



**Agenda**  
February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

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.

**SGPS Council Open Forum: Student Fee Referendum (5:30pm)**

**Adam:**

Obert Kingston urges to deratify the vote, we were short on the votes by about 50 votes

The 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority vote in SGPS passed by no debates

The AMS had similar changings in their voting projects, they only require 2/3<sup>rd</sup> for large projects

Other schools do a 50% majority you should do it to

Opert strongly supports changing the 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority threshold and wants the deratification of the previous vote

To have all refereudm fees on the ballot and to reform the voting

**Nick**

All 3 of those measure are good

There were such minor fee increases and its awful that it didn't go through

The bus fee should pass, it sucks that it didn't pass

We ask everyone to vote against it

We thought people would have kept the bus pass, if they knew exactly what they were voting for



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Our representatives need to get the word out

If all this fails, we have to get another movement to get it back

And as for the JADAC its a lot of money, we have to make sure the money is well spent with ideas like green space solar panels

Jenny speaking for Courtney

I will not be able to be here, I use the bus all the time I cant stress how bad this will be and how I wont be able to attend feincing practice

Carlaina

Im extremely concerned about the results, majority of graduate students rely on the bus ass to get to the campus, it offers freedom to run errands for students

The referendum question was ambigiously worded

A bus pass is a necessity for students that live on the outside

Anonymous

Im unsure who my representative is so Im emailing you here

By sending the question back properly worded, students will make a different decision

Because of a medical condition Ive lost my license and now I need the buses, it is terrifying if I cannot use it

I think I speak for many when I say that I thought the bus fee increase would be the only thing that would increase



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Jarred moves to add the motion after G, note the following motion will only come forward if the top vote fails, let us have a re referendum for Obit

Structurally the same but apply to walkhome fees (after H)

Both added



## I. Adoption of the Agenda

---

### A. Adoption of the Agenda

**MOTION 13/02/18:1**

**BIRT SGPS Council adopt the Agenda for the February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Council Meeting.**



## II. Executive & Speaker Reports

---

### A. Executive Reports

- a. President – Adam Grotsky (report attached)

SGPS council I the legislative body of the SGPS

I thank you all for your engagement

Welcome to the incoming vice president of the SGPS – Leo, Issabel, and Abel

Welcome Alex Disilka, the new Rector

There has been some unfortunate news in the SGPS, we had a turnout of 36% which is the highest in record

5 fold updates

1. if you haven't done yet, vote for the JADAC you have till 8 pm
2. both vice presidents are coming along, we will have names by after reading week



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

3 tomorrow Cathleen Wyn will be coming to campus, im moderating the Q and A

You can have a lot of questions and opinion on how the province can improve

Finally im open to criticism but I have seen things that are equal to harassment,

These are tough times, thank you all for your engagement

- b. VP Graduate – Stéfy McKnight (report attached)
- c. VP Professional – Russell Durward (report attached)
- d. VP Finance & Services – Lauren Peacock (report attached)
- e. VP Community – Tyler Morrison (report attached)

#### **B. Speaker Report**

- a. Speaker – Jennifer Williams (oral report)

You have all seen what has happened with the elections and we will discuss that later

Our 36% this year is very successful compared to last years 6%

I want everyone to speak up and represent their department, not your personal views

There will be points today where we talk about specific items, I will keep everyone on track

I will echo Adam on harassment and say that we have to recognize each other as humans, with that, do we approve the council

#### **C. Approval**

**MOTION 13/02/18:2**

**BIRT SGPS Council approve the Executive and Speaker Reports.**



### **III. Senator, Trustee, Commissioner, Committee & Other Reports**

---

- A. Senator Report** – Graduate Student Senator – Alexandru Sonoc (report attached)
- B. Trustee Report** – Graduate Student Trustee – Adam Ali (report attached)
- C. Commissioner Reports**
  - a. Athletics Commissioner – Lindsay Ruitter (report attached)
  - b. Equity & Diversity Commissioner – Rosie Petrides (report attached)



