



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

**CSU Regular Council Meeting – Agenda**

**Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

**18h30, S.G.W Campus**

767,

**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. The Concordia Student Union 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.**

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Roll Call**

**3. Approval of the Agenda**

**4. Consent Agenda**

- a) Approval of the Minutes – July 27th, August 9th
- b) Reports from Committee
- c) Executive Reports
- d) Positions Books

**5. Presentations & Guest Speakers**

- a) Judicial Board

**6. Appointments**

- a) Loyola Committee
- b) Appointments Committee
- c) Clubs & Space Committee
- d) Signing Authorities

**7. New Business – Informational**

- a) Visioning on Student Space
- b) Community Action Fund
- c) Quarterly Finance
- d) Software Engineering

**8. New Business – Substantive**

- a) Daycare
- b) Motion against Fascism
- c) Tenth Strategic Direction
- d) CAF Standing Regulation Amendment
- e) Closed Session
- f) Accessibility

- g) Independent Students
- h) Bog Seat
- i) SUDS
- j) Chairperson's report
- k) External Committee Report
- l) CAF Report
- m) June 14th Minutes

## **9. Question Period & Business Arising**

## **10. Announcements**

## **11. Adjournment**

Chair: Caitlin Robinson

Minute Keeper: Corinne Ouimet

### **1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 18h43

C. Robinson: Some of you were away for the summer that we haven't met yet. Welcome everyone I hope your beginning of semester has been productive and restful. I will begin by reading the Indigenous Solidary Statement.

We would like to acknowledge that Concordia University is on the traditional territory of the Kanien'keha:ka, a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst nations. The Concordia Student Union recognizes, and respects the Kanien'keha:ka 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: Omar Riaz (General Coordinator), Soulaymane El Alaoui (Finance Coordinator), Asma Mushtaq (Academic & Advocacy Coordinator), Veronika Rydzewski (Internal Affairs Coordinator), Maria Gabriela Polanco (Loyola Coordinator), Leyla Sutherland (Student Life Coordinator), Devon Ellis-Darity (Sustainability Coordinator) Ahmed Badr (External Affairs and Mobilization Coordinator),

Executives absent for the duration of the meeting were: (Nil)

Councillors present for the duration of the meeting were: Rim Hamila (Engineering and Computer Science), Khadidja Komah (Engineering and Computer Science), Sally Younis (Engineering and Computer Science), Peter Zhuang (Fine Arts), Damon Toohey (Arts and Science),

*Camille Thompson-Marchand (Arts and Science), Alienor Lougerstay, Lougerstay (Engineering and Computer Science), Julia Sardo (Arts and Science), Patrick Megallanes (Arts and Science), Rowan Gaudet (Arts and Science) Ali Sherra (Arts and Science), Aouatif Zebiri (Arts and Science), Tabea Vischer (Arts and Science) Ahmed Jemma (Engineering and Computer Science), Rory Blaisdell (John Molson School of Business), Mikaela Clark-Gardner (Arts and Science), Charlotte Genest (Arts and Science).*

Councillors absent for the duration of the meeting were:

*Jeremy Laxter, Dylan Applebaum*

---

C. Robinson: We need a motion to excuse Dylan and Jeremy.

*R. Blaisdell moves to excuse Dylan and Jeremy.*

*C. Thompson-Marchand seconds.*

For: 15 Opposed: 0 Abstain: 0

The motion passes unanimously

R. Blaisdell: Question, should we add that to the regulations?

C. Robinson: If you'd like to mandate that, it's your prerogative.

J. Sutura Sardo: Moves to enter it into policy, religious holidays excusal.

seconded :

F: 13 O: 1 A: 1

### **3. Approval of the Agenda**

#### **4. Consent Agenda**

- a) Approval of Minutes (Nil)
- b) Standing Committee Reports
- c) Executive Reports
- d) Executive Work Plans
- e) Positions Book

C. Robinson: If you want to send motions after the initial agenda is sent out, now is the time to do it.

R. Gaudet: I would like to move the SUDS report to new business substantive. As well as the financial coordinators report as Informational, as backup points for the SUDS report. 8F) General Coordinator for SUDS, three points. Can I also add signing authorities to appointments?

