



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

CSU Regular Council Meeting – Minutes

Wednesday, February 11th, 2015

H-767, 18h30, Hall Building

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

- a) Appointment of council secretary

3. Approval of the Agenda

4. Consent Agenda

- a) Approval of the Minutes – January 28th Council Meeting
- b) Reports from Committees
- c) CUSACorp Report
- d) Executive Reports

5. Presentation and Guest Speakers

- a) Student Housing Project

6. Appointments

- a) Appointments
- b) Chief Electoral Officer



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

c) Loyola

7. Returning Business - Substantive

a) Reggie's

8. New business - Informational

a) Clubs Financial System

9. New Business – Substantive

a) Election regulation changes

b) Reggie's/Hive referendum question

c) Financial reallocation and indexation referendum questions

d) Health/Dental plan referendum question

e) Health/Dental plan admin fee by-law change

f) Privatization of public services referendum question

g) Greenhouse project referendum question

10. Question Period & Business Arising

11. Announcements

12. Adjournment



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

CSU Regular Council Meeting – Minutes

Wednesday, February 11th, 2015

H-767, 18h30, Hall Building

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting is called to order at 18h46

We would like to acknowledge that Concordia university is on the traditional territory of the Kanien'keha:ka (Ga---niyen---ge---haa---ga), a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst nations. Concordia recognizes, and respects the Kanien'keha:ka (Ga---niyen---ge---haa---ga) as the traditional custodians of the lands and waters on which we meet today.

2. ROLL CALL

Executives present for the duration of the meeting were Katherine Bellini (VP Clubs & Internal Affairs), Charles Bourassa (VP Student Life), Jessica Cabana (VP Sustainability), Anthony Garoufalos-Auger (VP External Affairs & Mobilization), Benjamin Prunty (President), Gabriel Velasco (VP Loyola), Terry Wilkings (VP Academic & Advocacy) and Heather Nagy (VP Finance).

Councillors present for the duration of the meeting were Terry Ngala (Independent), Scott Carr (JMSB), Nicholas Mouzourakis (ENCS), Caroline Messier-Gemes (JMSB), Jeremy Blinkhorn (Fine Arts), Jenna Cocullo (Arts & Science), Emily Fisher (Arts & Science), Lucinda Marshall-Kisparissis (Arts & Science), Marion Miller (Fine Arts), Angelica Novielli (Arts & Science), Matthew Palynchuk (Arts & Science), Marcus Peters (Arts & Science), Thomas Radcliffe (Arts & Science), Vicky Rodgers (JMSB), John Talbot (Arts & Science), Chloë Williams (Arts & Science), Jeremy Tessier (Arts & Science), Emma Wilson (Fine Arts), Jason Poirier-Lavoie (Arts & Science) and James Tyler Vaccaro (Arts & Science).

Councillors absent for the duration of the meeting granted reprieve were Gemma Acco (Arts & Science), Rami Yahia (ENCS) and Maylen Cytryn (JMSB).



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Councillors absent for the duration of the meeting not granted reprieve were *Taimur Tanoli (JMSB), Faddy Kamel (ENCS) and Michael Richardson (JMSB).*

a) Appointment of Council Secretary

Caitlin Robinson sends her regrets but unfortunately, she has severely hurt her wrist playing soccer and is in a cast for a solid month. Nonetheless, she tells me that she is doing better and she says hello to everybody.

But in the meantime, **Cassandra Fehr** has generously offered her help tonight and so we will need a **motion group pointer** for the duration of the meeting.

Vicky Rodgers appoints Cassandra as secretary for the February 11th 2015 Council meeting.

Seconded by **Chloe Williams**.

VOTE

No objections – unanimous vote

Motion carries.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Requests for excusals:

- **Michael Richardson:** I will be unable to attend the meeting tonight, I have just been called into work due to a colleague calling in sick and will likely finish very late. Could you pass along my regrets to council and my request for excusal on my behalf.
- **Gemma Acco:** My aunt asked me to watch my cousins from 4-9. I have to watch the baby when the siblings are at karate practice with their grandmother. When the others return, I have to bathe them and put them to bed. My aunt and uncle are on vacation so I can't even reach her to tell her that about the council meeting. Do you think council will give me an excusal? I'm pretty sure I already missed 2 council meetings



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

- **Jeremy Tessier:** I will be unable to attend until after 8:15, I'm applying to grad school and my supervisor requires that I attend seminars on Wednesdays from 6-8:15. I would like my absence to be excused by council.
- **Rami Yahia:** unfortunately I won't be able to make it to the meeting tonight, I haven't been feeling well for the last few days. I have flu like symptoms. I spent the day in bed trying to recover.
- **Taimur Tanoli:** I will not be able to make it tonight. I am competing in the ethics case competition. My team and I are currently working on the paper for submission. It is a prestigious competition which focuses on ethical practices in business. Thank you for your understanding. I am requesting an excuse for a previous meeting – I was not aware of the excusal procedure (that I had to submit a formal request to be excused) and I was away in Toronto at a case competition. If council could excuse this, It would be appreciated

Chair: council may consider a retroactive request for excusal. It requires $\frac{3}{4}$ of the majority vote. It must be stated clearly as to why the absence was unforeseeable and the reason why a request for excusal could not be submitted prior to the meeting.

MOTION 1

James Vaccaro moves to excuse everyone and also move to excuse **Maylen** who is sick and will be emailing you soon.

Seconded **Nicholaos Mouzourakis**.

Proposed amendment that **Anthony Garoufalidis-Auger** be considered in the list of excusals because he has to leave around 8pm to work on the coalition fundraiser being launched tomorrow. He is the spokesperson for this fundraiser.

Seconded by **Benjamin Prunty**.

Friendly amendment.

John Talbot: according to the bylaws, **Taimur** should not be excused. I have brought this up last time and the time before. We have to stop just excusing people for not being here all the time. We did it all year and I just wanted to bring that up and if everyone wants to vote along with this, that's fine but I won't.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Terry Wilkings (POI): In Jame's motion, was he moving to excuse everyone from today's meeting including retroactive excusals?

James Vaccaro: yes I am moving to excuse everyone, including retroactive excusals as well as Anthony.

Scott Carr: I call the motion into question

Benjamin Prunty (POI): was there a motion to split?

Jeremy Tessier: I did not make a motion to split

VOTE – MOTION 1

In favor: 6

Opposed: 8

Abstentions: 7

Defeated. (Brings us back to the current speakers list for Motion 1)

John Talbot proposes an amendment (**AMENDMENT MOTION 1**) to the previous motion to excuse **Maylen, Gemma, Jeremy, Rami, Anthony** but not **Michael** and **Taimur**. Excusals are for those who are sick or caught up with children.
Seconded by **Matthew Palynchuk**

Vicky Rodgers motivates for why **Taimur** must be excused on a retroactive basis and current absent. You have to understand that case competitions make the name and reputation of the John Molson School of business. Which means it is even more important than a final or mid-term for the students competing in those case competitions. Those are extremely awesome learning experiences and this is why I believe **Taimur** should be excused by both of these council meetings.

Scott Carr: why is **Gemma** being excused if it was considered work? I don't believe that separating the reason why their absent (sick versus other) is good because then everyone will just start calling in sick.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Chair: Just to contextualize, the standing regulations include classes, tutorials, study groups, other academic events that are not mid-terms or final exams, homework, regular work, vacation. These are all in the standing regulations as non-justifications for excusals.

John Talbot: it just seems **Gemma** got stuck in a situation that she didn't prepare for. It's an actual child and its family. I just want to abide by the standing regulations and keep in with what I said earlier.

Benjamin Prunty: if people are lying, they can be caught. I think its bad faith to assume people will lie. Let's choose to either be an open friendly council or just follow our roles strictly.

Caroline Messier-Gemes : I just want to confirm that the actual competition is just like a final exam and the preparation for it should be considered as a mid-term.

Jeremy Tessier: that could be argued for everyone because we all have school related activities like presentations, year- long projects that count for marks; many visual arts students have projects instead of actual midterms or finals.

Scott Carr: a podium at a competition guarantees you an A+ in the class. A lot of times, you get the case and you only have a certain amount of time to submit your proposal so it's like an extended final. So I would have to say that the competition is like the final.

Matthew Palynchuk calls MOTION 1 into question
Seconded by **Benjamin Prunty**.

RE-VOTE MOTION 1

In favor: 14

Opposed: 3

Abstentions: 2



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

VOTE AMENDMENT MOTION 1 (motion to excuse Maylen, Gemma, Jeremy, Rami, Anthony but not Micheal and Taimur)

In favor: 14

Opposed: 1

Abstentions: 3

Motion carries.

Chair: let's move on to approving the agenda.

Gabriel Velasco: Eliminate the judicial board point and replace it with the Loyola committee. Eliminate number 9F and to move it point 9I and making it informational rather than substantive (8a).

James Vaccaro: would like to pull out appointments Feb 3rd again please. I can be the first point on Point 6.

Chair: If there is nothing further, I would like to make a comment. In the standing regulations point 53 actually dictates a different procedure than what we have been doing lately which is actually the general procedure for senate. By approving the agenda of any regular meeting of Council, all of the items contained under the Consent Agenda are duly adopted by Council excepting those items removed from the consent agenda as per article 57. Which means that once we vote on the approval of the agenda, there is no need for us to then approve the "consent agenda" point.

Chair: Let's move to a vote for the new agenda

VOTE

In favor: 17

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1

Motion carries.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Chair: which therefore also covers point 4) Consent Agenda.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

a) Approval of Minutes – January 28th, 2015

Ratified by consent.

b) Reports from Committees

Ratified by consent.

c) CUSACorp Report

Ratified by consent.

d) Executive Reports

Ratified by consent.

