



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

CSU Regular Council Meeting – Agenda

Wednesday, February 10th, 2016

H-767, 18h30, S.G.W. Campus

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of the Agenda

4. Consent Agenda

- a) Approval of the Minutes – January 27th Regular Council Meeting
- b) Reports from Committees
- c) Executive Reports
- d) Chairperson's Report
- e) Positions Book

5. Presentations and Guest Speakers

6. Appointments

- a) Finance Committee
- b) Clubs & Space Committee
- c) Student Life Committee

7. New Business – Substantive

- a) Concordia Refugee Initiative (CRI) fee-levy
- b) IEAC Fee Levy
- c) Cooperative Student Housing
- d) Concordia Council on Student Life (CCSL)



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

- e) Positions Book - Referendum Questions
- f) ASEQ
- g) Student Tribunals
- h) Affordable, Sustainable, and Student-Run Food Policy

8. Question Period & Business Arising

9. Announcements

10. Adjournment



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

CSU Special Council Meeting – Minutes

Wednesday, February 10th, 2016

H-767, 18h30, S.G.W. Campus

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting is called to order at 18h47.

We would like to acknowledge that Concordia university is on the traditional territory of the Kanien'keha:ka (Ga-niyen-gé-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-gé-haa-ga) as the traditional custodians of the lands and waters on which we meet today.

2. ROLL CALL

Council Chairperson: *Mat Forget*

Council Minute Keeper: *Caitlin Robinson*

Executives present for the duration of the meeting consisted of *Anas Bouslikhane* (Finance Coordinator), *Gabrielle Caron* (Sustainability Coordinator), *Lori Dimaria* (Clubs & Internal Affairs Coordinator), *Marion Miller* (Academic & Advocacy Coordinator), *John Talbot* (Student Life Coordinator), *Gabriel Velasco* (External Affairs & Mobilization Coordinator), *Terry Wilkings* (General Coordinator) and *Chloë Williams* (Loyola Coordinator).

Councillors present for the duration of the meeting consisted of *Sami Beydoun* (ENCS), *Jenna Cocullo* (Arts & Science), *Hayley Currier* (Arts & Science), *Rachel Gauthier* (JMSB), *Charles Gonsalves* (Arts & Science), *Sanaz Hassan Pour* (Fine Arts), *Adrian Longinotti* (Arts & Science), *Lucinda Marshall-Kiparissis* (Arts & Science), *Armani Martel* (Arts & Science), *Aloyse Muller* (Arts & Science), *Geneviève Nadeau-Bonin* (Arts & Science), *Marcus Peters* (Arts & Science), *Jason Poirier-Lavoie* (Arts & Science), *Fadi Saijari* (JMSB) and *Rami Yahia* (ENCS).

Councillors absent for the duration of the meeting consisted of *Joseph Betinjane* (JMSB), *Jana Ghalayini* (ENCS), *Hassan Jabri* (ENCS), *Antoine Rail* (Fine Arts), *Leyla Sutherland* (Fine Arts) and *Michael Wrobel* (Arts & Science).

Chairperson: You have received some sensitive documents for closed session so while in open session, please refrain from having a look at them until closed session. I also received a few requests for excusal – **Michael Wrobel** sends regrets as he has a subcommittee meeting. **Leyla** has a technical run-through of a performance piece and I have a message from **Jana** who had family emergency.

Adrian Longinotti: I would like to be excused no later than 20h00 and I have a supervised workshop I should attend for a class where technical equipment is being used that I do not know how to use. This is the only night I can attend it before the project is due.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Marcus Peters moves to excuse all councillors.
Seconded by **Sanaz Hassan Pour**.

Terry Wilkings: Is **Jana** asking for excusal for last meeting?

Chairperson: She was excused last meeting.

Terry Wilkings: I had a side conversation with **Jana** and no one likes dealing with these kinds of health concerns so I encourage retroactive excusal.

VOTE

In favour : 10

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1 (**Adrian**)

Motion carries.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Marion Millers pulls two (2) Policy Committee reports, to be approved in point 7. a) *Concordia Refugee Initiative (CRI) Fee Levy* and 7. b) *IEAC Fee Levy*.

Marcus Peters: Was today the last meeting to submit referendum questions?

Terry Wilkings: It is the last meeting that is before our next Regular Council meeting, so it is the last Regular Council meeting to do this, but we could call a Special Council meeting. Given the desire of councillors in the past to try and have things run accordingly in a timely manner, we have put all questions received today on the agenda. With the delays internal to our regulations we can have them up to the 19th of February.

Chairperson: We will now vote on approving the agenda and all items under 4. *Consent Agenda*.

VOTE

In favour : 11

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

a) Approval of the Minutes – January 27th Regular Council Meeting



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Ratified by consent.

b) Reports from Committees

Ratified by consent.

c) Executive Reports

Ratified by consent.

d) Chairperson's Report

Ratified by consent.

e) Positions Book

Ratified by consent.

5. PRESENTATIONS & GUEST SPEAKERS

No presentations were made nor guest speakers present at this meeting of Council.

6. APPOINTMENTS

a) Finance Committee

Gabrielle Caron: The first committee is the Finance Committee and we have one (1) spot open. This person will be looking through budgets and things to do with financing with our Finance Coordinator. Meetings happen at least once a month.

b) Clubs and Space Committee

Gabrielle Caron: This also is a committee that meets at least once a month and looks at clubs, working closely with **Lori** the Internal Coordinator.

c) Student Life Committee

Gabrielle Caron: The last appointment is for the Student Life Committee, which meets once a month and looks over and helps **John** with all kinds of activities happening around campus.

7. NEW BUSINESS – SUBSTANTIVE



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

a) Concordia Refugee Initiative (CRI) Fee Levy

Marion Miller moves to approve the Policy Committee minutes of February 4th, along with the following referendum question:

The Canadian Refugee Initiative is a grassroots organization providing sustained support to Concordia University Students through a Refugee Center. The services of this Center will include employment aid, academic assistance, psychological assistance, housing aid, bursaries, legal aid, research publications and business development consultations. Do you agree to pay 37 cents per credit indexed to inflation in accordance with the Consumer Price Index, to the Canadian Refugee Initiative, effective Fall 2016?

Seconded by **Rachel Gauthier**.