C. Robinson: Yes, I will put that at the end.

C. Thompson-Marchand: I want to motion against fascism.

C. Robinson: We can do that, moving along.

R. Blaisdell: Can I put up the approval the minutes. We need to pull them to discuss them to remove June 14<sup>th</sup>. I'd also like to pull out of consent agenda reports External Committee, CAF, yes that'd be fine. Thank you.

C. Robinson: Can do that. Moving along, J. Sutura Sardo.

J. Sutura Sardo: Can I move community action fund from Appointments to Informational?

C. Robinson: Yes. V. Rydzewski?

V: Can we add Clubs and Space committee to appointments, X to Presentations and Guest Speakers, P of Governors to Substantive.

Soon: Accounts and finances.

J. Sutura Sardo: Motion to move Tenth Strategic Direction to

O. Riaz: I'd like to add accessibility to student X, I'd also like to remove June 14<sup>th</sup> from the minutes given that they were late.

R. Blaisdell: Could we add a point under New Business informational, the software engineering?

C. Robinson: Sure.

A. Mushtaq: I'd like to add a CAF amendment to standing regulations, and one into closed session.

C. Robinson: Yes, Julia?

J. Sutura Sardo: Did you sort out the server?

C. Robinson: No, that won't be sorted out but I will send you the documents.

J. Sutura Sardo: Thanks!

R. Blaisdell: Point of information, would you be able to tell me what happened with CAF?

A. Mushtaq: It's an amendment to the standing regulations.

R. Blaisdell: A new point on the agenda under what? I don't want us to duplicate points.

C. Robinson: Anything else to be amended, subtracted or removed? Okay, so I will formalize this and send out the amended agenda after it's approved. Nothing else?

Okay that's it because we're not breaking RR. All in favor?

F: 16 O: 0 A: 1

MP

C. Robinson: I'll put this in the council group so everyone knows where we are. Would everyone be amenable to food break? Recess it is.

**RECESS: 6:55pm**

**END 7:05pm**

C. Robinson: We need to approve Leyla 's point. Yes, Veronika?

V. Rydzewski moves to go into closed session

O. Riaz seconds

F: 11 O: 0 A: 1

## **5. Presentations and Guest Speakers**

C. Robinson: Please everyone who is not an executive, council Judicial Board member, minute keeper, myself, to please exit and we will call you back in.

### **5 minute recess**

*K. Komah moves to excuse themselves, at 20h45*

*J. Sutura Sardo moves to excuse them,*

*R. Blaisdell Seconds*

F: 14 O: 0 A: 0

The motion passes unanimously

**J. Sutura Sardo moves to appoint Safa and Sarah.**

**P. Zhuang: Moves to amend to appoint Mathilde**

**J. Sutura Sardo considers the motion not friendly**

Tabea seconds the motion.

M. Clark-Gardner motions to call the question, the amendment to add Mathilde.

All in favor:

F: 13 O: 0 A: 1

The call to question carries.

Call To Question: All in favor of adding Mathilde to J. Sutura Sardo's motion?

F: 5 O: 8 A: 4

The amendment fails.

A. Zebiri moves to vote to call the question on J. Sutura Sardo's motion

J. Sutura Sardo seconds to call the question

F: 11 O: 1 A: 4

The question has been called.

Julia's motion to appoint Safa and Sara to the Judicial Board.

F: 10 O: 2 A: 4

The motion carries, Safa and Sara will be appointed to the Judicial Board.

T. Vischer moves to appoint Mathilde:

M. Clark-Gardner seconds.

M. Clark-Gardner calls the motion to question.

J. Sutura Sardo seconds.

F: 15 O: 0 A:2

The question has been called.

Tabea's motion to appoint Mathilde, seconded by M. Clark-Gardner:

F: 12 O: 2 A: 3

The motion carries and Mathilde will be appointed to the Judicial Board.