5. PRESENTATION AND GUEST SPEAKERS

a) Student Housing Project

There was a very informative presentation by Nancy Neamtan (CEO) from Chantier de l'économie Social. (For further information, the powerpoint is available on the CSU website).

Recap from last council meeting when Terry Wilkings spoke about the Student Housing Project:

Hello everybody, I am very excited to let you know about the housing project the CSU is embarking on. Here is a quick overview; in September, the CSU commission and organization called UTILE provided a feasibility study for us looking into the viability of the CSU to begin producing cooperative housing for students. The study took several weeks to complete. In November, they came to council meeting to give a presentation. During this presentation, they went over the outcomes of the feasibility study,



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

specifically reviewing the development models and funding models that the CSU can choose to go ahead with.

In terms of development, there is the classical conversion of residential units or initial infrastructure which can be converted into affordable housing for students.

The alternative is to have new construction. There are positives and negative to each scenario. However, I feel it was pretty well explained in the document, given the complexity of students embarking on such a project. Seeing this as a ground breaking initiative, I describe it as our most ambitious one because it has the ability to influence the discourse at a municipal level. Montreal is a student city, we have 400 000 students and unfortunately, there is not a high level of policy on student housing. There is a complete inadequate supply of housing for students provided through Universities. For example, there is less than a 1000 housing units provided through residences at Concordia. Therefore, we are faced with a lot of students being exposed to the unfair tenant and expense market. This is known due to the reports and surveying done by the CSU's HOJO. Recently, there was an investigation done by the Journal de Montreal talking about how international students in our province are paying a lot more for rent as well being asked to pay illegal deposits, being asked for personal information, financial information, among a host of other problematics. So I think it was important to have the opportunity to view this document.

Additionally, there were some financial models that were outlined; one option is where the CSU would be providing equity for the development of cooperative housing units. In simple terms, we would be providing hard money to a single project and the wiggle room that would be provided through this option is one where we would have different payback schedules. However, that would put more pressure on the more traditional loans that we would have to procure from the down payment we would be putting in the equity.

The second funding option was the loan option. It is very similar to the equity option but instead of providing hard money, you are providing a loan. So in the end, the CSU would be receiving that money back. This allows us to create a situation where there could be first ranked loans and second ranked loans. So the CSU would be the second rank loan.

The 3rd option would be to create an investment fund for providing affordable housing for students. This scenario was the one outlining the capacity to expand and the ability for us to produce more housing for students. This is a lot more innovative.

Following that presentation in November, there was a referendum question: Student Housing – [*Do you as a member of the Concordia Student Union approve the continued prioritization of efforts being made to address student housing conditions and actively support student cooperative housing as a student space initiative?*] Surprisingly, this question received the highest amount of support from the student body. It received 89.8% support. You can't underscore how overwhelming that number is. It gave me the confidence to go and speak to external organizations that could act as institutional investors. When we look at our income, housing eats up a significant chunk. Your disposable income is a direct function of how much you pay for housing. So this is really about increasing the living standards for students while they are at Concordia.

Following the election in January, Ben and I were able to meet with the CEO of the **Chantier de l'économie Social (CES)**. They run a trust and this trust, last year alone, invested 13 million dollars in social economy enterprises. CES is funded by the federal government, however, they are completely independent. We discussed the outcomes of the election and the direction we would like to take this



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

project moving ahead. So Nancy Neamtan will be coming to our next council meeting and talk about the collaboration we would like to embark on.

At the moment, we are determining the scope and the scale of this partnership with the CES. The reason for that is because in the constitution of the chantier, it exclusively states that they cannot transfer finances into another fund. So if we are looking into exploring and moving ahead with the 3rd option, then there should be some perimeters set on how much they will be collaborating with us. So at the moment, we are fine tuning those things. Simultaneously, the chantier is validating the model that was presented to us for the 3rd funding option. This means just going through the financial format (building cost, operating cost, and the cost of the payment schedule). Therefore, I feel like after they have validated the model, I will be able to get some discussions going regarding what the collaboration would look like specifically. That will be taking place prior to the next council meeting. Ideally, Nancy will be speaking of the potential partnership we will be having with the CES. The reason why me and Ben felt it appropriate to approach the CES is because they have an explicit mandate to promote and support new projects, specifically social enterprise projects. Therefore, they really emphasize continuous support in a long-term sense.

Question Period following the Housing Project Presentation:

Scott Carr: Thank you. I find social financing really interesting. I was just curious – If I understand clearly, you are taking the discount rate and dropping it because communities are really involved which will uphold it and reduce the risk, correct?

Nancy Neatman: we are trying to offer financial product to communities and we've learned how to analyze the risks. They think that If we invest money in environmentalists and socialists that somehow we are throwing our money out the window. If we analyze it from the perspective that banks use (looking to see who will be the next bill gates), yes it seems risky. But we've developed a guide; how do you analyze whether a community project is a good one to invest in. We ask ourselves what do communities want to do and how can we leverage capital in a way that will allow democratic control to continue. Short-term return investment and control is often what we see but we are doing something different here. We might not be rich but we don't experience loses either so it comes out to be a very good investment.

Scott Carr: How do you calculate risk in this situation? What are your risk factors? Because I think a lot of the students are going to be asking; what is the risk in this?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Nancy Neatman: in real state, the risk is so low. What matters is making sure that the project is being run properly by the students. That no one is running off. The risk is that there might be a few people who invest money with the goal of turning it into their own project and creating a certain prestige out of it. So we have to make sure that we evaluate any investors, make sure we are transparent and clear, and that the figures balance and that we get a decent return on investment.

Vicky Rodgers: is the return on investment going to atleast be equal to inflation?

Terry Wilkings: absolutely.

Vicky Rodgers: in regards to the housing bubble, if it were to burst within the next few years, how would it impact this project.

Terry Wilkings: since the whole purpose of having co-op student housing is to have it removed from the speculative housing market, you are then in fact reducing your exposure to the bubble. We also have to keep in mind that the student housing we will have are never going to go on sale. Our purpose is not to increase the return on investment. We are trying to provide permanent student housing.

Vicky Rodgers: I believe that we are currently at the peak of this bubble, therefore as a student, I would be afraid of over paying for the piece of land.

Terry Wilkings: it's difficult to determine when there is a peak or not. If that was the case then everyone would be able to hedge and level their investments according to the housing bubble. Apparently, the housing market has been suffering for the last decade. So I understand your worry and we recognize this and have considered such things like introducing extended payment periods etc. But the factors in our model have been analyzed by financial specialists and includes risk mitigation regarding possible risk factors such as the housing bubble.

Scott Carr: What is the dollar savings for students? So what is that social dollar impact and how many of Concordia students are going to be gaining from that dollar. So my question is how much money are we putting up versus how much social reward are we getting?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Terry Wilkings: our definition of affordable is aiming the rent at 80%. We are looking at making it as affordable as possible. Based on our research, students live in plateau, NDG, southwest. We are probably not going to do the plateau because it is expensive. I am sure you can understand and appreciate that. Its 80% of the market median and since the rents are tied to inflation, that 80% market median goes down over time. So in 10 years, it could be 75% of the market median. In terms of the number of students, we are looking at 100-150 students in its first project. To be put into context, Concordia has 7-800 beds and they've been at it for 40 years. In our first year, we'd like to create 100-150 beds.

Scott Carr: can we get a projection of the dollar amount?

Terry Wilkings: they were included in the appendix (20 pages) that will satisfy the inquiries you are making at the moment. I will send it to you later.

(MOTION 2) Terry Wilkings moves to vote that the General Election P.U.S.H Fund question gets put on the ballot; *The CSU would like to set up an autonomous revolving fund dedicated to supporting the need for student housing with an explicit mandate to create affordable cooperative housing for students in Quebec. The establishment of such a fund would be conditional on giving members of the CSU exclusivity on its first project. Do you as a member of the Concordia Student Union approve the reallocation of approximately 15% (\$1,850,000) of the Student Space Accessible Education Legal Contingency fund (SSEALC) to create the Popular University Student Housing fund (PUSH)?*

Seconded by **Chloe Williams.**

Terry Wilkings: creation of an investment fund to create the capacity to establish more than on housing project at a time. Social returns will increase over time. This fund will seek external organization that would act as institutional investors. The Chantier has expressed their willingness to collaborate on projects and financing the fund up to 1.5 million dollars.

James Vaccaro: why did we mention Quebec and not Montreal in the question?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Terry Wilkings: The reason for this is so that when we are seeking institutional investors, we have the ability to get support from investors all over Quebec. If we make it exclusive to Concordia, I can't see there being any large impact funding.

Scott Carr: I am just curious as to why we are pushing this question forward without any significant information regarding how the money will be invested? Students should be informed on how this money is managed and what is used for. I feel the question to be ambiguous and it doesn't provide the students with a clear understanding of where the money is going.

Benjamin Prunty: there is a lot of clarity to this question. Essentially what's important is that the students will be getting 100-200 student housing out of it. We are working on the research campaign that will accompany this question. In regards to the government and how the money is managed, this concerns more with external institutional investors and not necessarily the students.

Terry Wilkings: right now, we are discussing whether this question will go on the ballot. But between now and the election, we will have extensive communication with students and we plan on providing all the details and spreadsheets as well as FAQ regarding the purpose of the fund. There is great validity in making sure that the students are informed but for the purpose of this meeting, we are discussing whether this question goes to the election or not.

Marcus Peters: I would just like to say that I am totally in favor of this. There is nothing wrong with wording and I understand why Quebec is written instead of Montreal.