Marion Miller: The Canadian Refugee Initiative is a grassroots organization providing sustained support to Concordia University students through a Refugee Centre. The services of this centre will include employment aid, academic assistance, psychological assistance, housing aid, bursaries, legal aid, research publications and business development consultations. This is a group seeking to install a new fee levy. They are following the process outlined in the Standing Regulations – we received the application right before the December break. They met the deadline and send the required documents. We did not get a chance to look it over until January, but the Policy Committee reviewed the application, had of the all documents necessary, looked over the constitution and made suggestions, which is normal for a new fee levy. Just to let you know the process, the criteria we consider is outlined in Standing Regulation 240 and in the case of a non-CSU group seeking a fee levy, the committee has the responsibility to verify the signatures, work on questions, and see whether the constitution reasonably allows the organization to operate and manage funds. Under no circumstances do we take into consideration the mandate or mission. We are looking at whether the organization could function structurally. We found the group responsibly cooperative and they came to meet with us about the changes we suggested and show us that they integrated some and explained their rationale about the things they decided to keep. We suggest that the question be put to ballot. In summary, they submit the question, we decide if it is prejudicial, recommend a form for the question and then the CEO has the final say. Our recommendation was to shorten the question. We just condensed it and did not change the wording but cut out a few things. It is up to Council to approve the question going forward.

Armani Martel: To those representing the organization, is this is a temporary thing in nature? After a few years, how would you function?

Abdullah: This is not just for the Syrian influx, Canada accepts many refugees and this is just publicized more. We plan to be more sustainable and slowly push away from getting a fee levy, however the initial plan for the first three (3) years is dependent on the fee levy, and then after that we will be working on networking and private donors to disassociate and take the pressure off students.

Marcus Peters: If you could elaborate on the talks that we made about considering a smaller amount

Abdullah: We talked to **Terry** and he suggested that we bring the projected budget and we did bring it. The \$0.37, we could not get the exact number but it might be little bit less. Aside from that, given the



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

huge range of services being everything from psychological aid, academic aid, admissions, housing projects and consultation, this is at least eight (8) to ten (10) services, and all are justified under our budget. We are going to be very transparent in what we do and if there becomes a time that we do not need that money we will reduce the fee levy amount, but we are projecting to need the full amount This is based on many consultations with other organizations and other people to be working on this.

Aloyse Muller: I really support this initiative and just want it to be noted that it might be harder to get into a referendum? It is kind of a gamble. There might be heavy campaigning needed.

Terry Wilkings: The Council appreciates the projected budget but highly suggests that you publicize it if Council decides to put the question to ballot, and to have it accessible during the campaigning period.

Abdullah: We have taken that into consideration and cannot do that now because it is against the campaign rules, but two (2) weeks before we will have a fully functional website including where the money is going, who is involved and how much will cost to be as transparent as possible. Obviously, we are here to take any suggestions.

Marcus Peters: I recommend that you try to implement some sort of formal procedure by which to lower the fee levy in the future because I feel that any organization, when considering substantially reducing its funding without any mandate, will likely disregard that option in the future. It might be worth taking that approach. Overall, it seems like a reasonable project, but you might want to consider doing this.

Rachel Gauthier: Due to the fact that it is student money, how do your services differ from CSU services like The Housing and Job Bank, the Advocacy Centre and the Legal Information Clinic. Can they use both?

Abdullah: There are certain comparisons between the CSU and what we offer, for example the job bank. Our job bank will differ because we have created a network with companies willing to offer jobs for students or refugees coming in who might not adapt to the French language right away. We have created a network willing to take on student refugees and I do not think that the job bank here has that. We have created legal aid with lawyers specifying in immigration issues as well. There are a huge number of undocumented refugees in Montreal whose student visas have expired, and there is legal precedence to take care of them and enrol them back in school and find jobs. This is a problem that people have come up to us about to say that they need a specific type of legal aid. Refugee issues are unique and undocumented refugee issues are unique and this is something that we want to tackle head-on. Montreal has one of the highest rates of this in Canada.

Charles Gonsalves: I completely support and can speak to everything that you have just said. The legal aid that these people need is unique and not met by the general legal aid centre, which does not confront these situations. If they are offering services which are unique, that is important.

Geneviève Nadeau-Bonin: I was wondering if you have spoken to or plan to speak to other fee levy groups or the group FLAC to just talk to them about how functioning works?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Abdullah: We talked to other fee levy groups, not specifically FLAC, but other organizations like QPRIG. We learned how to structure and create our finances correctly and we learned how to become more transparent. Basically, we talked to a couple of fee levies and tried as best to take the best of what they do to provide the best services to the population.

VOTE

In favour : 12

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1 (**Geneviève**)

Motion carries.

Terry Wilkings: I just want to take this opportunity to suggest that you re-read the regulations around the referendum because they are quite specific and you do not want a unfortunate misunderstanding to jeopardize your efforts. The Policy Committee and myself are all resources to help understand the rules and proceed in a good way.

b) IEAC Fee Levy

Marion Miller moves to approve the Policy Committee minutes of February 4th, along with the following referendum question:

The International/Ethnic Association Council incorporated July 2015 and began activities as an independent fee-levy group the following Fall semester, September 2015. The IEAC promotes and celebrates diverse international and ethnic cultures and heritage in a non-political and non-discriminatory manner. Would you agree to raise the fee-levy from the current \$0.06 per credit to \$0.12 per credit, allowing the IEAC to allocate funds towards growing the cultural and ethnic club-base within Concordia, effective Fall 2016?

Seconded by **Marcus Peters**.

Marion Miller: The International/Ethnic Association Council (IEAC) has been around a long time and are going to increase their fee levy. Last year they seceded from the CSU and since they are autonomous, that is part of what motivated them to look to increase their fee levy from \$0.06 to \$0.12. We received their application on time within the regulations in January and looked through the documents to make sure that had everything. As mentioned in the minutes, two (2) things were missing and they sent them to us within two (2) hours. A day later we had the minutes from their general meeting and we felt comfortable going ahead. The constitution is strong and the organization has been functioning for many years. We had no comments about the constitution. In our new process for fee levy changes, groups who did not have a complaints policy had to make sure to install a new one, and they submitted a newly created complaints policy. It was obvious that it had been created recently and not tested, and the Policy Committee gave suggestions and we feel confident that they will implement recommendations. We are comfortable with the documentation and I think that we took close to what the submitted question was. The question to ballot is. Once again, the CEO can modify the question if he sees fit, but that would be our recommendation and we felt comfortable recommending the IEAC for an increase. We have Lori, the former chairperson here, and another representative, Sari.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Lucinda Marshall-Kiparissis: Assuming that the question passes, do you have it advertised anywhere on your pamphlets or website that you are a fee levy group and what the current fee is?

Sari Sarieddine: I am not sure because we did it last year so I am not sure if we have done that. It is on the Dean of Students list.

Lucinda Marshall-Kiparissis: I would suggest that if the question goes forward, in the interest of transparency, to be very clear that you are a fee levy group and receive fees from students.