A. Sherra moves to appoint Ibrahim

(No second, two motivations against)

Move to a vote:

F: 4 O: 10 A: 3

The motion fails

A. Zebiri moves to appoint Alex.

Second: C. Thompson-Marchand.

F: 13 O: 0 A: 4

The motion carries and Alex will be appointed to the Judicial Board.

R. Gaudet moves to go into open session.

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds.

F: 15 O: 0 A: 2

The meeting moved back in to open session at 20h47

## **6. Appointments**

### a) Loyola Committee (1 seat)

Gabby: We still have one member left for the Loyola Committee. This year we will be doing a lot of different events, an animal welfare event, a Quidditch tournament, a workshop, but the point is we will have many events and would like someone to join me and make these events as enjoyable as possible for the students at Loyola.

There were no appointments.

### b) Appointments Committee

V. Rydzewski: We appoint students to portions of the CSU body and over the summer we met a lot of people but during the year we don't have as many as we've done most of the appointments. It's a fun committee, we got good food and we need someone.

D. Toohey : I'd move to nominate myself.

**J. Sutura Sardo** seconds.

C. Robinson: Why would you like to?

D. Toohey : I am going to be stepping down from the Clubs Committee and would still like to contribute and I have experience with appointments and would like to contribute.

All in favor?

F: 14 O: 0 A: 1

The motion carries.

### C) Clubs and Space

We create club spaces and we need an appointee, I also try to get good food for this committee and please join the rest of us and the councillors.

C. Robinson: Anyone nominate themselves?

Ally: I would be interested but I am busy this month. Can I join later?

V. Rydzewski: You could join and then come later as long as you're free.

Ally moves to nominate themselves to sit on the clubs and space committee.

**J. Sutura Sardo** seconds.

Ally (motivates): I'd like to be involved in the Clubs and Space committee and I'd like to get involved with that.

All in favor?

F: 14 O: 0 A: 1

Ally has been appointed.

6 D) Signing appointees

R. Gaudet moves to appoint R. Blaisdell and themselves.

R. Gaudet: We've been signing authorities since the start of June. When we were appointed we'd only be the authorities until September so we need to renew it now.

We were confused about being on Finance Committee and being a signing authority but we've been here for a couple of months and there have been no problems. We discuss checks together and our experience compliments each other's very well. I know a lot of the standing regulations, I don't know finance but R. Blaisdell does so we make a pretty good team.

C. Robinson: Any other discussion to be had?

All in favor?

F: 14 O: 0 A: 1

The motion carries, R. Blaisdell and R. Gaudet are the CSU's signing authorities.

## **7. New Business – Informational**

### a) Visioning on Student Space

V. Rydzewski: As council requested the committee sent out a survey to all faculty associations and member associations and clubs to figure out how they're dealing with their offices around campus. Overall the clubs that do have an office on-campus are quite satisfied, but the clubs that do not find it difficult to pursue their mandates.

I'll submit a referendum question at the By Elections and we will work on it at the new Policy committee to see if some need more space and potentially use funds from the "SSAELC" fund.

Ally: What kind of survey was this?

V. Rydzewski: Emails, newsletters, contacted the presidents to distribute it because I don't have contacts with every faculty but I got feedback from everyone but engineers so I think the Referendum question would be good to get everyone's input.

**A. Zebiri:** Out of curiosity, what was the rationale of adding non CSU groups in the survey?

V. Rydzewski: I think closing it off the CSU clubs especially if we're perusing student space for everyone.

**A. Zebiri:** correct me if I'm wrong but from my understanding when we talked about student space and about offices in particular I thought that if we were to offer more student spaces they would go to CSU groups. Groups under ASA or CASA that already have offices but it skews the survey. If out of 100 clubs under CSU only 15 responded it's not representative.

V. Rydzewski: Obviously yes, we would prioritize for CSU groups but that concern is valid I agree.

**P. Zhuang:** If you are offering space are you only talking about club spaces, can you offer spaces that are non-Concordia? I want to know if they can discuss those space potentials or are you only focusing on CSU club offices?

V. Rydzewski: If we do get to that point we could look at opening them to other groups, to have kind of like a collaborate space that can be booked like the library rooms. It would be a good idea.