Benjamin Prunty: In regards to communication, we did a clubs fair and made it mandatory for them. The first test round of how students would take it was very favorable. It's a once in a life time opportunity that is being presented to us. Now we are at the point of execution but of course it's up to students whether they want to spend money on this.

Vicky Rodgers: I have a problem with the word "approximately 15%". Approximately 15% is not clear. So I would be weird about voting.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Terry Wilkings: The reason we put approximately 15% is because the value of the SSEALC fund changes every day so we just want to be clear that when we put an amount such as 1.85 million, it's approximately 15% of what is currently in the space fund.

Vicky Rodgers: I think a better way of writing it would be: do you approve to have 1 850 000 which represents approximate 15% of the student fund.

Benjamin Prunty: the authority of wording would be up to the CEO so if you would like, you can approach them and talk to them about it.

AMENDMENT 2 to MOTION 2 James Vaccaro moves to amend the previous motion regarding the P.U.S.H referendum question where the parentheses around 1 850 000\$ should be removed and instead, *approximately 15%* should be put in parentheses. In addition, the “(approximately 15%)” would follow “1 850 000\$”. Resulting in the referendum question being: *The CSU would like to set up an autonomous revolving fund dedicated to supporting the need for student housing with an explicit mandate to create affordable cooperative housing for students in Quebec. The establishment of such a fund would be conditional on giving members of the CSU exclusivity on its first project. Do you as a member of the Concordia Student Union approve the reallocation of \$1,850,000 (approximately 15%) of the Student Space Accessible Education Legal Contingency fund (SSEALC) to create the Popular University Student Housing fund (PUSH)?*

Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers**.

James Vaccaro: Just to touch on Scott asked and on what Ben responded, I would like to say that the executives are looking at this question from the inside of the bubble. We are all in the bubble but you guys specifically because you are dealing with this daily and you know the ins and outs of it in detail. When you say create affordable cooperative housing for students, that is clear to you, but if I am a student that is uninvolved with school politics and simply vote after reading this paragraph, I wouldn't get out of it what you are really trying to get out. So I suggest we just take the time to add some information to the referendum question and indicate more information on the fund in the question. It's important to discuss that the SSEALC fund has been around for a long time and has collected money over the year. Indicate what the SSEALC fund is.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Terry Wilkings: we are planning on providing the raw document of the feasibility study. We are also planning on talking to the media. We also have the opportunity to place the scripters and motivations for questions in a separate binder at the polling booth. So we will be communicating with students at the booth. As of early next week, there will be a lot of available information for the students.

Scott Carr: I'd rather be overly communicated than under communicated directly on the question. Indicate how many houses on the question. Indicate that you plan on putting up x number of houses which will lead to x number of savings. No doubt that I believe you guys will be very communicative with the students, but in regards to the question, it's important that it is clear and concise and being able to provide the basic information to students when they read it, would be only beneficial.

Benjamin Prunty: I ran all the questions that we have. Everything has been approved by our lawyer. I actually think that students are very capable of informing themselves and that they often do. I noticed last time that there is a large variation between yes and no votes which is an indicator that people are making informed decisions. I think we can only do so much and we don't need to hold the students hands. When it comes to the writing of the question itself, we don't want it to be biased. If the CEO doesn't think it's clear, then I'm sure it will be changed. But at this point, we can only speculate.

John Talbot: collaboration and discussion with the CEO is very important. But also, I actually have a lot of faith in the executive to get this out to student and media. Now they have someone willing to support them so heavily financially and that says a lot about how the community is willing to help.

Marcus Peters: just for my understanding, most of the discussion of this question has to do with the wording and not the actual substance, correct? Because if so, then the CEO can oversee that and at the moment, we have a motion on the table so how about we proceed with that.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

VOTE MOTION 2

In favor: 17

Opposed: 1

Abstentions: 4

James Vaccaro: did any discussion take place about reallocating the money outside of the SSEALC fund.

Benjamin Prunty: yes this is possible.

VOTE AMENDMENT to MOTION 2

In favor: 17

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 2

Motion carries.

Gabriel Velasco moves for a 15 minute recess
Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers**.

Meeting enters recess at 20h13

Meeting reconvenes at 20h42

6. APPOINTMENTS

a) Appointments

James Vaccaro: I just want to mention something regarding the standard of appointing a CEO. Firstly, I don't think that running it through the appointments committee is smart. It is the third most important position in the union and it should be done through council. It allows for us to see the candidates, ask them questions, etc. Secondly, I also believe that the appointment committee minutes



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

we were provided do not give us enough information/background on the candidates.

Gabriel Velasco: we have spoken about the process and we thought committee could look at the list of candidate and choose to interview the strongest one. If it was close between 2 or 3 candidates, we would send it to council. But if we feel someone is really clear and special, then we would just strongly advise council.

Chair: standing regulations on appointments.

Terry Wilkings (POI): is **Andre Marcel** involved in the hiring process of the new CEO?

Gabriel Velasco: yes he would like to be part of the process because he felt his experience would help.

James Vaccaro: council was provided with a shortlist of 4 candidates that were interviewed. Did you interview more?

Gabriel Velasco: no we did not. We sent out a callout and we shortlisted 4 and out of those 4, we are making a recommendation to Council that **Mohamed Nasser** is the most qualified candidate.

Benjamin Prunty: both perspectives are valid but at this point, I think the ship has sailed. I will have to check with the standing regulations but it is a possibility that we appoint a CEO for this year (conditional appointment) and perhaps revisit this appointment sometime during the year based on his behavior and whether he is doing a good job. That aside, I'm very confident the appointment committee has been solid in the hiring process of CEO.

James Vaccaro moves to go into closed session
Seconded by **Scott Carr**.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

VOTE

In favor: 15

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1

Council goes into closed session at 20h40.

Council is in open session at 20h58.

Vicky Rodgers: I don't have anything to say

Benjamin Prunty: I'm comfortable with the recommendation that has been put forward.

Heather Nagy: I just wanted to say that the piece of the puzzle that makes this recommendation legitimate is that Andre Marcel was there and he made a good recommendation. This on its own, is solid gold as far as recommendations go.

James Vaccaro: Although I don't think that discussing candidates in open session is appropriate, and I think this might be the first time I have ever seen this done at CSU council...so good time for firsts. I don't think Mohamed Nasser is the best candidate for the position of CEO for 2 reasons. First reason being that he is graduating this semester and the most important thing a CEO can have is experience. The experience one gains from one election to another is extremely valuable and serves this organization very well. I think that someone doing one election and then graduating is problematic. We would have to go through the hiring process again next year and hiring an inexperienced CEO all over again. I would like to clarify that this does not mean that I find Mohamed Nasser to be a bad candidate, he was the DEO and he ran an entire election. He is clearly able and has the recommendation of the past CEO. My second reason as to why I believe him not to be the ideal candidate is because he is an executive of a club at the CSU, the Muslim Student Association. And after our BDS by-election referendum question, which made national headlines and newspapers all over the world, I don't think that it is appropriate to have an executive of the MSA as our CEO. I do want to make a point on Terry's earlier comment about how



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Muslims and Palestinians are not inherently related, but I do think it is important to recognize that this will appear as a completely problematic appointment. I don't think that club executives should be appointed as CEO's and I think that should be adjusted for in the standing regulations.

Benjamin Prunty moves to go into closed session
Seconded by **James Vaccaro**.

VOTE

9
1
4

Council goes into closed session at 21h03.

Council goes into open session at 21h18.

Chair: I would just like to remind council that a motion was passed during closed session.

James Vaccaro: I would like to clarify the fact that it is incredibly problematic for councillors in this room to try and pressure someone's speech to conform to a certain way by requesting to go into open session, where media is present, with the hope that they will lessen their argument or wash it down and not have it be as potent as it could be because media is present. I think the debate that we are having is not happening because we are behind closed doors, and there are veils and daggers and all that horrible stuff, but the debate is present because we are discussing the prime concerns of individuals and candidates. Therefore, for the future, I do think that finances and candidates should be discussed in closed session.

James Vaccaro moves to approve the motion passed in closed session.
Seconded by **Jeremy Tessier**.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

VOTE

In favor: 15

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

b) Chief Electoral Officer

Rendered obsolete given the discussion in point 6 a).

c) Loyola

Gabriel Velasco: I just want to say if there are any other councillors that are interested in joining the Loyola committee, this is the time.

(laughter)

Gabriel Velasco: no? okay.

7. RETURNING BUSINESS - SUBSTANTIVE

a) Reggie's

MOTION 3 Benjamin Prunty moves to approve a maximum of 5000\$ for the purpose of hiring a structural engineer for the Reggie's project and that this amount be taken out of the SSEALC Fund.

Seconded by Scott Carr.

Benjamin Prunty: it is important to get this approved because it was not in the original proposal.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Kate Belini: further motivate – when we spoke to you guys about the proposal and we approved the honorarium and the fees of the architectural firm, at the time, the reason why we chose that architectural firm is because they are engineers and architects together. We are going to destroy the wall to create natural lighting and build a window. Therefore we need a structural engineer who will give us more information concerning the creation of holes in the wall before the construction phase. Because it was not in the proposal, we are bringing it to council to have it approved. It should be less than 5000\$ but since we are presenting it to council, we want to make sure everything is covered.

Benjamin Prunty: we did not send this out to council before the meeting because we didn't have confirmation on the cost but now we do. Essentially, we are on a deadline, if you want this by September, we do need to get moving. Everyday counts and we need to be efficient.

James Vaccaro: when removing money from the SSEALC fund, does it not require the authorization of the fund committee?

Benjamin Prunty: yes it has been discussed with the Fund committee.

VOTE MOTION 3

In favor: 16

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1

Motion carries.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

8. NEW BUSINESS - INFORMATIONAL

a) Clubs Financial System

Presentation by **Kate Bellini** regarding the changes and improvements made to the Clubs financial system.