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

- c. International Students Affairs Commissioner – Atul Jaiswal (report attached)
- d. Social Commissioner – Martyna Kamela (report attached)

#### **D. Committee Reports**

#### **E. Department Reports**

#### **F. Other Reports**

- a. University Rector – Cam Yung (report attached)
- b. Chief Returning Officer (oral report)

Voting went really well,

#### **G. Approval**

**MOTION 13/02/18:3**

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



### **IV. Question Period & Departmental Issues**

---

#### **Questions from Alexandru (Graduate Student Senator) to Adam Grotsky (President)**

1. What is the Health Fund and how can it or cannot be used?
  
2. How does the executive decide on what the health plan covers and costs? How does it consult with council? Are these formal processes with a set procedure or does it change year to year with the executive?



### **V. Business Arising from the Minutes**

---



### **VI. Main Motions & Discussion**

---

***Election Ratification***



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

**A. Ratification of the Election Results: Vice Presidential Candidates    MOTION 13/02/18:4**

BIRT that SGPS Council approve the following results of the Vice Presidential elections:

Vice President Community – Isabel Luce (55.2%, contested election)

Vice President Graduate – Leo Erlikhman (89.2% yes, acclamation vote)

Vice President Professional – Lauren Peacock (93.6% yes, acclamation vote)

Vice President Finance & Services – Abel Hazon (95.8% yes, acclamation vote)

**B. Judicial Committee Recommendation re: Presidential Election**

**MOTION 13/02/18:5 (1) & (2)**

Note: (1) and (2) will be voted on separately.

Please see statement attached, released February 9, 2018.

“Recommendations by the Judicial Committee to SGPS Council:

1) To host an SGPS Presidential Election during the February 13<sup>th</sup> SGPS Council meeting, as per our previous statement; and

Adam says he will vote against this – the council said that they would nullify the results of the election → in response to that I say that while I respect the separation of powers \i was uncomfortable with the lack of transparency, from why the judicial committee cancelled the election

They have also recommended again that the council should set the president

We had a turnout of 36%, we don't want to now say thanks for your votes but they don't matter

Adam says we should have a by-election

People say that the transition will be affected by the by-election, I don't think so, because both candidates are on the council, they don't need too much time to learn

Recognizing that the judiciary and council are closely linked, I see that as an insufficient way to choose the next leader of society, so I say that we should have a by election and not the council vote

Leo:

Disagree with Adam



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

In requesting the statement to the judicial committee, there was a note that it could have been released to the committee speaker

There is supposed to be separation of powers, Adam should not be involved in this as a member of the executive

You have been selected by your departments as representatives  
The president needs training and vice presidents have to wait as well until this presidential thing is resolved

We are a body that can select this role, I want us to move forward

It was a very tight race in the election, the elected body and select the president when a crisis occurred

Chris  
Questions about the judicial committee

We should know when the overspending occurred and that is information that we need

That is an aspect that I have been uncomfortable about

The reason for the initial find is to prevent overspending to stop council members from buying their positions – if they use a fine, that is not an advantage because the member is still buying their position

→ The committee said that it is hard to assess an unfair advantage, hard to say how dollars transfer to votes, that's why the judiciary said

Sean representing the Electrical and Engineering department

- One issue with holding another election with the same candidates is that all students have an idea of who won that election and if the judiciary nulled the election, then students get the impression that the only reason the election results are thrown out, then it is the fault of the person that won the election

If you put it to the vote again, people have questions about okay what does that mean for

Norman

We will be voting very blind, overspending could be on accident or on purpose,  
I didn't even see a sign poster for elections, where is the money going



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm

McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

→ Each campaign is allocated a 100\$, and they get reimbursed up to a hundred dollars

David

- Voting blindly or blindly enough, the results were out beforehand, if we do want to have confidentiality, this wasn't transparent enough
- There is too much confidentiality in terms of numbers, how much overspending was involved, can that be revealed?