R. Blaisdell: I want to echo what **A. Zebiri** said. I was on the clubs and space committee, one of the things you can't see are the subsections of the CASA respondents to the survey, we don't see how many of them have access to an office or not. We don't know from here whether all the respondents to the next question were from CASA or not.

However I do think that it's important that we look at some of the last questions in there, the groups that do not have an office what would they use it for? And vice-versa.

This gives us a sense of equal relevance between their use. This report doesn't say we'd be giving offices to people we already have them. Their motivations aren't present.

J. Sutera Sardo: To Veronika's credit I think the CSU represent everyone, and meeting the needs of everyone is really important. Once we've decided all the budgets for all the clubs send out a census to all the clubs so you'd have a more specific feedback from them and they'd be strongly encouraged to respond.

But having this overall idea is important too, being part of a Faculty association we've been fighting for space all the time. The University responds to us like "But you're not the CSU. Ask the CSU". The CSU needs to ensure all of these concerns are being voiced to the university, to make sure everyone is being served. We can make sure everyone's needs are adequately met.

L. Sutherland : It's similar to what J. Sutera Sardo was saying, a lack of space is the same regardless of what part of the student body it affects. Something like a census could be directed to a club space specifically, but if there is a greater need from outside the club space we need to assess what the space is used for and what the needs basis is.

C. Robinson: We can move on to Community Action Fund

**J. Sutera Sardo:** There was an issue with that, there's a place that's up for appointment, and I want to clear that up before we appoint that. Basically what happened when I Was at CAPA for the first meeting the only person who was appointed was Madelyn Summers and we wanted more counsellors. It looks like the external groups have been covered but there's only me as a counsellor and I wasn't even invited to the last meeting, that should be rectified, the email of who the chairperson is should be sent out because the process is a bit different for CAF and we should appoint the person that will replace Eloise. I don't know if I'm appointed as an executive or as a member of the CSU, I know I need clarification.

C. Robinson: It was my mistake, that's why it was removed.

J. Sutera Sardo: So should we add a seat to add another councillor? We should consider adding another person there to be part of the discussions that could arise.

R. Gaudet: I'm going to motivate against it because the reason they created the committee was to decentralize funding. The main purpose was to create a majority of community member seats. CSU funding resources under the control of the community instead of directly under the CSU, creating more seats goes against that point.

J. Sutura Sardo: Question, are you on there as a CSU executive?

SOON3: I am there as a CSU executive. The handbook direction is not to have anyone from the CSU as a chair or minute keeper.

D. Toohey : I am also on the CAF but I am sitting on it as a representative of QPRIG (The Quebec Public Interest Research Group). The purpose is to fund different community initiatives, the groups as the community seats have a lot more experience in dealing with them directly than CSU does. That's not to discount councillors or anything but we're not involved on the ground as much as different community groups in Concordia. They don't have any lesser of a seat than anyone else but he cannot be made chair or act as minute keeper. He can vote just as much as anyone else.

J. Sutura Sardo: Would it be possible to be sent the chair's email? It sucks to be counted as absent when I'm not notified.

A. Badr: I can talk to them about that.

C. Robinson: Any more discussion on CAF? We can move on.

S. El Alaoui : I believe it's in the Bylaws that we have to present our quarterlies. I want us to have more transparent numbers on a monthly basis. An update on spending and revenues. Are there any questions as to the Quarterly Finances document?

When you open it you will notice three columns. One is POP3 actuals what we've spent so far, and budget and annual budget are what we approved at the June council. To date 'POP3' is an estimate of where we should be at but is not necessarily representative for all lines. It is pretty much spot on but there are a couple of things I'd like to discuss.

The IT expenses and MIS unfortunately some of the things like the website migration are costing more than expected, so there are some IT external labor and migration costs over budget by a little bit. The other thing is the Concordia Farms Market payment, we weren't aware of this agreement when we made the budget for June. It's a payment to the CFM,

Soon4: Last year we reached a five year contract giving 8 thousand dollars every year to the CFM.