Lori Dimaria: I was going to speak on behalf of IEAC, as last year's chairperson, it was a lot of work getting IEAC incorporated. Since finalized and being separated from the CSU, it is essential for IEAC's functioning to have an increase. At the moment, there are not enough funds and they need to have a staff member present to be able to help the organization thrive. It is very important that we recognize their efforts and what this means for IEAC, seeing as this was an organization established in 1981 and has very rich history.

VOTE

In favour : 13

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Marion Millers: I would like to thank the members of the Policy Committee because there were lots of documents to go through and quite a short timeline to make sure that everything was all there before the referendum.

c) Cooperative Student Housing

Terry Wilkings:

WHEREAS in the 2015 General Election students voted in favour of creating the Popular University Student Housing fund to finance the construction of cooperative student housing;

WHEREAS the above mentioned referendum question outlined general parameters under which the CSU would move forward with the project (i.e.: CSU exclusivity on the first project);

WHEREAS in May 2015 Council empowered the executive and the Fund Committee to engage in the process of re-allocating \$1.85 million from the SSAELC fund to the PUSH fund; WHEREAS, the Fund Committee, the PUSH fund, and UTILE have worked collaboratively in consultation with legal experts in the production of the term sheet and subsequent contracts;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council ratify the Term Sheet between the CSU, the PUSH Fund, UTILE and the housing cooperative that delineates the terms and conditions under which the



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

student housing cooperative will be developed;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council ratify the donation contract between the CSU and the PUSH fund as derived from the term sheet;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council allocate a \$ 35,000 budget envelope for the legal fees associated with the aforementioned documents to be expensed by the Student Space Accessible Education Legal Contingency fund.

Seconded by **Marcus Peters**.

Terry Wilkings: There are going to be two (2) parts to this presentation – one part in open session and one part in closed session, and I have encouraged student media to come and speak with me after meeting for further review as much of the documentation is highly sensitive and only some aspects can be discussed in open session. This is the legal ecosystem delivering the housing project: what the CSU is engaging in is the creation of housing for students. This has not been done in Montreal or Quebec until now, so we have the opportunity as Concordia students to potentially influence the discourse at a municipal level about student housing. Over the past eighteen (18) months, the CSU has been working hard to develop this model and mobilize student support over issues of housing. A lot of knowledge production has been done over past the year on the issues our members face around student housing. Firstly, its been empirically determined that students pay more than the market median for rent across Montreal and Quebec and the negative impacts are staggering. International students pay more than out-of-province students and there are language and cultural barriers preventing the enforcement of tenant rights in agreements with landlords. That trickles down to out-of-province students and Quebec resident students. That is the monetary side where students pay more for housing and typically reside in substandard conditions. There is an inability or lack of awareness that students have as tenants which leads to further dilapidation because they are not holding their landlords accountable and a lot of material deconstruction happens. There are a lot of non-monetary issues faced as well like unauthorized entry into units by landlords or the taking of personal information or financial information. A landlord might demand that an international student give a copy of their study permit when it is not legally required. Since they do not know their rights, they are having them infringed upon. Illegal deposits are being taken from unsuspecting students and this cascades into a negative experience outside of the financial setting and this ultimately has a negative impact on housing markets overall. This is a concept called gentrification – students create upward pressure on the rental market because they are consistently acquiescing to illegal increases in rent and not engaging in proper lease transfers, etc. This is a very short explanation as to why we are doing the project and I guess that we can quickly review the referendum question that the CSU put to ballot. I had written about it extensively in my executive report, but essentially there were two (2) referendum questions on the project during the 2014-15 mandate. The first had to do with gaining conceptual support to move forward. It is very untraditional for student associations to be directly implicated in the construction of housing for members. When we had commissioned the feasibility study to happen in the Fall semester, the results of the study appeared to be of interest, and in order to invest further resources, a question was run in the by-elections of last year which received overwhelming support and we felt like we had the mandate to move forward on the issue of student housing. I was working on this project last year on the CSU executive and now we are in the Winter semester and it was a year ago today at the February meeting that we put the referendum question to ballot to create the Popular University Student Housing (PUSH) fund. This is happenstance that a year later we are being presented with a motion to enable what had first come to Council year ago. The question was quite wordy because it was trying to ask students whether or not they wanted to



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

embark on this financing structure. Students voted in favour to create the PUSH fund and voted for some of the parameters under which students would agree to create it. Since last spring/early summer, the CSU executive the the Student Student, Accessible Education and Legal Contingency (SSAELC) fund committee and other parties have been meeting on a monthly basis to negotiate the ecosystem of different legal entities on the project. First you gave the CSU a mandate and its responsibility is to have a longterm political vision to improve the student condition materially and otherwise, and housing is a big part of the non-negotiable, non-disposable income of what we are obligated to make up. The longterm political vision is to propagate the model in order to allow more students to live in more housing units which over time will drive down rent costs and provide a social environment where stronger linkages can be made between students and the broader community. The second legal entity is the PUSH fund whose mission is to act as financial controller overseeing the funds being utilized by students in the creation of the housing cooperative. This assumes a high degree of risk in the sense that in order to mobilize enough resources to produce a 100-unit housing complex it will cost a lot more than the \$1.85 million that students are putting into the project. Something I forgot to mention was that the CSU announced its partnership with the Chantier de L'économie sociale, a group which finances the creation of social enterprises to the tune of \$1.5 million to this project. In this scenario the reason that they are assuming a lot of risk is because compared to the other financial institution like Desjardins, they are less risk-averse. The PUSH Fund is acting as a patient capital partner and this means prioritizing the social impact over monetary gain and making sure that what you are loaning is making as much interest revenue. The last point is the growth and propagation of the model. The CSU is the founding member of the PUSH Fund but over time, more investors will be taking part such as philanthropic organizations and other student unions. This is a portfolio option that individual groups interested in socially responsible investing could choose to put money into. Over time, we are seeking to explant the capacity of fund so that more projects can be delivered. There third legal entity is the Unité de travail pour l'implantation de logement étudiant (UTILE), which is a not-for-profit group whose mission is straightforward, to study and develop student housing. This is the group that the CSU commissioned, in 2015, to conduct the feasibility study. The project that UQAM was involved in which would have been a student housing complex was a debacle and UTILE was the group which kind of exposed the inconsistencies of how the project was being developed. They have an authoritative understanding of students' needs and the CSU was a collaborator with respect to the student housing market survey they initially circulated in 2014 which gave us notice of how students pay more for rent than other groups. Their expertise is very technical with respect to student housing. The last group is the cooperative. This is the solidarity housing cooperative that is for students, and this is the last legal entity. It has not been incorporated because the location of the project is going to be determined after we get past this phase of the project. The composition of the board will be dependent on the neighbourhood because we want stakeholders from the neighbourhood to participate. Their mandate is very strict in the sense that they will be in charge of the housing unit itself. There are four (4) different legal entities and the reason why it is spread out in this way is that the CSU will be, if Council decides, donating \$1.85 million to the PUSH Fund. We are not loaning funds because then we are just acting in unitary fashion. The purpose is to propagate and create more than one housing project as just a single one will not influence the discourse surrounding the issue. This is the purpose of the donation contract – to inject funds. The PUSH Fund will then loan to UTILE an amount of funds that is for the purpose of delivering the project and UTILE will then pay back the PUSH Fund from the revenue that it gains from the cooperative, once the cooperative established, every month. There is an assumption of risk. UTILE will pay our other financial partners like the bank and the Chantier de l'économie sociale. The PUSH Fund will be paid back last, so it is the lowest rank on the



