under Food or Professional Development? It has annually depended on how the books were set up each year.

**Adam:** Just for next week, I am interested in the expenses for bursaries/grants were $18k, and budgeted for the coming year was $40k. Why is there that large discrepancy there? Social events were at $17k for this year, and budgeting $30k for this year. Particularly curious about bursaries and grants. The budgeting for this year seems more in line with previous years. It would be interesting to know what went on in terms of last year.

**Stuart:** One thing Sandy flagged was that the departure of our previous director slowed down some of the programming we did last year. I expect a lot of the speed in which we would spend slowed down during that period. I will bring the exact numbers next week.
Kyle: Just out of curiosity. Is the budget affected by the cancellation of the orientation event?

Stuart: No.

Vote: Unanimous approval.

B. SGPS Departmental Registration and Event Sanctioning Administrative Review

MOTION 09/13/16:8

Motioned: Jared Houston,
Seconded: Christina MacLean

Whereas the SGPS recently implemented new departmental registration and event sanctioning processes that were recently utilized by SGPS members planning events for orientation week;

Whereas there is a need to provide a formal structure to collect and review feedback on the processes so that they can be improved upon in the future;

Whereas a formal review of these processes will help communicate how they serve the interests of SGPS members, despite adding some administrative barriers to member activities;

Whereas a formal review of these processes would help identify areas where efficiencies can be improved as to lessen administrative burdens on members and staff.

BIRT the Finance and Services Standing Committee (hereafter the committee) undertake a review of the departmental registration and event sanctioning processes that were designed and implemented over summer 2016. These processes include:

- The web form used to submit applications
- The criteria by which departmental societies are deemed to be registered
- Risk assessments procedures of student events
- Two-way communications with administrators regarding how departmental societies can make progress toward registered status, and how events could be reorganized as to become sanctioned.

BIFRT the committee solicit feedback from those who utilized the departmental registration
and event sanctioning process, including those who had difficulties or problems with the process, and those who had their applications rejected.

BIFRT the committee solicit feedback from those who administered the processes, as to gain insight as to how administrative burdens of these processes could be reduced, or efficiency improved.

BIFRT the committee include in appendices documentation detailing external constraints, such as our insurance provider’s policies or University policies, that determined or influenced design of the processes.

BIFRT the committee provide a justification for the processes as implemented for summer 2016, and integrate feedback on these process in order to make recommendations regarding how the SGPS should change or improve these processes going forward.

BIFRT the committee report back to Council at its December 2016 meeting.

Jared: I think this was pretty long so it doesn't require much motivation. The question is whether we want a formal apparatus to look at these processes, or do we want that to be done by some other means. I think a formal apparatus will help. These committees have councillors and executive consulting with people. I think this is a good way to go.

Kyle: As someone who has a lot of experience with these procedures, I wholeheartedly support this motion and the ability to assess these new procedures. We've been changing and working with them, but it's been a large mess. It would be better to have a formal process.

Kishan: Jared – I think this is a great idea, we're looking to do it anyways. I don't know if it's the most efficient solution, as we're expecting to receive a presentation from the university. After the presentation, we'd be striking a liaison committee. The current structure is a bit of a stop-gap, so as to allow coverage for events to occur during orientation week and early weeks of the semester. I think this is a great idea, but you'll see in my year plan, this is something we'll be doing anyway. Having something independent of the committee could seem redundant and taxing on SGPS resources. I do not think we should proceed with the motion because of the direction we are planning on moving, to form a committee alongside the university. The university is putting along an initiative to have an SGPS/AMS/University procedure. I do believe this is a good idea, and I hope your concerns are met.

Ciara: Jared - is this to apply to departmental events as well as to SGPS events?
Jared: The intention was to cover the two processes that were brought up in the question earlier. One to get a departmental group officially registered - the other is to have one's events sanctioned so that SGPS insurance covers events.

Ciara: As a follow-up to Kishan, at the August meeting we had a good debate about this topic. We were speaking to the fact that, maybe these processes aren't right for our SGPS body. To what extent can we have our own body that really talks about this as a community?

Kishan: The basis of the program itself: departmentally, that process is to have access to the event sanctioning process. The committee - if we had our own full of council members and interested parties, it would not hold as much weight as the committee going alongside the university. The SGPS used this process as a stop-gap for orientation and the next few months. I think working with the University - they are trying to implement a uniform efficient process - would be the best solution to all our concerns.

Stuart: I think to sum up: our position is that we need to wait and see for a month. It's important we have a discussion about if this system is right at all. If it's something the University brings down on us, since they control access to the buildings. I think we should wait until the university comes and talks to us, and tries to set up their system. We could establish a bicameral model, with a working group with representatives from different groups, and subcommittees with all the interested groups. In 30 days, we could maybe strike our own parallel committee to take the place of this sub-committee.

Korey: I would like to support this motion. What I like is the fact that it focuses on the SGPS event process, which is internal. I applied through the online form to register the Dept. of Pol. Sci graduate student association. I was told I had to provide personal information for insurance reasons. There was also all this other information, which was why my questions wanted to delineate the insurance side and the departmental recognition side. Recognition clearly goes you access to the insurance and sanctioning side. In my conversations with the University Vice-Principal of Finance, Caroline Davis, she circulated a memo on June 16, if it's a student run event, then it is SGPS sanctioning or nothing. If it's a university event, then that's a different question. They explained why they needed to have these processes in place. The softball game I was organizing, was a faculty/student softball game endorsed by the department. This is a grey area, though the official memo has a clear delineation. This motion focuses on the internal processes of the SGPS, and how we want these to go forward, if it falls into the categories that the university has decided. It is important to have this committee, regardless of the university process. We need to have a process that works for us for events that are solely in the purview of the SGPS.