Brittney

- The judicial committee overstepped, that is punitive to voters not just candidates, we have to go to a by-election
- It seems like not everyone is aware of this, the information has not been forthcoming, it's not clear to the student body

Leo

- There was a gap in policy
- To move forward with another election, that gap is not fixed
- We have to insure that the policy is good for future elections
- If we push forward for another election will be unwise, it is important to say that every member here is responsible for their SGPS members
- They are acting regularly on what their members
- This is just a way for the SGPS to move forward
- The judicial committee spent multiple hours, it wasn't a decision to remove the rights of students, it was an independent

Adam

There was a comment made about affecting the vice president

We didn't start our transition until late March last year,

During the leave, I can personally help with the vice presidents

I want to clarify that while I questioned the transparency of the decision, I did not question the decision itself

I thought it was my duty to get more transparency for students but not the decision itself

Another factor on students voting blindly, those questions are not answered by having council vote, because the council has the same questions

We have less than half the department representatives here





### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Chris

When was the last time they changed the reimbursing amount of 100\$

Emily

I've recieved many people from the law students who says that it is unfair to place the vote of the student away

Our council has the same problems that a majority bi lateral vote would have

I don't see how I can represent an entire faculty that is dvided on this issue

Dan

Department is very confused about this issue, they have read the statemet but say that more details are needed to the magnitude of the violation

If they don't have enough information to vote, then I don't have enough information either

- Im not sure how councillors will be more capale o removed their bias than students

Norman

Even if we go the bi election or a re vote, if we don't know who did it

David

If im to understand it is that the punishment should be a slap on the wrist, and moving forward we can have an honest election

Sean

We have the ability to pick the next president, if we are increasing powers of council, ususalyl we hold elections council should not be voting to choose the next president

Next speaker

Elections are a process and invormation are a big role, what would matter for me is the policies that we get from the candidates

If we have a debate with the candidates we will be able to get more information on the candidates

John for department of geography

Ask whetehr or not council has the ability to cancel the nulifictaion

Britanney

The nulifciation cannot be overturned



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Matt

I think that I'm one individual in a faculty of 80 people, I don't feel like I've had enough conversation with my constituents to give me that vote

A by-election would allow things to go smoothly and to let the students feel that the decision is made by them

- An overspending of 5\$ or 100\$ are different

Rules are there to make things fair

Adam

Respond to one comment

Council is in a better place to decide rather than 2 paragraphs, there is a 7 day campaign with debates and students have online options as well

There is a lack of information for us to make decisions

I would encourage that we reject this recommendation and to go for a bi-election

2) To task the Bylaw and Policy Committee to review policies described in this statement, among others, and bring forward amendments at the March Council meeting."

#### **C. Alternative Recommendation re: Presidential Election**

**MOTION 13/02/18:6**

Note that the following motion only comes forward if the motion in B is not approved by Council.

Alexandrew

- We have a massive accomplishment with the election turnout,
- I was disqualified from a senatorial position, because it was a minor infraction that I had.
- We send this back to judiciary to say either disqualify the candidate, or to just let the elections stand

Adam

We need to respect the finality of the judicial decision, respect the fact that the judiciary had this option and didn't take it, it is our jobs to move forward from not, not to send it back



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Sean

We need to have a bi-election

Jarred

Is this a motion to refer back to the judiciary, is this in order or not?

Adam Ali

If we send this back to the judicial committee, they cant reverse their own deicions,

→they could reassess their decisions

Dan

Hoping that this wont be public humiliation

Alexandrew

- Proceedings in the judiciary are confidential what more infomrtaion could we get

→ The judiciary can decide how many question to take in

David

Can we vote on the Bi-election and vote separate to the release of more infomrtaion



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

BIRT SGPS Council approve a by-election for the Presidential candidates Stefy McKnight and Tyler Morrison, to be held on March 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup>, with a campaign period from March 5<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup>.