Heather Nagy: the use of contracts between the CSU and club members for events has been a really big plus for us. In terms of taking in revenue from clubs, it's been very positive. When they do make any kind of revenue, they want to give it to us so we can hold it in a bank account for them to use. The clubs seem to be a lot more comfortable and empowered in the way they do things. In regards to handing them actual money, at the moment, we do not do that but it can be discussed.

9. NEW BUSINESS - SUBSTANTIVE

a) Election regulation changes

Terry Wilkings:

- In the last CEO report, there were several recommendations given to us. Upon these recommendations, the Policy committee met to discuss these, whether it be changes made to the standing regulations or reiterating the deed to recognize certain procedural delays that haven't always been respected.
- **Harassment Policy:** the CEO requested a more articulated statement about how harassment should be considered unacceptable. This was *added to Regulation 298*.
- **Ballot counting:** we did recognize that having individuals working on the day of the election when the polls close can lead to 12-16 hour days which then can increase the potential for human error. Therefore, we moved the *announcement of official results and ballot counting to the Friday following*



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

the closing of the polls. This is reasonable considering the polls usually close on Thursdays, therefore eager candidates and committee representatives will have to wait. Another point – the margin of victory was initially less than 5. This is correct according to the standing regulations. We have changed this *margin of victory to 50.*

- **Media Specialist:** it was recommended to us to hire a media specialist who will be in charge of promoting the election which would hopefully increase turn out. We have decided that instead of a media specialist, the *DEO will be in charge of this.* Why? Because the DEO will be able to provide information regarding the election to students which will allow an increase in informed voting turn out.
- **Receiving information from Council in a timely manner:** we definitely agree with this. What usually takes place is that we modified some rules in accordance with stringent deadlines that we had to face. But nothing prevents the ability for councillors to drop their position from council at the last minute. This was an issue in the past by-elections. Therefore, what we can do is have the *chair remind the councillors that if you know that, after the drop deadline, that your schedule will not fit with elections, then to please drop out earlier.*
- **Appeals, complaints and contestations:** this was deliberated on quite vigorously. We believe that if an individual is severely breaking procedures and provisions of the standing regulations then this candidate is not fit to represent other students on the board. Therefore, we included a provision that said that, to the discretion of the CEO, if an individual, if an individual has several broken the rules, they may be rendered ineligible to run for office in any CSU by-election or election for one calendar year. This grants the authority of the CEO is applying disciplinary measures.
- **Elections committee:** it was recommended to us that maybe there should be a separate elections committee. We disagree with this and believe that *the policy committee can be extended and a position could be offered to anybody who feels they would like to make electoral policy changes.*
- **Election period end dates:** new material nor can previous material be added after the campaign period has ended. This is already in keeping with the standing regulations currently in place.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Marcus Peters: I thought that after the January meeting and the CEO proposing the idea that there would be no restrictions on social media during campaigning, I'm not sure why it is not okay anymore? Could you expand on that?

Terry Wilkings: I think it's important given the more recent contentious by-elections, that we diffuse any tensions that may be going on during the polling period. And we didn't want any aggressive online campaigning to spill over into the real world polling, because the CEO was very adamant about not campaigning outside. We also didn't want to disadvantage folks that maybe only came to school on one of the days of the ballot and what if that is the first day and there is all this new information coming out during the polling period. We don't want to create this incentive to wait till the very last minute to vote. And that is what we felt could arise if this recommendation had come into play. After discussing with Andre Marcel, we agreed that this was an acceptable middle ground. I also feel that going ahead, nothing prevents us from further modifying the rules but for now, this seemed like an appropriate measure that would address the media concerns but also leave room for possible future modifications.

Lucinda Kiparsis: I just want to add to that and say that part of the concerns were also how difficult it is to keep track and manage all the campaigning going on offline as well as online. It's a big job. And by putting in place a certain timeline where online campaigning can occur, it actually makes the job easier. It's also fair that campaigning during the polling period should be restricted for offline as well online.

Matthew Palynchuk: another reason was that the person standing in line can't be addressed by a person running the campaign during the polling period. But then if the person can just open their phone and see things being posted about the election online from the person who is campaigning, what is the difference? It is essentially the same thing. "Vote for me" in person is the same thing as "vote for me" being posted online. This issue was really discussed at length at the meeting and it's important how Terry mentioned that this would be fluid given that social media is becoming something that is so giant, that maybe instead of trying to restrict it, we can look into ways in which we can adapt it according to what voting is and what polling is. But this still needs to be discussed.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Vicky Rodgers: would it be possible under this new regulation, would it be allowed for campaigners to come to the CSU during polling period and letting them know where the public can find more information on them (example: a website they created)?

Terry Wilkings: the CEO currently has an elections website and also a facebook account, so they are definitely informed students as to where they can get more information. Also, it is important to note that nothing prevents websites that are affiliated to campaigns or referendums from staying online. We are not asking people to take down any information that was given during the campaigning period, we are simply asking them not to add any new information once the campaigning period has ended. This also goes for printed media.

b) Reggie's/Hive referendum question

Benjamin Prunty: the question has been looked over and approved by the lawyer in terms of legal regulations.

Benjamin Prunty moves to approve the Reggie's Hive Referendum question
Seconded by **Terry Ngala**.

(MOTION 4) The referendum question is: The CSU has been working on a project to completely renovate every aspect of the Reggie's bar and the Hive Cafe on the mezzanine of the downtown campus for the past year as major renovations are considered a structural necessity. Given that we cannot know the final cost of construction until the project is completed we are only capable of providing an estimated range of costs for approval. The CSU feels as though a final approval of an expense of this size should be decided by the membership. Do you approve of the CSU using between \$1,200,000 and \$1,800,000 (which is between 10-15% of the Student Space, Accessible Education & Legal Contingency fund), knowing that this is an estimate and that the expense could realistically vary beyond the ranges specified above once the final construction costs are known?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Benjamin Prunty: this has been a long time coming and it's great to finally get an estimate of the cost and put it to referendum. Yesterday, we brought it up at clubs event and there were a few initial reservations about the changes being made to reggies. Some students expressed worry that reggies would be completely different from what it was before. Yes the esthetics will be different but we plan on having it be "membership run" and easy for students to access in terms of government. We finally have some visuals as to what it will look like. We presented it at the clubs event and they seemed really happy about it which is great.

Scott Carr: if I understand clearly, there is no limit being put on this?

Benjamin Prunty: we are limiting ourselves in the sense that if we come out afterwards and spent way more money than we stated, then we are clearly being dishonest. This is our educated estimate and regardless of whether or not we put this vote to students, the case will be the same – we won't know the exact cost until renovations are done. So with this question, we are just giving the ability to students to comment on it.

Scott Carr: so the answer is that you are not putting a limit on it?

Benjamin Prunty: we are currently not putting a limit on it.

Scott Carr: Thank you. So my next question is then why are we not putting a limit on it, even if it is high, at least it is there. The way the question is written is saying that if we need to do continuous improvements, we will and spend the entire amount of money. This is something that is absurd and should not be entertained. My second question is when you say "renovate every aspect of reggies and the hive cafe", to what extent does renovation and operation fall into each other?

Benjamin Prunty: This question has nothing to do with operations. So that is the extent as to how much they have to do with each other. There will obviously be operational costs that are involved when operating a business. In regards to the question regarding limits, I think we are an organization with integrity and if it goes far beyond the amounts that we put then the right thing to do would probably be to cease working with those firms because the estimation they



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

originally gave us was extremely wrong. Essentially we would have to make a decision on it no matter what. I would like to think that we are an organization with integrity.

Vicky Rodgers: why don't we put a limit on it like 2 million dollars and if we do happen to exceed that amount, we can go back to the students and ask.

Benjamin Prunty: we honestly can't put a limit on this. The way that I personally think we should present this to the students is: these are the numbers that we know and if it happens to be over, say 3 million dollars, that it means Reggie's will not be open for probably another year. And as a board, we have the power to make a decision on this already, so asking the students is not a necessary step, legally speaking. Honestly, I think that the students want this project to be done as soon as possible. And if we limit ourselves to 2 million then it becomes illegal to go beyond that and we'd have to wait till our next election or by-election before we can address the question. The only way for us to know the final cost of construction is once it's done so we are kind of in a conundrum. All we are trying to say is "look guys, the scope of this project is huge and do you want to spend this much money on it or not?". There is no trickery in this whatsoever, we just want to involve students in this decision. We want Reggie's to be back up and running but we don't know how much it will cost so we are being very transparent in letting them know that.

Vicky Rodgers: when is construction supposed to be completed?

Benjamin Prunty: so far, it's on track to be reopened in September. We would like it to be open during orientation.

Marcus Peters: Heather, I don't really remember going over this at Fincom, did we go over this?

Heather Nagy: no

Marcus Peters: on the subject of the integrity of the union, ambiguity and transparency of the question, I'm going to have to go with what has been previously stated, because if I were to look at this outside the bubble, as a



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

student, and see “in between, beyond the ranges of”, I would view this as ambiguity and would not be entirely comfortable answering the question. I understand that these are measures that are necessary and put in place to try and create a system of transparency between the student union and the students but I’m also not sure of all the complications surrounding Reggie’s but I would definitely feel more comfortable if there was a ballpark figure. And if it exceeds the figure, we will be asked again. The question could even maybe indicate that there will be constant financial updates on the situation. This would make me feel more comfortable in regards to this use of ambiguous language.

Benjamin Prunty: if people really want to put a limit on this then I will not be held responsible if it exceeds it. In the end, we can either ask or not ask the students but I think students just want it done. And in the end, we are being as transparent as we can be. I don’t think we want to put a limit on it and then later on, encounter the possibility that we might not be able to increase it, even though we do have the money for it. We’ll end up with a half constructed Reggies.