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

mortgage used to create the housing project. UTILE will have space management contract with the cooperative, which has certain rights and responsibilities with respect to ensuring that rent is paid on time, that members are being preferred over non-members, and a whole host of other obligations that will be determined as part of their work with the provisional committee. That addresses how the money moves around and I will go over how the governance of these entities works. The CSU has a seat on the PUSH Fund and ultimately on the board of the cooperative as a member. The PUSH Fund board is composed of a member nominated by UTILE because UTILE is a member of the Fund but not a board member. Lastly, the housing cooperative has UTILE as one of its support members and in the future, UTILE is planning to alter their governance structure to give room to the housing cooperative to participate in the affairs of the developer. Right now, since there is no student housing cooperative, there is no room on UTILE's board for solidarity cooperative members, but this is in the future plans.

Marcus Peters moves to enter closed session.
Seconded by **Armani Martel**.

VOTE

In favour : 13
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Marcus Peters moves to reconsider motion.
Seconded by **Charles Gonsalves**.

VOTE

In favour : 13
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Marcus Peters moves to enter a ten (10)-minute recess.
Seconded by **Charles Gonsalves**.

VOTE

In favour : 13
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Meeting enters recess at 19h42.

Meeting reconvenes at 20h01.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Marcus Peters moves to enter closed session.
Seconded by **Rachel Gauthier**.

VOTE

In favour : 11
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Meeting enters closed session at 20h02.

Terry Wilkings moves to enter open session.
Seconded by **Charles Gonsalves**.

Motion carries.

Meeting enters open session at 21h36.

Terry Wilkings: I encourage folks interested in the project to come and speak to me to discuss more about the content and mechanics, and I am reiterating that I have invited The Link and The Concordian to participate in an information session about the project and the parameters we can talk about.

VOTE

In favour : 13
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Terry Wilkings: This is a pretty big event so what we are going to be doing is not just addressing needs of student housing that Concordia students face, but bring up the problem in terms of the broader debate. At some point in one (1) to six (6) weeks we will be hosting a press conference to talk about the project and I invite all councillors to be present. I invite all of you to be there because if we want to influence the mayor and other people they need to see that students are passionate about these issues.

d) Concordia Council on Student Life (CCSL)

Marion Miller:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT that the CSU transfer the nomination of one CSU seat on the CCSL to Sustainable Concordia, effective June 2016;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the CSU recommends to CCSL to amend its membership guidelines to replace a CSU seat with a SC seat effective for the 2016-2017 year;



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, conditional upon the approval of the above, Policy Committee amend the Standing Regulations to reflect the referral of this seat to the nomination by Sustainable Concordia.

Seconded by **Aloyse Muller**.

Marion Miller: The Concordia Council on Student Life (CCSL) is a body that grants money to student life initiatives on campus, and the membership is ten (10) voting students. We nominate eight (8) of the them and graduates are two (2). There are ten (10) voting non-students like faculty, staff and administration, and ten (10) non-voting other people who are also administrators or heads of departments like health services. Basically, the idea is to integrate more the focus of sustainability when that granting body is giving money to student initiatives on campus. The idea is to transfer one student seat normally nominated by the CSU and to come to an understanding with another student group to let them nominate for one of the eight (8) seats. This adds a perspective from a group which has a lot of experience looking at projects which are sustainable in terms of the three tiers of sustainability – social, economic and environmental. It has been discussed at CCSL that different members of the community were interested in integrating this sustainability perspective, and the idea is that one of the non-voting members would be someone from Environmental Health & Safety, so there would now be a non-student sustainability person and student sustainability person. We are deciding to give one (1) seat to Sustainable Concordia, which has already been approached, and then suggest to CCSL to modify their bylaws to reflect this. Even if they do not, we can still do this internally.

Jason Poirier-Lavoie: I salute the intention of the motion and would be totally supportive of us delegating and supporting other students from the community, but not to do so in an irreversible manner. We represent all students and I think that we should retain the option of deciding who gets to maintain these positions. A permanent change in the rules effectively making us lose a vote and I would vote against this.

Aloyse Muller: The motion is about giving nominating power to Sustainable Concordia, not a bylaws change, correct?

Jason Poirier-Lavoie: It is included and permanent.

Rami Yahia: I think that it is within the positions we took within the CSU, so I would not see a problem giving one of the eight (8) seats.

Marion Miller: From what I understood from the discussions at CCSL, the intention was to institutionalize a sustainability perspective on the committee to make sure that when projects are discussed, there is a reference person who is an expert and can bring a more expert perspective on the issue. We talked with the GSA representatives on CCSL and they felt really strongly about this, and originally wanted to add a voting student member and non-student member, but that did not seem possible, so this was another way. The idea was to firmly implement sustainability as a mandate in the CCSL, especially in this university right now when many levels of government are trying to think about how sustainability can become a driving force of academic and social activities. I sat on a committee analyzing how sustainability perspectives can be implemented into all nine (9) of the university's



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

strategic directions and I see this as a continuity of those ideas in terms of structurally implementing them.

Jenna Cocullo: I sit on CCSL, and at one of the last meetings I went to, we were talking about allocating \$45 000 to large student projects and sustainability was not even part of the criteria, so I feel that it would be useful to have someone from Sustainable Concordia to sit on the committee to not have projects detrimental to the university or not include safe spaces.

Terry Wilkings: Is it earmarked for a student the sustainability seat? Because I know that the Sustainable Concordia board is not always students.

Marion Miller: Yes, because they have to have parity on the board between students and non-students.

Terry Wilkings: I think that we can have confidence in how ultimately it will be a member of the CSU sitting at the table. It will be one of our members, just under a different designation. The ultimate interests of students will not be undermined moving forward with this. Having one member with sustainable mindset can add volumes to the discussion.