#### **D. Graduate Student Trustee Election**

**MOTION 13/02/18:7**

BIRT SGPS Council approve an election for the Graduate Student Trustee position, to be held on March 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup>, with a campaign period from March 5<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup>.

David

Why are we doing this?

→this is a first position for it, nobody wanted to run for it

### ***Student Fee Ratification***

#### **E. Student Fee Referendum Policy Amendments (Appendix A)**

**MOTION 13/02/18:8**

BIRT SGPS Council approve the attached student fee referendum policy amendments, as detailed in Appendix A.

Adam Ali Amendment

To approve motion E, 61% is a strong commitment from students, they shouldn't have to  
It would apply immediately, not just starting next year

Leo:

We raise it to 15% to make sure that the majority of the forum is in favour of any motion  
I'm requesting that because we had a great election turnout year and that historically we are really bad

To ensure we have a large enough forum, we need 15% of the forum to vote for it to work

Adam

I assume that this applies to the JADAC vote

The 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority is arbitrary



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Leo

As much as people do not like how people supported the 2/3<sup>rd</sup>,

Groups now have to campaign to get our interest because of these votes

There is no perfect number, but we need to see that 2016 as a precedence

- When you say 2000 people can decide for the entire council, that is outrageous
- We need to talk about how to get people to campaign

Sean

I think it's a good idea to bring this threshold down, I think the discussion needs to happen for non-mandatory fees, but for mandatory fees we need the high threshold

Lower income students are less likely to vote, so we need a higher threshold for those fees, so that those fees are not forced upon people

Brittaney

We should change it to a 50% majority

Correy

2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority encourages a lot of competition and it gets people to campaign

- Requiring a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority puts more effort on companies to campaign

The JADAC is a bigger issue, it has to be taken into account, it is an important decision, - we need a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority

Maria

- The 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority, it is unrealistic to have a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority
- 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority is not letting things to be made



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Lindsey

Sounds like 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority promotes campaigning

I think that some groups have more capacity to campaign than others

Smaller groups are disadvantaged

Adam Ali

The idea of a level of even paying field 100\$ is a 100\$, companies will not be spending more money than other ones

The grassroot groups we are talking about they tend to help students of colour

Im not in favour of the 15% increase to forum

Paulina

In terms of optional fees, I don't see a problem

I agree with Adam these organizations are optional, if you don't agree with it you can opt out

- Why should it be higher than a 50%

Leo

I was torn on this originally, now I feel like opt out fees should get the same strict guidelines against them,

But all the mandatory fees need to be brought up to the students constantly

These are not small fees, they are significant fees, we need the 15% corrum

→new friendly amendment that no corrum for non mandatory fees



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Alexandrew

We have to make our voices known

Brittaney

I'm against increasing the corum, it is foolish to be with it

Raising the corum is premature, people that don't vote, that is their choice

We can talk about arbitrary numbers but that is not a thing that we should consider

Jarred

Proposal on how to structure a debate, people who want simple majority and those that want different majorities

We can reduce threshold down

→split the two in half, where we separate the discussion 1<sup>st</sup> one being should we discuss the 50% majority, now should we discuss the 2<sup>nd</sup> part as the corum

Adam

It has been deemed friendly that the corum of 15% applies to mandatory fees and not non mandatory fees

David

I wish that the referendum results were different

But the image that the image that it would have on the SGPS is very poor, these results came back, we decided to change the goalpost and it would apply

- **Id** feel like that it would be wrong to apply them to these years, to take out the immediacy,
- **That is** an amendment



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Adam

Says no to the amendment, it is not friendly

We are arguing about whether or not we should apply a 50 majority starting now, that would mean that we believe that the 2/3<sup>rd</sup> has failed us

That is what I'm concerned about and I would encourage you guys for supporting the motion

Walk home failed this term, there are better ways that we can mechanize the means for campaigning