Marcus Peters: I just want to say that I am more so just uncomfortable with the wording. The wording makes it seem a lot less transparent than you are describing now.

Benjamin Prunty: could you please clarify which parts are unclear exactly

Marcus Peters: just when you use terms like “at least” and “Estimate” and “

Benjamin Prunty: Okay. At this time, we generally know that the costs are estimated to be 1.46 million, plus or minus 25%. That is why we chose to put between 1.2 and 1.8 million. We know that it will cost **at least** 1.2 million. That is roughly 10-15% of the money we have. And in regards to why we say “estimate” is because that’s the truth, it really is an estimate and it can vary. And if we didn’t put that in there, we would actually be less transparent. We are literally just showing them all the variables and asking them to make a decision.

Heather Nagy: the reason why we can’t put an absolute limit in this question is because this project is such a huge undertaking and it would be very limiting to us and our union abilities in regards to achieving our goal of getting Reggie’s back.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Even though the decision making power of the SSEALC fund remain within the council, it is a referendum question because we want to increase transparency to the student membership. And unfortunately, yes, this kind of weird language is us just being honest and transparent. Also, there is going to be a campaign surrounding this referendum question therefore a lot of information offered to students. The student body is already aware of the Reggie's project and very excited about it. So this question just lends some feelings of empowerment to those voting, in that they are part of the decision making process.

Terry Wilkings: everything that Heather said. There will be a campaign and we are here to offer detailed conceptual support. The concept is do students want to move ahead in opening Reggies. I'm pretty sure they do and we are trying to provide as much detail as we can.

Scott Carr: I think the issue with this transparency thing is that you are saying you are going to do it with no idea how much it costs. Because if you were to tell them that it might cost every penny in the fund that you have created, they may stop and think twice. So if there really isn't anything to help estimate these costs, which is kind of absurd...

Benjamin Prunty (Point of privilege): But this is the estimate. This is the estimate that has been given to us by professionals.

Chair: if you want to go back and forth, that's fine. But for the last time, that is not a point of privilege. Next time, I am simply going to shut down whatever the person is saying on that subject.

Scott Carr: so the point of saying that there are no way to estimate costs and when people estimate costs and it could possibly be an 1.8 million dollar building, is scary. There is always a range you can stick with. But if it comes to the point where there is a certain cost, we probably should be stopping the project because it's getting absurd. I don't see this project costing more than 2 something million dollars. If it is, then we have a serious issue in which we have contracts with the University where if it would be costing that much, it's because something happened with the University that probably shouldn't have happened. I do feel like there is an underlying issue here when you say you don't know how much its



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

going to cost and therefore you leave it open ended. I just don't think it's us doing our due diligence by saying that we have no way of knowing how much it will cost.

Benjamin Prunty: Ya so we can put a limit on it if you really want but if that binds us and then we can't go beyond that limit, then there is no way of us finishing the Reggie's Project. And I don't think that the overall cost is going to be outrageously different than the number that was given to us. I mean, if you really want, add limits. But it really doesn't seem like a good idea.

Kate Bellini: Scott, I understand your concern, however I think that maybe there is some information missing that maybe I can help with. It would not be transparent to provide a number that we invented. We will only know the final amount once we approve the conceptual phase and we hire a construction firm who can review it and then provide different estimations. But at this time, we don't have any viable data that can help us create an exact range. It would be damaging to the project to create boundaries when we don't have information to back it up. As of right now, the information we have is that we know the magnitude of the project which is 1.46 million dollars. We don't know the rest of the costs because as you know, construction is always delayed for several reasons. There are always things we might not have foreseen. Just recently, we found out that to have a hut, we need to bring the ventilation system outside, which means that the kitchen has to move back a few feet. And this kind of thing that we cannot plan in advance and has additional costs. As of now, we approved the honorarium phase, we approved the project itself in its conceptual design phase and now we are trying to move forward and reach the actual construction phase where we can come back to council and discuss the project as it is with all the details. As has been suggested by the project managers, by the architectural firm, by the facility managers, by the engineers, and by the asbestos consultant, everybody strongly encouraged us to create a 25% margin. We don't even need to bring this to referendum. We are doing this simply to increase transparency and matches the desires of the students. These students have expressed that they want an upgrade to this bar and we need to make sure this bar is functional and working for 10 years minimum. With all of this said, I would like to strongly motivate to move the referendum question as was presented by Ben.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Scott Carr: I understand what you are saying. It sounds like we are going in blind and relying on the Tender offers from the individuals with no real understanding with the issue of time sensitivity. We need individuals with an understanding of the costs, because we clearly don't siting around this table. We are dealing with a multi-million dollar issue and this is not the best process to follow.

James Vaccaro: in response to Scott, the numbers I think, are a result of the consultation with institutions and staff and there is a cost break out associated with it. I think that it's a shame that council was not provided with documentation on ongoing projects all year long. I think that is something you should probably look at. Another thing I wanted to say is that the document that was sent out to us has a version of this that was not the same, it says 1.85 million with a 25% margin, and Ben is talking like it clearly stipulates 2 amounts, correct?

Heather Nagy: the adjustments have been added to the Facebook group and yes, there is no longer the "25%" at the end, there are 2 amounts (1.2 and 1.8). That is the range and that is why the lawyer asked us to add "At least".

James Vaccaro: okay earlier you said the estimate was 1.46 million so let's say 1.5 million plus or minus 25% range. So why don't we just take that number and include a 25% range around it. If it costs more than that, I think there is clearly a problem. It's not like we are building a super hospital and oh wait, it costs 100 million dollars more. Let's just give ourselves a very large margin in which we hold ourselves accountable. This is going to alleviate concerns of students in regards to the costs being left open ended.

Matthew Palynchuk: I think the idea of it being arbitrary because I think creating a threshold would be somewhat arbitrary. It might make the students uneasy when they see an even larger number and they think "Oh my God, it could cost this much? Then maybe I don't want that".

Vicky Rodgers: As a councillor, the 2 most frequent questions that I receive is the BDS campaign and "when is Reggie's opening? When is it? When is it? When is it?". And I'm starting to get sick and tired of trying to answer this.

Heather Nagy: I don't really know what can be said that hasn't already been said. I do want to say one thing to James; thank you for bringing up the super Hospital,



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

that was funny, I really liked that. But in regards to what we just voted on regarding consulting a structural engineer was not in the proposal at all. And now we just voted to give this person the honorarium. But it's possible that it ends up costing more. So we have these situations where we receive an assessment and it ends up costing more. At the end of the day, the ultimate thing with me is that if we end up putting an ultimate value on this, it ties our hands in order to not achieve this project. I feel that then we would really be letting the students down in seeing this project through.

Terry Ngala: I think that students who are not in math or engineering, the more numbers we put, the more intimidating than it looks. Yes I think we should be transparent and provide all the information but let's not make it more complicated than it has to be. I think 70-80% of students will probably read through the question one time and I think what we have now is pretty clear.

Emily Fisher: I do believe that everyone here at this time is trying to act on the student's best interest. That being said, I don't believe that we should exhaust funds unnecessarily, then again I don't think the costs will greatly exceed what is already indicated. Have faith in the CSU and how they make decisions. We all want the same thing so have faith in the CSU and the professionals involved.

Gabriel Velasco: I am recommending that we call this into question.

Benjamin Prunty: Essentially, the options we have is that we can add a limit which would really tie our hands. If the students disagree, we could go to another referendum. Or, we could just decide for ourselves that we not going to referendum which would be way less democratic.

Marcus Peters: let's just let the questions go to referendum and the students will vote. And im sure that any questions the students have, we will have too. And we can trust the integrity of the campaign and that they will answer any questions.

With that being said, **I call the Reggie's referendum into question.**

Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers.**



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

VOTE

In favor: 10
Opposed: 1
Abstentions: 0

Chair: the question has been called. Those in favor of the motion, please raise your placards.

VOTE (MOTION 4)

In favor: 10
Opposed: 1
Abstentions: 3

Motion carries.

c) Financial reallocation and indexation referendum questions

Heather Nagy: Okay so I sent out the final numbers in an excel document. I hope everyone got a chance to look over it. This is something we have been talking about since the beginning of the year. The CSU will benefit greatly from a change in how the fee levy is structured. We ran an overall deficit this year but if we were to follow the restricted fund accounting model that was proposed last year that we still haven't moved into, we would have a deficit in our operation budget and a surplus in advocacy for example. Our main goal here is to put a motion through about passing the referendum question. Final tweaks about cents per credit, I mean, there is some room for manoeuvring but I am confident that the numbers in the document are the final numbers that should go forward on the referendum question. The preamble for the referendum question does need a little bit of tweaking in regards to grammar and punctuation. We can work on that. So without further a due, I will read them out:

(MOTION 5) Heather Nagy moves to approve the financial reallocation and indexation referendum question

Seconded by **Jeremy Tessier**.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

REFERENDUM QUESTION REGARDING FINANCIAL CHANGES PREAMBLE: The CSU is changing its accounting system towards a restricted fund accounting model for the purpose of increasing transparency and this requires changes to our fee levy structure. The CSU will also be substantially reducing the administration fee that it charges to students for the Health and Dental plans. As a result, CSU's available funds can no longer support its current operations without changing the allocation of the fees that it currently levies. The changes listed below will neither increase nor decrease the fees levied from students on behalf of the CSU, but will allow for the CSU to maintain its current level of operations.