Gabrielle Caron: I want to reinforce the motion and speak in favour of it. Just a reminder, this will be a student, and Sustainable Concordia is mostly student-run so I would not see anything going wrong with that. I would have total faith that Sustainable Concordia would represent the student body.

Armani Martel: I do not know much about the committee, but is it a Concordia administration committee? I find it odd that the CSU is giving a seat to another administration.

Gabrielle Caron: It is a fee-levy group.

Lucinda Marshall-Kiparissis: Sustainable Concordia is a primarily student-run fee-levy group operating on campus independent of the university. They forced the university to go in every sustainable direction it has gone in. Relinquishing one CSU seat is not relinquishing student power. It is in line with the fact that Sustainable Concordia is a respectable enough student body that they have seats on many boards across campus. Offering a seat aligns with what **Jenna** was saying, as there is not enough sustainability on campus. This is in line with the administration's only process of developing sustainability policy, which is through every level of decision-making at the university. So this is us allowing that student-administration-faculty co-created policy to be implemented in another part of the university's decision-making. This does not do anything to disempower student or the sustainability mandate.

VOTE

In favour : 11

Opposed: 1

Abstentions: 2 (**Sanaz, Lucinda**)

Motion carries.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

e) Positions Book - Referendum Questions

Marion Miller:

WHEREAS the CSU is committed to defending accessible, quality, public education for all students;
WHEREAS International Students are an important population within the Concordia Student Union both through the vibrant diversity they bring to the University and in their active engagement in the Concordia community;

WHEREAS new laws have allowed Quebec universities to deregulate the fees charged to International Undergraduate Students in six disciplines: business, engineering, law, computer science, mathematics, and pure sciences;

WHEREAS this measure allows Concordia University to increase the tuition rates charged to International Undergraduate Students in certain programs across the University;

WHEREAS such increases represent a threat to the accessibility of post-secondary education in Quebec for International Students;

WHEREAS recent news from the Liberal government of Quebec have confirmed the impending threat of further downloading the costs associated to maintaining a quality post-secondary education system on the vulnerable population that are International Students;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following questions be put to ballot for the March 2016 General Elections:

Do you, as a member of the Concordia Student Union, approve the adoption of the following positions?

That the CSU oppose any increase in International Student tuition fees to offset budgetary cuts to the academic sector.

That the CSU oppose the financial segregation of International Students through the expansion of deregulated academic programs.

Furthermore, that the CSU work collaboratively towards increasing the accessibility of and defending the right to quality education for International Students.

Seconded by **Marcus Peters**.

Marion Miller: Building upon the motion passed at last Council meeting, it seems like it is going to be a fight upon us in the next few years in terms of protecting the accessibility to education of international student in Quebec. We talked about the expansion of deregulated programs in Quebec and I guess part of the motion was putting into context how international students are hit hardest to make up for budgetary losses to the academic sector in general.

Terry Wilkings: It is unfortunate how the facts have borne out of the predictions made by researchers at the CSU and how they are viewing international students as a cash cow. It is important to put the question to ballot because if it passes, it gives a strong mandate to oppose these hikes vigorously. The reason that this is pertinent is because the Board of Governors is where the fee increases will be approved. They will not be approved directly by the Quebec government, especially for the six (6) programs discussed at the December meeting. I am a representative on the board and will speak very strongly against adopting any increase given that we just received this mandate from students. It is



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

deliberate that we are putting these questions to ballot. The writing is on the wall and we are trying to react in a way to let the community know that we do not see international students as cash cows, but a group that brings dynamism to the community and who should be treated equally.

VOTE

In favour : 14

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1 (**Geneviève**)

Motion carries.

Gabriel Velasco:

WHEREAS both the Energy East pipeline and the Line 9 pipeline are projects that uphold a resources extractive economy that negatively impacts our environment;

WHEREAS the CSU already has a position in favour of our society making a transition towards being fossil fuel free by 2050. [Adopted October 8, 2014];

WHEREAS the CSU already has a position in favour of blocking all pipeline projects in Quebec, with the intention to stopping tar sands exportation. [Adopted October 8, 2014];

WHEREAS tar sand and pipeline development have both been condemned by frontline indigenous communities that directly face the negative social and environmental impacts of their development;

WHEREAS the CSU already has a positions that recognizes indigenous sovereignty over their territories, and their veto power over resource extraction projects [Adopted October 8, 2014];

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following referendum questions be added to the CSU general elections:

Do you as a member of the Concordia Student Union (CSU) agree that the CSU adopt the following position:

That the CSU oppose the the Energy East and Line 9 pipelines, as well as any form of tar sands development.

Seconded by **Marcus Peters**.

Gabriel Velasco: This falls in line with what was just passed. We have a lot of positions around pipeline issues and environmental issues, but these are just motions from Council. In terms of motions from the members, we have very few on these issues and if you understand the Positions Book, motions from Council are meaningful and powerful, but not as much as those taken by the membership of students we represent. We thought it important to get a motion from our membership with respect to pipelines and Energy East is something that is a hot topic right now. This is the ideal moment to take a strong stance on pipelines, Energy East and i9? along with general tar sands development in Canada. If you have questions about why this is not a positive project in general for Quebec and Canada, ask me.

Marcus Peters: Where did this motion come from?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Gabriel Velasco: It was written by the executive in order to fill up the Positions Book this General Election.

VOTE

In favour : 15

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

f) ASEQ

Terry Wilkings: This is a housekeeping measure insofar as last year a referendum question was run to address the financial strains that our health and dental plan are currently undergoing, and unfortunately that question was not approved by the members. Upon further investigation we have come up with a new solution that will address this financial strain. There is a motion attached to this, but it is ultimately up to Council to decide which question will go to ballot. For any of you who were on Council last year, a referendum question was put to ballot with respect to the healthcare plan – one was increasing the ceiling to charge students for services and the second had to do with the notorious administrative fee and various exchanges that took place. One question was to add Special Bylaw K to set a cap of what the CSU can charge as an administrative fee, which was \$3.00. The second question had to do with expanding the ceiling that we could charge students and that question did not pass. This set of documents sent out is trying to address that issue. This has been written about extensively by the media and a lot of universities are coming to the realization that mental health is something that students should have access to. Questions of mental health are still overcoming the need to be seen as a legitimate health problem because there is this stigma around having the need for seeking mental health support. There are a couple of moving parts here but the first is to discuss the monetary side of it. In terms of how healthcare works at the CSU, right now the CSU has a cap as to what we can charge students for health and dental care and that is set at 195.00\$. Every year, the CSU has the capacity to charge up to \$195.00 to students, as per ASEQ, and every year an assessment is done about how many students utilized the services and premiums. On average, this is about 17 000 students per year. ASEQ was actually founded at Concordia. The \$195.00 is divided into health and dental. Health is capped at \$82.00 and dental at \$113.00, which equals \$195.00. The next point has to do with premiums and Quebec tax. Last year, out of a possible 195.00\$ per student, \$184.82 was used in terms of cost. There is a gap and that gap is \$10.18. In the past, before we passed Special Bylaw K, the cap that was placed on what we could charge for the administrative fee was nonexistent. This \$10.18 could be viewed as an administrative fee. Now, the CSU can only charge up to \$3.00 as an administrative fee, so where does the other \$7.18 go? That goes into a reserve fund delineated in the bylaws, though in the past it was 50% reserve 50% administrative, but nothing legislated this in an enforceable way. Since the administrative fee was being put into the operating budget of the CSU, there have been years in the past where the amount of money placed in the administrative fee was more than 50%. That was corrected last year with Special Bylaw K, so it is no more than \$3.00. In terms of what the reserve fee is for, right now there is a cap of 195\$ and 184\$ has been used. That depends on the number of people using the ASEQ healthcare plan and what they are using it for. If we did not have 17 000 students using it and the number dropped to 5 000, what would be the implications? That means that the \$184 is going to jump up because