Debra: I want to stress my concern with continuing to further align with the AMS. Graduate students are different from the AMS, primarily in age. I know that the university committee will try to differentiate. This motion continues with our own internal politics, and can be clear about what we are
trying to do and our intentions. Maybe if these two things could be brought closer together, and there were a better way for council members to be included, fine. I think the intentions behind this motion are important.

**Kishan:** To respond to that, I think these are all valid concerns, and the executive has spoken about at our meetings. It is not something we are doing with the AMS. It's something we're doing with the university that the university will also be doing with the AMS. So we are not necessarily doing it in conjunction with the AMS. We will be having our own conversations with the university. If we have our own committee, I am worried it won't be efficient and have as much of an impact as the other committee. We could have both, if council wants. Because right now the SGPS sanctioning process is not a permanent fixture, it's not something we need to optimize for our needs since it may be overhauled in the near future.

**Korey:** I just want to highlight the fact that my application was rejected by the SGPS. I am left in this weird space where, not only did I not have coverage for our departmental softball game, but the ambiguity behind the application on what recognition actually means, I don’t know … the Political Science Society application to SGPS was not recognized, even though I sit on council and the Finance & Services committee, and the Political Sciences society has existed for 30 years. I want this motion because we can give feedback on what types of questions are asked and why they are asked. Is this an insurance application? Is this recognition of our society?

**Sebastian:** Korey, your application was rejected because you refused to provide your address. It is not anything to do with your society. It was because you refused to provide your address.

**Korey:** I am well aware of why Andria chose to reject the application. The application itself conflated my personal information with the actual recognition of the society itself. The reasoning to me was clear. I find it problematic that, in the same application you are asking for my personal information, and I am also supplying the constitution of the society. What I would like to see…. maybe this review process could get into, why not have two application processes? One for recognition of society, and one for particular events that go to insurance? I would like to expand on that... it wasn't just me that had an issue, but other members of our departmental society as well. We felt this information was not actually relevant.

**Kishan:** We appreciate the comments. The basis of the rejection was it did not satisfy the requirements for the process right now. Unfortunately that's the process right now. my comments about the committee I've already stated. This won't be something to deal with the questions of the process right now, but the process is not a permanent fixture. The reason for the process right now is not for recognition, but to show that you have the authority to enter the event registration process.
Ciara: We are speaking about a number of different issues. I think this motion should be passed. This is a conversation I think we need to have amongst ourselves. Why are we doing sanctioning? If we're doing events off campus, why are we giving the university our personal information? I haven't given this information because I didn't want to give this personal information. The spirit of this motion should pass.

Lauren Brick: I am a little confused. I can empathize with the frustration. I've had work emails, and I'm not there anymore. Some of this information needs to be passed along. Whether you are in charge now, you need to be able to be contacted. We need some way to contact you and need your personal information. I think it's worth waiting to see what the university has to say. They have the final say in it.

Jared: As I said - the question is what way do we want this review to happen. Concerns about efficiency are important. The issues of efficiency are the prorogative of the committee chair - they can amend the motion to extend out the day the motion is due. This is all part of the terms of reference of the committee chair, who would be the VPFS. I don't see these as relatively important as whether we have a democratically endorsed process that provides a formal structure to review these processes. Much of these discussions happening now could take place and happen at committee. You have a constituency of people there. A report is produced, and accepted by Council. I see this as a complementary parallel route to the discussions going on through the executive. We need a democratic discussion going through.

Adam Ali: As the Trustee, often times communications in terms of when things will happen gets set for certain dates and those get pushed back and pushed back. I am for this motion - it allows us as SGPS to proactive in the process. There's nothing to say that, if we have a meeting with the campus, whatever committees come out of that can come out of this committee. What this allows us to do is to maybe have some research done beforehand and have some questions ready. It can be dangerous at times to allow those at power to come meet with you, because it is in their power to control those meetings. Whenever I hear things about universalizing and efficiency... this is a great thing to do if you are an administrator, it usually misses the diversity of different members. I think striking up a committee to prepare something that voices the diversity of experiences that we have, presented to us by main campus, can be more proactive as a council and membership. I am very much for the motion. I think this is also a great opportunity to move into the year. Jared has spent a lot of time on it, and I think a good level of support from the executive would be appreciated.

Stuart: I like that idea a lot. there's nothing to say we can't just designate this committee as a committee that comes out of the subgroup of the university process. I think a committee set up with the customer service side of the process is a good thing and we've done our jobs at the end of the day.
Vote:
In favour: (all but one)
Against: One

C. Extend Submission deadline for September 20 Council meeting  
MOTION 09/13/16:9

Moved: Stuart
Seconded: Saba

Whereas the deadline for submission to the second September meeting of Council coincides with the first September meeting of Council

BIRT the Council submission deadline for the September 20 meeting to be moved from September 13 at 4PM to September 15 at 4PM.

Vote: In favour – unanimous.

VIII. Other Business

IX. Notices of Motion & Announcements

X. Adjournment

A. Adjournment  
Motion 09/13/16:10
Moved: Saba Forbodkia (president@sgps.ca)
Seconded: Stuart Clark (vp.finance@sgps.ca)

BIRT this meeting of SGPS Council be adjourned.

Vote: Motion passes.