QUESTION: This is the current organization of our fees:

General Operations: **\$1.75 per credit**

Non-Academic Clubs: **\$0.25 per credit**

Student Space, Accessible Education & Legal Contingency Fund: **\$1.50/credit**

Advocacy Centre: **\$0.30 per credit**

TOTAL: \$3.80/credit

Are as a member of the CSU you in favour of the following reorganization of the fees currently levied by the CSU, effective for the Fall semester of 2015:

CSU operating fee: **\$1.97/credit**

CSU Advocacy Center fee: **\$0.21/credit**

CSU Housing and Job Back (HOJO): **\$0.20/credit**

CSU Legal Information Clinic (LIC): **\$0.17/credit**

CSU Clubs: **\$0.25/credit**

Student Space, Accessible Education & Legal Contingency Fund (SSAELC):

\$1.00/credit

TOTAL: \$3.80/credit

Heather Nagy: I just want to say that we did not include the IEAC in our fees because it was effectively taken out this winter semester so even though we have been in contact with them and financial services and how it's going to be worked out, we are still in a transition phase. After speaking with the lawyer, it was decided that it would not be smart for us to include that in the question, as we don't currently collect that at this point.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Chair: would you like to motivate?

Heather Nagy: not really, I feel like I have been motivating this all year. We know that the CSU ran an operational deficit last year and the year before that. And the year before that, there was a 50 000 surplus which isn't much. We need to secure the financial sustainability of this organization, as it is the accredited student representation at Concordia University.

Benjamin Prunty: I just want to say that for those who are very familiar with the bylaws, this would be a break from our current bylaws, so after this, the typical thing to do would be to ask for a bylaw change at the same time as asking for the change in the fee levy, but given that we don't know what students will vote. If they vote in favor of the indexation, then we can't raise what the fee levies are in our bylaws because they will change year to year. We don't want to change them now if then next year, these fee levies are changed or not changed. So just in case people were wondering about that, that's another thing.

Scott Carr: I am just curious as to whether we are still going to be charging an administration fee which has helped us keep financial stability in the past.

Heather Nagy: yes.

Scott Carr: But if we are doing a whole overhaul on the way we do funds, I think we should find a way to talk about health/dental plan fees in a strategic direction. If we are looking to be transparent, I just want to know how we are going to manage the health plan admin fee, if I'm not mistaken, we will still be receiving quite a bit still, comparative to what we actually do for it. How does this tie in to the financial transparency and sustainability thing?

Heather Nagy: that is 3 questions down on our agenda point. We have been speaking about this for a long time and the student body is aware that we collect this fee but it is substantially more for what the CSU does, so we plan on diminishing it this year to 50 000 dollars. Which would be 1.00-1.50\$ per student for those who are enrolled in the health and dental plan fee. It is an admin/reserve fee so this fee can also be used to improve the health benefits on the plan, later on, after we hit the ceiling. But we will talk about that more after



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

the fact. In regards to how it impacts this question, it will be going from 180 000 to 50 000 and that is included in the numbers in the second excel sheet, it gives a break down and the admin fee goes to 50 000.

Scott Carr: (he spoke too fast and I was unable to type it out)

Benjamin Prunty: to figure out our cash flow issue, we have a 600 000\$ gap. So essentially, even if we do all these things, it's still going to take many years to pay off that amount with the current plan that we are putting forward and the reduction in this includes the reduction from the admin fee. Also 1.50\$ is the maximum, that means 1.50\$ doesn't necessarily have to be taken.

Scott Carr: so the strategic imperative that the CSU is saying is that we'd like to move a large portion of the funds being used for the SSEALC fund is going to an operational fee?

Benjamin Prunty: the only alternative to that is essentially raising our fee levy. And we have no intention of increasing the aggregate fees. Of course that is an option but that would be increasing the fee levy which in my opinion is more risky and not necessary.

Vicky Rodgers: In the allocation and indexation question, why don't we give students a choice between reallocating the fund OR increasing the fee levy?

Terry Wilkings: Just from a services perspective (LIC, advocacy, HOJO), this will streamline their operations going forward in a very smooth manner. I know that for instance, the advocacy center fee was not being used as described in the bylaw. They were getting a lot of left overs that were getting put into the operating budget. So I believe that not only internally, within CSU operations but externally in terms of transparency to students, it adds a lot of clarity as to where their money is going and how it is being used and the proportion between the different services. So I believe that this is very straight forward and that from an employee perspective, this is going to streamline a lot of the operations.

Vicky Rodgers: I'm sorry, you did not at all, answer my question.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Benjamin Prunty: I'm just trying to verify if that is even possible given the deadline for our referendum questions.

Heather Nagy: the SSEALC fee is a fee that is administered by the CSU as all of its other fee levies, and as we haven't found the restricted fund accounting, that has been relatively fluid except with the exception the SSEALC fund, we have the fund committee which is set up and council which passes through these exceptional projects that happen regarding student space. In terms of choosing either one or the other, we feel that it's okay that we take cents from the student center fee and give it to the CSU standard operations. In regards to the student centre fee history, the CSU was actually supposed to purchase a building using the SSEALC fund and the student membership has turned it down. This idea of using the money to purchase a building has gone further and further into the distance but in regards to the CSU and how we utilizing the student space fund this year is a real thing. Here we have 13 million dollars to be able to fund student projects on campus. To be perfectly honest, I never thought that far into the option of giving students the choice. Mostly because I did not think it was allowed according to the ballot and standard regulations. It would stifle either the mandates of the CSU general operations or the student space and what it is supposed to be used for.

Marcus Peters: Ya I just want to voice my support for this, it makes sense. It's better to take the money from our fund that has an original purpose then to try and raise the fee by 50 cents in various categories. I think that giving students the choice would be a little bit ambitious and maybe not even feasible.

Charles Bourassa (POI): is there a motion on the table?

Chair: the motion is on the first of 2 of the referendum questions regarding finances.

Charles Bourassa: I would like to recommend that someone calls the question.

Benjamin Prunty: a group of Fincom people met and there was a long e-mail thread afterwards, where there were discussing something similar than what is on the table right now. I am pretty sure according to our referendum rules, we are



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

unable to give students the option. Giving an option isn't a bad thing but I don't think that within our rules, we are capable of doing that.

Lucinda Kiparissis calls the question.

Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers**.

VOTE

In favor: 12

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 2

Chair: the question has been called then. Those in favor of putting this question on the ballot, raise your placards.

VOTE (MOTION 5)

In favor: 11

Opposed: 2

Abstentions: 1

Motion carries.

(MOTION 6) Heather Nagy moves to approve the indexation referendum question.

Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers**.

REFERENDUM QUESTION REGARDING INDEXATION

PREAMBLE : The CSU has not increased its fees for the better part of a decade, but has reduced its nonoperational fees (the Student Space, Accessible Education & Legal Contingency Fund) by \$0.50/credit, in 2011. In order to stabilize the CSU's operations with its costs it is necessary that the CSU's fees be indexed to inflation. The alternative is that the CSU will need to increase its fee levy every couple of years in order to account for its yearly increase in salaries and other expenses due to collective agreements and inflation. However, we recommend that students vote to index the CSU's fees to inflation so that students can expect that, year to year, the CSU has the same purchasing power. To be clear, voting to index the



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

CSU's fees to inflation will allow us to maintain, not increase, our current operations over the medium to long term and would allow students to normalize their expectations of the CSU due to the stability of the operating budgets overtime.

QUESTION : Do you as a member of the CSU approve of the CSU indexing all of its fees (currently totaling \$3.80/credit) to inflation in accordance with the Consumer Price Index, effective Fall 2015?

Benjamin Prunty: I just want to say that what is in the financial document that was given out actually shows a decrease in fee levy in the aggregate fees that we are collecting, despite the fact that this preamble says that there is neither an increase or decrease. Given that we are proposing a change, that hasn't been approved, to the special bylaw K which has to do with the administrative fee of the health and dental plan. We are effectively reducing the fee levy while asking for an indexation.

Scott Carr: the main thing that I want to ask for this indexing question is; this also includes the index in the health plan, right? And the admin fee would not be considered a part of that fee? Even though the CSU is collecting it.

Heather Nagy: it would not and we could specify that further if you'd like.

Scott Carr: why would we not force ourselves to come back to students and reinforce our mission as the student body representatives every few years to see if they do agree to the inflation rate, instead of just assuming they are okay with it. I rather come back every 3-4 years and say "hey inflation has gone up by this much, and we would like to increase the fee in that exact accordance, are you okay with that?". This gives the opportunity to students to voice their concerns and their dissatisfaction. And a lot of the time, during referendums, we have a lot of great insight into the student body. To me, indexing fees does have its own concern.

Benjamin Prunty: so it says that we would be indexing all of our fees, totalling 3.80\$/credit. If they want us to come back every couple of years then they will vote NO to this question.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Heather Nagy: I understand what you are saying and that is a fair point to make. Hopefully the CSU will want to grow in their operations beyond inflation rate, and allow that to go back to referendum. So that is one aspect to consider. Another thing is that there are some student groups on campus that have an index to their student fee levy, and it just allows the security of allowing financial sustainability. I don't see this being contentious.

Matthew Palynchuk: I think that this is interesting because if you do come back every 3-4 years and ask the students how they feel on indexation, this might allow them to show their dissatisfaction with the CSU. It might be an indication of how they feel about it.

Scott Carr: yes absolutely, if students are not happy with the CSU, one thing you will hear them say is "why the hell am I paying for this?". Which is a concern I foresee happening in this upcoming election.

Vicky Rodgers: I just want to voice that students do have the opportunity to vote every year for a new executive and new councillors. Which means that if they are unhappy with the management, they can vote for someone new. At the end of the day, it is the executive that are making the financial decisions. And students have the freedom to vote for whomever they please.

Matthew Palynchuk calls the question.
Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers**.