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

economies of scale. We are buying our healthcare in bulk and that is how the cost is being reduced. If for any reason fewer students use the ASEQ plan, and that is within the realm of possibilities, one year we may arrive at a number like \$197.00. Then we owe \$2.00 x 17 000 to ASEQ that we did not charge students for, and that money would come from the CSU's operating budget. That is where the reserve fee comes into play. The \$7.00 that we had taken from year before is put into a special account that will only be utilized in the case that the premiums of Quebec go above what the planned fee is. In terms of the current scenario, the rule of thumb is that inflation of our health and dental plan is 3 to 4%. Over three (3) years, the cost would go up 9 to 12% and if you add 9 to 12% onto \$184, we are well-above 195\$. We are basically \$10 away from our cap and we are running out of space between what the ceiling is and the actual cost of the plan. What happens in that scenario is that if we keep the existing limit of \$195 is that students will have access to less health and dental services. For the past two (2) years, students getting two (2) checkups a year can only have one (1) now because the cap has been set and we have to operate within the cap so we give fewer services. We may face a circumstance where we are able to provide fewer health and dental services than what we have been for the past five (5) years and I do not think that this is good. We were just talking about how mental health is an increasingly important issue and the survey about student satisfaction with ASEQ as a service provider has shown a desire for more mental health resources. Two different referendum questions were drafted in consultation with ASEQ. With respect to the information provided we wanted to know what we could do to increase mental health support to students, and after seeing the survey results, it is clear that students are interested in this and would like to have mental health be more of a priority. Some key aspects is that option 1 is the existing package, just with an increase of the cap from \$195 to \$220. This does not mean charging more, just that the CSU has some breathing room to incrementally increase the fee that we charge students for health and dental services while giving the existing coverage. Health insurance is kind of a nebulous field. With this option, we would increase the cap by \$25 so that every year we can incrementally increase the amount charged to students from \$195 to \$220 over five (5) years. This will allow students to access the same resources as today. Option 2 is where we move ahead and recognize that mental health support is something our students have a right to have and try to address. Here, the increase is 30\$ instead of \$25, so the cap is placed at \$225 instead of \$220. Why the extra \$5? If you get a checkup for \$90, you get reimbursed \$60. Right now, mental health providers are only recognized as being licensed psychologists, but we have the ability to expand mental health support to include social workers with master's degrees and registered clinical counsellors. Instead of being limited to one category of mental health support, we would broaden the definition of mental health support. I think that the reason why this is relevant is that the cost of a registered clinical counsellor or psychology varies drastically. The second thing is that under the existing plan, if a student is visiting a licensed psychologist they could get credited \$75 per visit for a maximum of \$400 per year. By paying this extra \$5 it would create a scenario whereby they would get reimbursed up to \$90 and the cap would be placed at \$600 instead of \$400. Instead of making five (5) visits to a licensed psychologist, a student could make a higher number of visits at \$90 increments.

Geneviève Nadeau-Bonin: Just to make it clear, the \$5 extra option would consider the other two (2) different mental health specialists whereas the first option would not?

Terry Wilkings: Option 2 is more concerning the \$75 to \$90 and the \$400 to \$600.

Geneviève Nadeau-Bonin: But do they both take into consideration a broader scope of mental health?



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Terry Wilkings: Yes, and that is something we can do independent of the referendum question.

Armani Martel: Are our health plans being renegotiated?

Terry Wilkings: The reason why indexing is a bad idea is because, indexed to what? Healthcare premiums and insurance costs do not follow the consumer price index (CPI). It is also dependent on the number of users we have and we cannot predict the number of users in a referendum. In the scenario where the number of users drops, indexing to a specific amount removes the flexibility we have when dealing with health and dental insurance. The whole purpose of increasing the cap from year to year is that the information taken from previous is used so that an informed assessment can be made based on empirical information.

Armani Martel: How do you know what the price is?

Terry Wilkings: You only know at the end of the year as it is based on the number of people utilizing it. You pay upfront, and we have dealt with that administrative/reserve fee issue last year. Hopefully this can get more coverage because mental health is an important issue.

Rachel Gauthier: The first time I was reading the questions it seemed like a charge of \$25 was for next year, so maybe that is something that will impact on how students vote. The way it is worded to me, it seems like as of next time I buy the plan I will be charged \$25 to \$30 extra.

Terry Wilkings: A quick response would be that Council decides on the question to ask, but we can speak with the CEO to try and produce a question which covers all bases. This is the best that I could think of, but I do not think that the purpose of the discussion is to word the question, but to discuss the concept. We can definitely revisit the wording, which is the point of the CEO having discretion. I am very open to suggestions on wording which would clarify the question. How would we explain the issue to a student who has not delved into this?

Charles Gonsalves: In your explanation of the nuances and differences between the options, I did not really understand them and the wordings would suggest that those should be more explicitly communicated. I know that there are constraints, but it needs to be worked out because it is not clear what the \$5 will do for students.

Terry Wilkings: I encourage you to come and speak to me to discuss the wording. I think that this led to a lack of success with the last question. How do people feel about one option versus the other? Do we like the idea of increasing the total benefits from \$400 to \$600?

Charles Gonsalves: If I were to try and reword the question right now I probably could not do any better, but I think that it is important and worthwhile to expand the access.

Rachel Gauthier: If you are going to ask students to raise the cap, you may as well ask to get the maximum and get the most of the the services, so the second option is the best.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Terry Wilkings: There is no motion on the floor because I wanted to exhaust conversation about this. I think that there could have been a better explanation of how the service works though, and that is something we could work on. We can get people who are creative to design posters with images and symbols for a better explanation during the referendum. I encourage a motion for one option or the other, however.