- Maybe having a requirement for the spending, you have to spend 75\$ and that will be reimbursed
- Oport campaigned very hard and deserves to have to pass this year
- This is unfair to the fees that we have voted on we should omnibus this motion

Correy

- This question of if something should be 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority to 50% majority
- The reason why 2/3<sup>rd</sup> exists is that enough people are represented
- The question of whether or not we have changing the voting structure – it seems like we are doing that in order to get certain things to pass

Kayla

- There should be a 50% majority and it should be taken into effect immediately
- We need to adjust this and fix this and want it immediately

Rick





### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

- I don't think we can lower the threshold when we have already seen the results of the referendums

Maria

We need to look at the result and see do the result serve the need of the students

Students want money and they vote against it but we should decide what is right for the students at a whole

Leo

- Setting this up the way it is, we will have a 50% corum and we are discussing two separate issues
- Representing student body is an issue
- As a body that represents the whole, we have to look at all things

For non mandatory fees, people can pull themselves out

- If you want to say that we have to impose mandatory fees n students then we better have a large majority to do so
- Say you live in Toronto for the summer, you don't want to pay for the bus pass

Shift in the amendment by Leo

Leo: opt out fees can be 50%

But mandatory fees need more discussion on them

Brittney

I would disagree, mandatory fees is about a wide rage of other fees

Shane

This proposed structure by Leo makes sense by making smaller chnges to the by—laws that we already have



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

With Leo's we say mandatory fees would make sense structurally

Adam

I would say that a big part of this debate is because of the bus it fee

This is an essential service

90\$ to have a student fee for buses and 900\$ for the 5 months pass

Tyler

It makes sense to move in increments

We remove 2/3<sup>rd</sup> for opt out fees

And then we do the mandatory fees

The second part of leos motion would deal with bus it, the corrum section

It seems logically this way makes sense

Shane

I think that the big problem is that the lack of information that the students had to the question, it was much more critical that

Emily

This is about the order of the motion

People that have good faith would not be able to order it in Adams way because they don't have the option of backpeddling



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

**Leo:**

Recommend everyone to vote yes to discuss one issue at a time

First we discuss a 15% corum for the mandatory fees

Kayla

We had a high turn out this year, is there any way that we can maintain this high level of voter turn out

Britanney

People that didn't vote chose not to vote

Emily

I agree that if you choose not to vote you are making a choice, however there is a corum is so that people are not going to sway the vote, if a small minority can set the corum

Adam Ali

What comparative data do we have on this when it comes to mandatory fees

There are differences between opt out fees and mandatory fees

The example was that law students can get together and decide something for themselves

Mandatory fee is that it affects everyone

Contextualize the difference between mandatory and non mandatory fees



### Agenda

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

#### Adam

An example that works well is that if I wanted to pass the JADAC, I could have not promoted the JACAC fee, I could just get law students to decide both sides

There is a new system for people to vote and that is increasing voter turnout

All signs point to that we will see a higher voter turnout

Right now there is no corrum for fees, in those areas its always 10%

#### Leo

Difference for opt out fees is you can opt out

To contextualize why 15% works is to say that 15% is 700 people. That is a large number of our memebrs, when you want to say 10%, 50% plus one of 10% of our population, that is 250 people

- Having a higher threshold is a good thing, because for mandatory fees that you cannot dispute, there needs to be an accurate representation of our student sample
  
- It is a supermajority and you need corum to challenge it to be representative of the student body

#### Shane

**Amendment option** – I propose that we start at the 15% number, if it doesn't pass we drop to 10, if that doesn't pass we vote to 5

- Friendly of 10%



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Yasmine

Why 5% is out

Also to say to stop referring to council as guys

It is the groups that are asking for an opt out fee, it is the job of the sgps to see that our voices are heard and that our voices are heard

Brittey

Everyone that could vote can vote

Things go on a ballot, everyone who is a emmeber can vote on the ballot

We cant count on you to choose when to

Stehan

Adam asked about how a mandatory fee is decided or established, it is decided by the group putting the fee in for the referendum