VOTE

In favor: 8

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Chair: the question has been called, those in favor of the referendum question regarding indexation, please raise your placards.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

VOTE (MOTION 6)

In favor: 7

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1

Motion carries.

Marcus Peters: is it a thing that past midnight, motions cannot be passed.

Chair: I'm going through the standing regulations now. I can't seem to find them. Nonetheless, we can always call a special meeting to address the remaining questions or we can vote on an allotted amount of time.

d) Health/Dental plan referendum question

Heather Nagy: we have not increased the health and dental plan fee since 2005. How it works is that the CSU and ASEQ goes to referendum to ask the students to approve a ceiling amount.

(MOTION 7) Heather Nagy moves to approve the health/dental plan by-law referendum question.

Seconded by **Benjamin Prunty**.

Health plan question revised:

Do you agree to increase the annual CSU health plan fee no more than \$46.93, for a maximum annual cost of \$240 per undergraduate student registered at Concordia, and not greater than maximum annual cost of \$143.00 for international students with dental insurance, in order to maintain and ensure the long-term sustainability of the current levels of coverage of the health and dental plan?

Fee breakdown:

Health: **\$97.00**

Dental: **\$143.00**

Total: **\$240.00**



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Heather Nagy: the 240\$ is the ceiling and the ceiling does include the 1.50\$ admin plus the 1.50 for the reserve fund totalling 3.00\$ that the CSU would be collecting on top of the premiums that are negotiated with ASEQ every year. For example, the premiums were negotiated 188\$ but actually the CSU was collecting 193\$. This has been a long standing ethical issue and this is our solution.

Scott Carr: this is a huge point and I feel that there is a huge lack of documentation, unless it was brought fourth prior and I was unaware. My questions are; what is the forecast that there remain ___? How much have they increased over the past years? And what have been the issues with this in the past?

Heather Nagy: I have all that information. I am sorry, you are right. ASEQ gave us a really pretty document. We have been negotiating with them for the last 2 months. I will look for the document right now and post it to council group. The document shows how awesome the CSU has been at maintaining the latest fee cap of 10 years. It shows that benefits have actually increased over the years and that the CSU is the lowest out of the 10 school they gave to us.

Scott Carr: I want to talk about the admin fee. I don't this is a secret to anyone but this is padding, unethical padding. What justifies us to take that 1.50\$? Because it certainly isn't equivalent to the amount of hours we put in to get that. Because that 50 000 or whatever amount represents half the amount of time the General manager doing work, period. And I don't think that he spends half of his time working on the CSU health and dental plan.

Heather Nagy: one thing is that non-profit organizations collecting admin fees from their insurance brokers on their employees behalf is very run of the mill. So we are in agreement that this is not a completely illegal thing. So you are saying that the 50 000\$ is half of the GM's salary and that he doesn't spend that much time on the health and dental plan fee, that is correct. But it is not only the general manager; it is also the executives, usually 2 or 3. There is also the time spent meeting with our ASEQ representative and the time we spend consulting our lawyer. I don't find this unethical and also, the reason why we call it an



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

admin/reserve fee is so that we can use that money if we do want to increase benefits.

Benjamin Prunty: 50 000 is on the high end of how much we would be spending this year. Given that this is a maximum and over time, this value will be decreasing. 50 000 to me, doesn't seem to high. That is a 70% decrease from previous years. We could reduce it to a 1\$ arbitrarily but I wouldn't recommend it. We can sit here and argue about how its unethical but the fact of the matter is, it is not unethical, it is just a slight increased representation of the time that is actually used for the health and dental plan fee. The actual amount of time that is used is an arbitrary number. Either way, over time, it will decrease.

Scott Carr: a 70% decrease doesn't make it ethical. The difference between stepping in the right direction and stepping towards doing the right thing is a pretty big gap. The reality is that it employs some cost on the students. I think the health and dental plan takes up about 20 hours of the year for the GM and VP finance. I think it's unfair to charge them for these meetings that the GM or executives have with ASEQ when they are already paying for these services so I don't understand why you have to charge them twice. My question is really, how can we even deem this to be ethical? We sit here and we're all about changing on how people do things and yet we are...

Benjamin Prunty: can I ask that this be discussed at another time when the question actually comes up on the agenda because we are straying far from the point.

Chair: that is correct. We are not discussing this on the current agenda point.

Charles Bourassa: I just quickly wanted to ask Cassandra who was a receptionist, how much time she spent giving out ASEQ forms and providing students with information.

Cassandra Fehr: it happened 1/3 to ½ of the time you are working.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Benjamin Prunty: so basically the question is how far do you want this to go, do you want it to be 230 or 240\$? 230 means we have to go back to students more often and 240 means we have to go back to students less. We are talking about a difference of 1 or 2 years depending on the change.

Scott Carr: so we specifically say maintain and ensure, so maintaining to save coverage with this, we are not adding anything new if the students might want something?

Heather Nagy: the word “maintain” is an operative word. We are going to maintain it within our negotiations with ASEQ every year. So we can still increase benefits but we won’t go above that ceiling. It’s more about the ceiling of the absolute value. And to tell students that their benefits will not diminish if they increase this.

Scott Carr: how many years is this supposed to hold for?
Heather Nagy: the projection is 5-10 years.

VOTE (MOTION 7)

In favor: 7
Opposed: 1
Abstentions: 2

Motion carries.

e) Health/Dental plan admin fee by-law change

Benjamin Prunty: I think that we simply debunked that 50 000 is too high just by simply hearing from the receptionist. I think that has been very helpful and directly from the source. I think we could say that 50 000 is reasonable, even maybe too low.

Scott Carr: how many hours are spent with the secretary sitting there and waiting for someone to come in?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Cassandra Fehr: It depends on the time of year and usually students come in waves but I would have to say $\frac{1}{4}$ of the time.

Scott Carr: the receptionist's salary is a sunk cost. We are paying them to answer general questions from students. And students already pay for that through the CSU operating budget. Now essentially, we are double charging them? How is it okay to charge them this administration fee out of their pockets? Also, this referendum question is not actually allowing the students to voice whether they agree with an admin fee or not. You are basically saying you have the option between: this is less bad or you let us do whatever we want. You choose.

Heather Nagy: I really don't want to go further into this but it looks as though we must.

James Vaccaro (Point of order): I don't think there was a question in any of that statement. Unless a question is asked to an executive or council member, there should be no direct response. This is not how the council meeting should be run.

Heather Nagy: well I was on the speakers list.

James Vaccaro: That's fine, you always have useful information to contribute. I'm just saying that in general.

Heather Nagy: I think that going from 280 000 to 180 000 to 50 000 has been a struggle in itself. I commend you for being so adamant about it being unethical. But I really do feel that there are some administrative fees that are incurred by the CSU in order to properly administer this fee. Though I didn't really think about the reception which makes me an executive jerk. But in regards to the winter semester deadline, I had a few students come talk to me at length about how they could not opt out of paying that fee. So Then I had to get on the phone with a representative and spend time talking to them. It was a big issue this year when Concordia extended their tuition fee deadline but ASEQ did not. So that is just one other example of how our time is given towards ASEQ and is outside of our general operating hours.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

(MOTION 8) Terry Wilkings moves to approve the admin fee by-law referendum question

Seconded by **Benjamin Prunty**.

Health and Dental Plan: New Special Bylaw

Special ByLaw K: “Health Plan and Dental Plan”

The CSU may levy no more than \$1.50 per student per semester for the purpose of administering its Health Plan, and no more than \$1.50 per student per semester for the purpose of administering its Dental Plan.”

The reserve fund for the Health Plan and the Dental Plan cannot be used for the CSU’s normal operations and must be kept exclusively for use as a typical reserve fund is expected to be used.”

Terry Wilkings: I feel that the discussion on this has been exhausted and it’s up to council to vote.

Scott Carr: I completely agree so I am just going to quantify it for you. 50 000\$ is equivalent to 81 hours/week. I don’t think anybody is doing that. That would be 2 employees at 12\$/hour.

Benjamin Prunty: I’m going to disregard that because that was essentially made up on the spot. When we look at the health and dental fee question, we consider the health and dental organization as it has existed over time. In the last years, it has collected dramatically more than 50 000. In specific, last year, it collected 280 000\$ which makes this year’s fee a decrease of over 70% from last year. As I said earlier, it decreases over time. This will give us less room to manoeuvre but hopefully within the next couple of years, we will be able to manage the financial debt. From an executive perspective, there is no disagreement on 50 000\$ as a fee and we do take up a certain amount of time for the health and dental plan fee and I believe that it would irresponsible for us to decrease it. If we decrease this, it would mean a further decrease in the amount of money going to the CSU but yet, we’d still be providing the same services. So essentially we would have to eliminate something else. We have a collective agreement negotiation coming up soon as well where we will likely have increases in wages. So this is not coming from a place of no thought. The first time this was proposed was last year after



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

elections and it would have been disastrous to have gone through with plans to completely eliminate it because at the end of our year, we had a 140 000\$ deficit and later on figured out that there had been a 300 000 deficit the year prior. Had we taken the advice at the time, we would have been looking at 320 000\$ deficit this year. The general manager, accountant, myself and Heather have been present at all meetings and we have deemed this to be a reasonable rate.

Vicky Rodgers calls it into question.

Seconded by **Benjamin Prunty**.

VOTE

In favor: 6

Opposed: 3

Abstentions: 2

Chair: those in favor of the motion, please raise your placards.

VOTE (MOTION 7)

In favor: 5

Opposed: 2

Abstentions: 3

Motion carries.