Jason Poirier-Lavoie moves to support the second health and dental plan option.
Seconded by **Charles Gonsalves**.

VOTE

In favour : 12
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Terry Wilkings: If you look at the way the commas are distributed throughout the sentence, I was able to figure out how to put commas in a way to make it more legible.

g) Student Tribunals

Terry Wilkings moves to enter closed session.
Seconded by **Sanaz Hassan Pour**.

VOTE

In favour : 12
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Meeting enters closed session at 22h32.

Charles Gonsalves moves to enter open session.
Seconded by **Aloyse Muller**.

Motion carries.

Meeting enters open session at 22h46.

h) Affordable, Sustainable, and Student-run food policy

Aloyse Muller:

WHEREAS the CSU adopted by referendum in 2013 the following position:



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

That the CSU actively supports affordable, sustainable, and student-run food service initiatives on campus.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the food served at Council meetings be in agreement with the above-mentioned position.

Seconded by **Jenna Cocullo**.

Gabriel Velasco: I am not speaking out against the motion, but I want to give the context in terms of funding – right now we have a budget of \$3 000 for pizza at every Council meeting, and as of now we seem to be on track with hitting that budget or possibly going over it by 8% because we calculate fourteen (14) Council meetings and each one costs \$220. To follow this motion, if we got all our food from Burritoville it would be closer to \$400 every meeting based on catering prices, so we would need a budget of \$5 600. By the end of the year we would be going over budget by close to \$790, so 800\$ for the next three (3) meetings. That is the financial context of what it would mean to not have Pizza Pizza, but Burritoville, which provides organic options.

Marion Miller: The role of the Position Book – I am referring to Book 2 – is to serve as the basis of the representation engaged in by officers of the unions, and to establish social, political and academic issues. I do not want us to get too wrapped up in what happens in the Positions Book and what happens in the union. I really hope that we do not feel as Council that we have not been respecting that position. I would invite us, if this is a change we want, to make sure that we look into how to integrate this into the Standing Regulations and the functioning of the union and internal purchasing policies. I want to make that distinction so that we are not trying to interpret every single position.

Jason Poirier-Lavoie: I would motivate against this, as food served here is a privilege and the less impact it has on the budget, the better. We are using students' money to provide us with a meal. We should be more sensitive to the costs of doing so.

Jenna Cocullo: I would motivate for this motion. At ASFA, we are thirty-one (31) councillors and seven (7) executives and we get wraps from Niloofar and buy a giant juice thing and tea, and it costs us \$200 for fourteen (14) council meetings. This means that the CSU would be spending \$2 800. I would motivate for this motion because it is doable.

Rami Yahia: I think that even if the food that we would buy at Burritoville would cost more money, it is going back to the community since it is a solidarity cooperative. It is reinvesting in the community instead of a for-profit company which has no interest in students. This benefits the community, students and the environment.

Lucinda Marshall-Kiparissis: I do not think that we should make things more expensive, but I do not think that Burritoville is the only option we have. If something were to be adopted we could find solutions without costing students more. Maybe amend the motion to say "where appropriate" or "as much as possible" or maybe an imperative for us to move in that direction while remaining fiscally responsible.

Aloyse Muller: I just wanted to clarify about the Positions Book, as it is just inspiration and we are not compelled to do anything. In terms of the budget, it is more important to have sustainability practice in



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

food and I do not think that we should spend more, but if it means having less then that is what we should do.

Armani Martel: We are in downtown Montreal. There is no reason we need Pizza Pizza, which is a corporation, as we could go to an independent food provider.

John Talbot: Are we are only allowed to eat catered food allowed by the university for Council meetings? I think that Pizza Pizza, Double Pizza and Burritoville are part of that list.

Gabrielle Caron: The catering has been changing and is continuing to be changed and there are alternatives that we can look into. Recently, Burritoville is not on the list anymore so that is a more complex situation.

Jason Poirier-Lavoie: The only reservation I have is that the motion does not prohibit us from spending more. The costs are controlled, and if there could be food for same price or less I would be for the motion, but this could open us up to spending more.

Jenna Cocullo: I think that the catering thing only applies for events. Technically we could bring our own personal food here.

Jenna Cocullo moves to amend the motion to specify that the amount not exceed \$220 per Council meeting

Seconded by **Rachel Gauthier**.

Jenna Cocullo: That would bring the costs to around \$3 100.

Geneviève Nadeau-Bonin: I was wondering if it would be better to change the amendment to “when possible” or “if possible” so that it leads us to having that leeway and we are not tied to having a fixed budget, because Pizza Pizza might change prices or things might not stay the same. Maybe this would be more prudent. I would be in favour of changing to “when possible”.:

VOTE

In favour : 7

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 4 (**Rami, Lucinda, Antoine, Geneviève**)

Amendment is adopted.

Lucinda Marshall-Kiparissis moves to amend the motion to read “when possible and appropriate” after the first “Be it resolved” clause.

Seconded by **Aloyse Muller**.

Lucinda Marshall-Kiparissis: This gives us a bit more leeway, especially if we have a budget cap.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Jason Poirier-Lavoie: By introducing that kind of wording you effectively neuter the motion, permitting us to effectively apply it when we want to. The reason I would like it to be a hard cap is that if we decide to spend more, I would like to explicitly state it by a motion to increase the cap. This is more transparent instead of permitting a soft rule.

Lucinda Marshall-Kiparissis: I was not adding it to the budget cap, I was amending the first “Be it resolved” clause.

Amendment is adopted via unanimous consent.

VOTE

In favour : 10

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

8. QUESTION PERIOD & BUSINESS ARISING

Terry Wilkings: I want to invite all those people who were part of the discussion we just had to communicate with the executive about how you feel that we can procure food to satisfy the resolution that Council has just adopted. We are trying to meet the needs of Council as much as we can, and having more information as to where we can go and how much it costs will help us, but please share that resource you have because we would like to follow the desire of council with respect to food procurement.

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Terry Wilkings: For folks who have envelopes, please bring them back here and then initial this sheet saying that you have returned them so that we can keep track of them.

Gabrielle Caron: Just a friendly reminder than Concordia Transitions is happening Saturday all day. We have been working really hard at collaborating with the Concordia Food Coalition and it will be an exciting day with breakfast and lunch, and after a huge day of conversation, workshops, activities, DIY things and food, we will have a 5 à 7 at the end of the day. You are more than welcome to come anytime and it will be happening right here in this room all day long.