Gabby

Iam structurally underrepresented

It is problematic to disregard those that are structurally underrepresented

Lindsey

We all have an opportunity to vote, saying that 100 people

People can access the email service,



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

- F. Ratification of the Bus-It Student Fee Results** **MOTION 13/02/18:9**  
BIRT SGPS Council approve the following Bus-It Student Fee results:  
“Do you agree to an increase in the Bus-It (Kingston Transit Student Pass) mandatory student fee from \$68.30 to \$90.00, an increase of \$21.70?”  
  
Fee did not pass 2/3 majority vote in referendum (Yes: 48.4%).
- G. Alternative Recommendation re: Bus-It Student Fee Results** **MOTION 13/02/18:10**  
Note that the following motion only comes forward if the motion in B is not approved by Council.  
BIRT SGPS Council approve a re-referendum of the Bus-It student fee, to be held on March 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup>, with a campaign period from March 5<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup>.  
  
The question would read: “Do you agree to continuation of the Bus-It (Kingston Transit Student Pass) mandatory student fee for \$90.00? The student fee has been increased from \$68.30 to \$90.00, an increase of \$21.70. Failure for this question to pass the referendum will result in the loss of the unlimited student bus pass for Queen’s Graduate & Professional students.”
- H. Ratification of the OPIRG Student Fee Results** **MOTION 13/02/18:11**  
BIRT SGPS Council approve the following OPIRG Student Fee results:  
“Do you agree to the establishment of an optional student fee (subject to individual opt-out) of \$4.66 for the Ontario Public Interest Research Group – Kingston?”  
  
Fee did not pass 2/3 majority vote in referendum (Yes: 61.8%)
- I. Ratification of the Walkhome Student Fee Results** **MOTION 13/02/18:12**  
BIRT SGPS Council approve the following Walkhome Student Fee results:  
“Do you agree to the establishment of a mandatory student fee of \$20.16 for the Walkhome program?”  
  
Fee did not pass 2/3 majority vote in referendum (Yes: 43.3%)

### ***Budget Matters***

- J. Change to SGPS Fiscal Year** **MOTION 13/02/18:13**



### **Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

Whereas the SGPS fiscal year currently runs from September 1st to August 31st of the following year. Since the SGPS executive takes office in May, any expenses or projects begun prior to September are counted against the budget for the last executive.

Whereas a change to our fiscal year end to April 30<sup>th</sup> would reflect the change in Executive and allow them to work within their 'own' budget for the full year of their term.

Whereas such a change would allow the outgoing and incoming VPFS to work collaboratively on the budget in February & March for council approval in April with the outgoing VPFS bringing almost a whole year's worth of experience and support to the incoming VPFS on how our budget works

Be it resolved that SGPS council approve a change to the SGPS fiscal year, contingent on approval from the Canada Revenue Agency.

#### **K. Updated Budget Approval (Appendix B)**

**MOTION 13/02/18:14**

Whereas the SGPS required a revision to the previously approved budget due to the unexpected loss of \$120,000 the SGPS receives each year from PSAC 901. Please see 'Revised Budget 2017-2018 – Supporting Documents'.

Be it resolved that SGPS council approve the revised 2017-2018 budget.



#### **VII. Other Business**

---



#### **VIII. Notices of Motion & Announcements**

---

The next Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 13<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 PM (McLaughlin Hall, JDUC).  
Motions for the February Council meeting are due by 4:00 PM on Tuesday, March 6<sup>th</sup>.

The SGPS Winter General Meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 27<sup>th</sup>. Motions and reports are due by Tuesday, February 20<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 PM.



#### **IX. Adjournment**

---



**Agenda**

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 - 5:30pm  
McLaughlin Hall, JDUC

**A. Adjournment**

**MOTION 13/02/18:15**

BIRT this meeting of SGPS Council be adjourned.