James Vaccaro: In the question, it says “The reserve fund for the Health Plan and the Dental Plan cannot be used for the CSU’s normal operations and must be kept exclusively for use as a typical reserve fund is expected to be used”. Therefore this means that it cannot be dumped into operations and cannot be covering legal expenses or receptionists or executives going to these meetings. So the previous discussion we just had just seems absolutely pointless. So the 50 000\$ is going to be locked into another reserve account? What can the money be spent on and how can it accumulate over time?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Benjamin Prunty: we have the option of creating a reserve fund.

James Vaccaro: are we taking the 50 000 and dumping it into operations and saying we may use this for reserve fund and if we don't use it for that then it just stays there and pads our budget so that we don't go into deficit every year. Or will it be a separate account?

Benjamin Prunty: separate

James Vaccaro: so we will have this separate health/dental fund.

Scott Carr: we charge 240\$ to every student, 1.50\$ of that + the premium would be taken away from the CSU operating budget and the rest would go into a reserve fund which can only be used to the purpose of paying an additional premium if it happens to exceed 240\$.

James Vaccaro: I get all of that. I just want to clarify that the 50 000\$ cannot be used for anything else?

Heather Nagy: HALF. All of that discussion was about 25 000\$. I made a mistake in the numbers and I meant to say that 25 000 of that 50 000 will be used for a reserve fund.

f) Privatization of public services referendum question

(MOTION 9) Benjamin Prunty moves to approve the Privatization of public services referendum question.

Seconded by Terry Wilkings.

Question: Do you as a member of the CSU approve of the CSU taking a position against the privatization of the academic sector specifically, and the public sector in general?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Benjamin Prunty: this was a question that we tried to ask in the first general election but the CEO wanted to change the wording to an extent where the question was not the same anymore. Therefore we are asking it again. It is pertinent to the public discussion currently going on because what essentially is happening with the austerity agenda is that there is an increase in the privatization of the academic sector and the public sector which forces institutions to start looking for funding elsewhere which effectively means sponsorships. We ran this by the policy committee and it was approved. We did approach the committee about the wording which was brought up by Vicky but the committee felt there wording to be accurate.

(MOTION 10) James Vaccaro moves to limit debate to 10 minutes followed by a direct vote.

Seconded by **Marcus Peters**.

VOTE (MOTION 10)

In favor: 6

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Vicky Rodgers: How do you define privatization? What items will it include? Does it include choice of the curriculum or just corporate and individual donations?

Terry Wilkings: I don't think we are accepting private donations. But donations from the academic sector would not be deemed inappropriate

Vicky Rodgers: Is it going to be a position against the influence of corporate donations? I'm sorry I'm still confused and don't understand.

Benjamin Prunty: basically we do not have a position on this yet and we would like to see whether the students would like to see society take a step away from the privately and publicly funded sector.

Vicky Rodgers: does this include corporate money?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Benjamin Prunty: council will interpret these policies once they are approved. It really depends on how council would like to interpret it.

Benjamin Prunty calls motion 9 into question
Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers**.

VOTE

In favor: 6
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 1

VOTE (MOTION 9)

In favor: 7
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 1

Motion carries.

g) Greenhouse project referendum question

(MOTION 11) Jessica Cabana moves to approve the Greenhouse project referendum question.
Seconded by **James Vaccaro**.

VOTE (MOTION 11)

In favor: 8
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

10. QUESTION PERIOD & BUSINESS ARISING

11. ANNOUNCEMENTS

12. ADJOURNMENT

Marcus Peters moves to adjourn.
Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers**.

VOTE

In favor: 5

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Meeting is adjourned at 24h02.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

CSU Council Meeting
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015
H – 767, 18h30, Hall Building

Summary of Motions Carried

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

John Talbot moved to excuse Maylen, Gemma, Jeremy, Rami, Anthony but not Michael and Taimur.

Seconded by **Matthew Palynchuk**.

6. APPOINTMENTS

a) Chief Electoral Officer

Following closed session, a new CEO was appointed.

5. PRESENTATION AND GUEST SPEAKERS

d) Student Housing Project

Terry Wilkings moved for the General Election P.U.S.H Fund question to go on the ballot; *The CSU would like to set up an autonomous revolving fund dedicated to supporting the need for student housing with an explicit mandate to create affordable cooperative housing for students in Quebec. The establishment of such a fund would be conditional on giving members of the CSU exclusivity on its first project. Do you as a member of the Concordia Student Union approve the reallocation of approximately 15% (\$1,850,000) of the Student Space Accessible Education Legal Contingency fund (SSEALC) to create the Popular University Student Housing fund (PUSH)?*

Seconded by **Chloe Williams**.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

James Vaccaro moved to amend the previous motion regarding the P.U.S.H referendum question where the parentheses around 1 850 000\$ should be removed and instead, *approximately 15%* should be put in parentheses. In addition, the “(approximately 15%)” would follow “1 850 000\$”. Resulting in the referendum question being: *The CSU would like to set up an autonomous revolving fund dedicated to supporting the need for student housing with an explicit mandate to create affordable cooperative housing for students in Quebec. The establishment of such a fund would be conditional on giving members of the CSU exclusivity on its first project. Do you as a member of the Concordia Student Union approve the reallocation of \$1,850,000 (approximately 15%) of the Student Space Accessible Education Legal Contingency fund (SSEALC) to create the Popular University Student Housing fund (PUSH)?*

Seconded by **Vicky Rodgers**.

7. RETURNING BUSINESS – SUBSTANSIVE

a) Reggie’s

Benjamin Prunty moved to approve a maximum of 5000\$ for the purpose of hiring a structural engineer for the Reggie’s project and that this amount be taken out of the SSEALC Fund.

Seconded by **Scott Carr**.

8. NEW BUSINESS – SUBSTANSIVE

b) Reggie’s/Hive referendum question

Benjamin Prunty moved to approve the Reggie’s/Hive referendum question: *“The CSU has been working on a project to completely renovate every aspect of the Reggie’s bar and the Hive Cafe on the mezzanine of the downtown campus for the past year as major renovations are considered a structural necessity. Given that we cannot know the final cost of construction until the project is completed we are only capable of providing an estimated range of costs for approval. The CSU feels as though a final approval of an expense of this size should be decided by the membership. Do you approve of the CSU using between \$1,200,000 and \$1,800,000 (which is between 10-15% of the Student Space, Accessible Education & Legal Contingency*



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

fund), knowing that this is an estimate and that the expense could realistically vary beyond the ranges specified above once the final construction costs are known?"

Seconded by Terry Ngala.

c) Financial reallocation and indexation referendum questions

Heather Nagy moved to approve the financial reallocation and indexation referendum question

Seconded by **Jeremy Tessier.**

REFERENDUM QUESTION REGARDING FINANCIAL CHANGES PREAMBLE: The CSU is changing its accounting system towards a restricted fund accounting model for the purpose of increasing transparency and this requires changes to our fee levy structure. The CSU will also be substantially reducing the administration fee that it charges to students for the Health and Dental plans. As a result, CSU's available funds can no longer support its current operations without changing the allocation of the fees that it currently levies. The changes listed below will neither increase nor decrease the fees levied from students on behalf of the CSU, but will allow for the CSU to maintain its current level of operations.

QUESTION: This is the current organization of our fees:

General Operations: \$1.75 per credit

Non-Academic Clubs: \$0.25 per credit

Student Space, Accessible Education & Legal Contingency Fund: \$1.50/credit

Advocacy Centre: \$0.30 per credit

TOTAL: \$3.80/credit

Are as a member of the CSU you in favour of the following reorganization of the fees currently levied by the CSU, effective for the Fall semester of 2015:

CSU operating fee: \$1.97/credit

CSU Advocacy Center fee: \$0.21/credit

CSU Housing and Job Back (HOJO): \$0.20/credit

CSU Legal Information Clinic (LIC): \$0.17/credit

CSU Clubs: \$0.25/credit



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Student Space, Accessible Education & Legal Contingency Fund (SSAELC):

\$1.00/credit

TOTAL: \$3.80/credit

d) Health/Dental plan referendum question

Heather Nagy moved to approve the health/dental plan by-law referendum question.

Seconded by **Benjamin Prunty**.

Health plan question revised:

Do you agree to increase the annual CSU health plan fee no more than \$46.93, for a maximum annual cost of \$240 per undergraduate student registered at Concordia, and not greater than maximum annual cost of \$143.00 for international students with dental insurance, in order to maintain and ensure the long-term sustainability of the current levels of coverage of the health and dental plan?

Fee breakdown:

Health: \$97.00

Dental: \$143.00

Total: \$240.00

e) Health/Dental plan admin fee by-law change

Terry Wilkings moves to approve the admin fee by-law referendum question

Seconded by **Benjamin Prunty**.

Health and Dental Plan: New Special Bylaw

Special ByLaw

K: "Health Plan and Dental Plan"

The CSU may levy no more than \$1.50 per student per semester for the purpose of administering its Health Plan, and no more than \$1.50 per student per semester for the purpose of administering its Dental Plan."



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

The reserve fund for the Health Plan and the Dental Plan cannot be used for the CSU's normal operations and must be kept exclusively for use as a typical reserve fund is expected to be used."

f) Privatization of public services referendum question

Benjamin Prunty moved to approve the Privatization of public services referendum question.

Seconded by **Terry Wilkings**.

Question: Do you as a member of the CSU approve of the CSU taking a position against the privatization of the academic sector specifically, and the public sector in general?

James Vaccaro moves to limit debate to 10 minutes followed by a direct vote.
Seconded by **Marcus Peters**.

g) Greenhouse project referendum question

Jessica Cabana moves to approve the Greenhouse project referendum question.
Seconded by **James Vaccaro**.

Question: Do you as a member of the Concordia Student Union approve the continued prioritization of developing a Loyola Student Greenhouse as a student space initiative?