S. El Alaoui : We added a line in the budget to represent this to be accounted for future years. Expenses for prior years not approved. We budgeted a thousand dollars for prior years not cashed in but we might go over the one thousand because of unexpected costs.

C. Robinson: We can move on to 7D) Software Engineering

Ally: I want to bring to attention this story with the Engineering faculty. To pursue an engineering degree, you need all of your core courses to be taught by an engineering PHD. That is changing. The system at

Concordia was supposed to allow them to register for courses that are non-PHD but there was a mistake and software engineering students were able to register for those courses, but a bunch of students were retroactively disqualified. These were 200 level courses which disqualifies their future courses, so students were dropped out of their capital projects, and it is a huge concern.

Students are complaining and I believe the software engineering Curriculum advisor or manager tried to reassure the students saying Faculty would deal with it but I want to bring it up that it is still a problem especially for International Students, anything that postpones their graduation is charged to us a fee.

**A. Sherra:** We are bringing at least one professor and a student to Academic Caucus. This is part of our role as senators, and it is very important.

R. Blaisdell: We can assume the Concordia Administration is scrambling over this and it's not necessarily on us to prod them but it is important for us as the union to state our support for this and come out in a position pointing out that this is bad for students and they need to take responsibility. We need to reinforce the representation of the student body is important for us.

Ally: I'm scared that Faculty might just protect their accreditation more than the students and this is the CSU's job.

**A. Sherra:** They're going to have to pay big international fees and VISA fees that will be extended. This is unfair for students, it's quite ridiculous actually. If they don't fix it it's not okay.

**A. Zebiri:** I'd like to echo all that has been said and agree with R. Blaisdell, a public position must be taken, and amplify the issues faced by international and regular students.

**P. Zhuang:** I wanted to address the executive team it happened to me. I know I am on the CSU council. For some reason my faculty has always notified me of these issues and I wanted to say that if there is any way possible to address it with the public. They come to me for help but I don't have the right to act individually (edit).

**C. Thompson-Marchand** rescinds.

Ally: The software faculty is working on this so perhaps we shouldn't be too aggressive, we should try to be supportive. People are getting angry but it doesn't help.

R. Blaisdell: When we talk about the fees and the costs in tuition, a lot of internships for engineers are lined up upon graduation. It's super structured and they need to take those courses. If they suddenly have something like this happen, that's one whole year they are not working. It's a huge loss. That's one year of delayed salary. This is a very serious deal for the university. The administration should realize this and I hope they take action but we ought to state it.

A. Badr: What kind of solution what can we bring to the table? It is not an easy issue to negotiate with the administration. Any suggestions?

R. Blaisdell: I have an idea.

C. Robinson: We'll wait for it to come around.

A. Mushtaq: I wouldn't bank on chance for the situation to resolve itself. We need to mobilize this with Academic Caucus. There have been concerns raised online and it's not something to wait around with, especially not with the considerations we have. It is a pretty straightforward issue.

**J. Sutura Sardo:** I recommend voting on bringing this to senate. We could appoint the person responsible for Academic Caucus to bring it up at the next Caucus so senators and the Board of Governors can strategize. The CSU has a nice role to play with the administration and maybe the chair of Academic Caucus can contact the ECA to see how they're dealing with it to work together to ensure this does not happen. The CSU is really into protecting international students and the right to education includes the right to graduate.  
I propose sending this to them.

**A. Sherra:** I think we are forced as senators to discuss this. It's not going to be a matter of voting to send it to us, we will have to move ahead to speak about it.

R. Blaisdell: What I'm trying to propose isn't telling the University how to solve it, but to tell them that it is important. If they cannot, then maybe we come forward. If we were to be the collective bargaining of the students, we have to consider the injury caused here.  
If they don't rectify it then it would be on us to fight. I hope the school is insured for this, they should. I would hope that these students aren't out of luck.

Ally: I'm not sure if it's relevant, or true, but someone told me they might be able to take those courses. People are spreading rumors that inspectors are coming.  
Maybe ask the Faculty to clarify the situation?