John Talbot: There will be an open mic at Loyola tomorrow and there will be a bunch of food and drinks and the music starts at 20h00 so you can take the shuttle. On Friday there will be a show/party/evening at Reggies. It is essentially an anti-Valentine’s Day party. There will be some live bands and a burlesque performance, and if you come wearing a CATs patch you get a free pint. Tell your friends.

Gabrielle Caron: It is anti-consumerism week and there will be a bunch of cool informative workshops all week. Also, there will be a clothing swap on Friday. We have blue bins all around campus and you can get a whole new wardrobe.



10. ADJOURNMENT

Jason Poirier-Lavoie moves to adjourn.
Seconded by **Charles Gonsalves**.

VOTE

In favour : 10
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0

Motion carries.

Meeting is adjourned at 22h38.



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

**CSU Special Council Meeting
Wednesday, February 10th, 2016
H-767, 18h30, S.G.W. Campus**

Summary of Motions Carried

2. ROLL CALL

A motion was carried to excuse Jana Ghalayini, Leyla Sutherland and Michael Wrobel from this meeting of Council.

– Marcus Peters (*Sanaz Hassan Pour*)

7. NEW BUSINESS – SUBSTANTIVE

a) Concordia Refugee Initiative (CRI) Fee Levy

A motion was carried to approve the Policy Committee minutes of February 4th, along with the following referendum question:

The Canadian Refugee Initiative is a grassroots organization providing sustained support to Concordia University Students through a Refugee Centre. The services of this Centre will include employment aid, academic assistance, psychological assistance, housing aid, bursaries, legal aid, research publications and business development consultations. Do you agree to pay 37 cents per credit indexed to inflation in accordance with the Consumer Price Index, to the Canadian Refugee Initiative, effective Fall 2016?

– Marion Miller (*Rachel Gauthier*)

b) IEAC Fee Levy

A motion was carried to approve the Policy Committee minutes of February 4th, along with the following referendum question:

The International/Ethnic Association Council incorporated July 2015 and began activities as an independent fee-levy group the following Fall semester, September 2015. The IEAC promotes and celebrates diverse international and ethnic cultures and heritage in a non-political and non-discriminatory manner. Would you agree to raise the fee-levy from the current \$0.06 per credit to \$0.12 per credit, allowing the IEAC to allocate funds towards growing the cultural and ethnic club-base within Concordia, effective Fall 2016?

– Marion Miller (*Marcus Peters*)

c) Cooperative Student Housing



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

The following motion was carried:

WHEREAS in the 2015 General Election students voted in favour of creating the Popular University Student Housing fund to finance the construction of cooperative student housing;

WHEREAS the above mentioned referendum question outlined general parameters under which the CSU would move forward with the project (i.e.: CSU exclusivity on the first project);

WHEREAS in May 2015 Council empowered the executive and the Fund Committee to engage in the process of re-allocating \$1.85 million from the SSAELC fund to the PUSH fund;

WHEREAS, the Fund Committee, the PUSH fund, and UTILE have worked collaboratively in consultation with legal experts in the production of the term sheet and subsequent contracts;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council ratify the Term Sheet between the CSU, the PUSH Fund, UTILE and the housing cooperative that delineates the terms and conditions under which the student housing cooperative will be developed;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council ratify the donation contract between the CSU and the PUSH fund as derived from the term sheet;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council allocate a \$ 35,000 budget envelope for the legal fees associated with the aforementioned documents to be expensed by the Student Space Accessible Education Legal Contingency fund.

– Terry Wilkings (Marcus Peters)

d) Concordia Council on Student Life (CCSL)

The following motion was carried:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT that the CSU transfer the nomination of one CSU seat on the CCSL to Sustainable Concordia, effective June 2016;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the CSU recommends to CCSL to amend its membership guidelines to replace a CSU seat with a SC seat effective for the 2016-2017 year;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, conditional upon the approval of the above, Policy Committee amend the Standing Regulations to reflect the referral of this seat to the nomination by Sustainable Concordia.

– Marion Miller (Aloyse Muller)

e) Positions Book - Referendum Questions

The following motion was carried:

WHEREAS the CSU is committed to defending accessible, quality, public education for all students;

WHEREAS International Students are an important population within the Concordia Student Union both through the vibrant diversity they bring to the University and in their active engagement in the Concordia community;



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

WHEREAS new laws have allowed Quebec universities to deregulate the fees charged to International Undergraduate Students in six disciplines: business, engineering, law, computer science, mathematics, and pure sciences;

WHEREAS this measure allows Concordia University to increase the tuition rates charged to International Undergraduate Students in certain programs across the University;

WHEREAS such increases represent a threat to the accessibility of post-secondary education in Quebec for International Students;

WHEREAS recent news from the Liberal government of Quebec have confirmed the impending threat of further downloading the costs associated to maintaining a quality post-secondary education system on the vulnerable population that are International Students;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following questions be put to ballot for the March 2016 General Elections:

Do you, as a member of the Concordia Student Union, approve the adoption of the following positions?

That the CSU oppose any increase in International Student tuition fees to offset budgetary cuts to the academic sector.

That the CSU oppose the financial segregation of International Students through the expansion of deregulated academic programs.

Furthermore, that the CSU work collaboratively towards increasing the accessibility of and defending the right to quality education for International Students.

– Marion Miller (Marcus Peters)

The following motion was carried:

WHEREAS both the Energy East pipeline and the Line 9 pipeline are projects that uphold a resources extractive economy that negatively impacts our environment;

WHEREAS the CSU already has a position in favour of our society making a transition towards being fossil fuel free by 2050. [Adopted October 8, 2014];

WHEREAS the CSU already has a position in favour of blocking all pipeline projects in Quebec, with the intention to stopping tar sands exportation. [Adopted October 8, 2014];

WHEREAS tar sand and pipeline development have both been condemned by frontline indigenous communities that directly face the negative social and environmental impacts of their development;

WHEREAS the CSU already has a positions that recognizes indigenous sovereignty over their territories, and their veto power over resource extraction projects [Adopted October 8, 2014];

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following referendum questions be added to the CSU general elections:



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

Do you as a member of the Concordia Student Union (CSU) agree that the CSU adopt the following position:

That the CSU oppose the the Energy East and Line 9 pipelines, as well as any form of tar sands development.

– Gabriel Velasco (Marcus Peters)

f) ASEQ

A motion was carried to support the second health and dental plan option.

– Jason Poirier-Lavoie (Charles Gonsalves)

h) Affordable, Sustainable, and Student-run food policy

The following motion was carried:

WHEREAS the CSU adopted by referendum in 2013 the following position:

That the CSU actively supports affordable, sustainable, and student-run food service initiatives on campus.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the food served at Council meetings be in agreement with the above-mentioned position when possible and appropriate.

– Aloyse Muller (Jenna Cocullo)