C. Robinson: If you'd like to move that. We can request something of the University. You can motion to ask, the University is not required but it brings some teeth to the issue.

Ally: It might be good to take a powerful position.

R. Gaudet: I motion that the issue surrounding Software Engineering Students be delegated to Academic Caucus with the goal of finding the best solutions for the students.

Julie seconds.

R. Gaudet: This is more or less as everyone has said, it's important we support these students in light of this issue.

**J. Sutura Sardo:** It's very important that it be sent to academic caucus, they will be made aware of this. This is relevant to the senate of academic caucus, council can send out information to be discussed to ensure that it is discussed. We must strategize before the next meeting.

C. Robinson: We're on the motion now.

F: 15 O: 0 A: 0

**J. Sutura Sardo's** Yes Noted

The motion carries

A. Badr: I want to correct the issue on internships. The internships are paid but whereas in some programs they are free. If you miss an internship it is part of the cost.

**J. Sutura Sardo:** Rescind

**P. Zhuang:** I wanted to say about the comments on the rumor, the problem right now that students only see us as the only power above them, so they come to talk to us. They don't know where to go. We don't have the right to be above them, in the end students only really think we are the ones the deal with this issue. This is a big issue right now.

**S. Younis:** I rescind.

**A. Sherra:** I think we should move on, we voted on it.

## **8. New Business – Substantive**

### a) Daycare Construction

O. Riaz: The CSU has been working in close collaboration with the Concordia University Student Parent Center.

*“Whereas The CSU has been working in close collaboration with the Concordia University Student Parent Centre (CUSP), in order to improve the current level of support the University is providing to our student parents*

*Whereas in 2011, a research document sponsored by CUSP and the Dean of Students Office was developed*

*titled “Student Parents and Their Children: How can we help them? An analysis of the student parent experience at Concordia University”, which outlined childcare as a primary stressor for student parents.*

*Whereas other university student unions like UdeM, McGill, and Laval already provide Daycare services.*

*Whereas a study was conducted by the CSU in order to understand the broad implication of going ahead with a CSU run daycare 2014.*

*Whereas in 2014 87% of the CSU membership voted yes for an on-campus daycare service.*

*Whereas in 2016, Concordia University agreed to provide an ideal and sufficient space for a student parent daycare (1425 Bishop).*

*Whereas the CSU has already spent approx. \$120,000 on demolition and preparation for final renovation of the daycare building.*

*Whereas Concordia University has agreed to provide financial assistance for the final renovation costs (Approx. \$270,461.42 plus taxes and 15% contingency for renovations and 50% of \$115,881.59 for demolition costs).*

*Whereas the CSU went to tender, which was overseen by Mme. Maggy Apollon, the CSU appointed architect and three quotes were submitted (please see attached documents for all 3 tenders.*

*Whereas Mme. Maggy Apollon has suggested (please see attached letter) to award the contract to Construction J. Michel Inc. for being the lowest bidder at the price of \$941 000.00 plus applicable taxes and fees and 15% contingency.*

*Be it resolved that the CSU allocate \$941 000.00 plus applicable taxes and fees and 15% contingency from the SSAELC fund for the renovations, contingent on the approval from the fund committee Be it further resolved the CSU allocate \$35 000.00 plus applicable taxes and fees and 15% contingency for the purchase of equipment form the SSEALC fund contingent on the approval from the fund committee.”*

**A. Sherra** seconds.

O. Riaz: We've been working on the daycare, we needed to get space, the previous executives worked to secure space. It took a long time to make sure the asbestos and structural issues were addressed. We had to make sure the structure is sound.

The last cost is to ensure the full construction for it to be ready in service.

R. Blaisdell: I looked through a lot of these documents, I didn't see the insurance documents from the selected company. This company was the one company that did not provide one? I want to ensure if we're choosing them we're insured against overpay if they go beyond the 20 weeks allotted for construction.

O. Riaz: I would suggest amending the motion for them to provide us with their insurance document to fully validate the motion.

R. Gaudet: I motion to add "be it further resolved that this depend upon proof of satisfactory insurance is provided to the CSU".

R. Gaudet: Motivation is the previous conversation.

R. Blaisdell: Can we amend that "for construction liability insurance".

C. Robinson: Can this be considered friendly? Perfect, moving on.

C. Robinson: Can R. Gaudet's amendment be considered friendly? Good.

All in favor?

F: 13 O: 0 A: 2

The motion carries.

b) Motion against Fascism

**C. Thompson-Marchand:** <MOTION NEEDED>

Second: **A. Sherra**

**C. Thompson-Marchand:** In light of the prominence of the Alt-Right and groups here in Quebec, and other groups in Canada that are Far-Right who praise discrimination. I believe that it is the duty of the CSU to take a position on this matter.

D. Toohey : I'd also like to motivate in favor of it from a practical point of view in that we recognize that we recognize we exist to protect our students and recognize that some students need more protection than others. We recognize that within the past couple of weeks that there has been a group postering

around campus, the same group responsible for Generation Identity. We have been looking into it and they have a planned recruitment initiative at a bunch of universities.

**A. Zebiri:** To clarify, they're external group but they're postering attempting to set up?

R. Gaudet: They postered on the same day across Montreal and Toronto. They're a white nationalist movement.

**J. Suterardo:** A logistic question, did they have approval from any association?

R. Gaudet: No.

**J. Suterardo:** My question is why were the posters up long enough for them to notice? What about security?

A. Mushtaq: There has been violations of the postering policy. Members themselves take initiative themselves to act on it. It's been voted on, it isn't always on CSU property, but areas that are not monitored as much.

R. Blaisdell: In the same vain I was assuming that no student group would support something like that. If they threaten our students, why can't we take a more proactive approach to defending our students? Get a group of volunteers to check the boards? We have groups invading our school. Let's organize something.

A. Badr: Similar to what A. Mushtaq said, we didn't even release a statement because we didn't want to give them any recognition. If we speak of them it would spotlight them.

R. Gaudet: I agree with A. Badr said, it's important not to give them a name for being a fringe group. Responding to R. Blaisdell's point, it's a good initiative, last time they went up they went down right away. Students took action and worked online together as a unit as an automatic response. So as an initiative so far it's not needed.

D. Toohey : Bearing in mind what R. Gaudet just said, it is a purposefully vague motion. It lends even more credence to supporting the motion. It allows us to verbally and materially support groups already doing this work.

Ally: I want to say that according to the facebook page, it is not a recurring thing so I agree.

C. Robinson: We can move to a vote on the motion.

F: 15 O: 0 A:1

D. Toohey and C. Thompson-Marchand's for votes are noted.

The motion carries.

Request for Excusal from **S. Younis** and A. Lougerstay.

F: 16 O: 0 A: 0

8 C) Strategic Direction

*J. Suter Sardo moves for the CSU becoming a feminist university and have it added to the positions book, that the CSU will support a feminist university and for feminism to become the tenth strategic direction.*

J. Suter Sardo: I think this is important, at other university-wide meetings it was brought up that Kimberly Manning has been trying to have Concordia's new six year campaign of fundraising. They brought up since there are 29 strategies and the nine strategic directions, they wanted to know if there would be a 30<sup>th</sup> strategy or a tenth theme be a feminist value. It is strange that Concordia wants to be seen as a feminist university but doesn't want it to affect fundraising. We need to ensure that the ideology is broadcast and reinforced. If we adopt this position and get a nice round ten with feminism we would be making a huge accomplishment because Concordia would become the first actual feminist university, putting our money where our mouth is.

Feminism is important and if our Concordia-wide campaign for the next six years doesn't touch on feminism and important heads of departments are being shut down just for asking about it, something ought to be done.

R. Gaudet: Could you post the motion to the group? I am looking to make a small amendment.

**A. Sherra:** I would like to amend the motion to be explicitly trans inclusive. I think that speaks for itself.

**C. Thompson-Marchand:** I am slightly afraid that it might be an in-the-air statement and no action will take place following this statement.

**J. Suter Sardo:** The reason I brought this up was that we do not have a clear position on this. It will give legitimacy to the Academic Caucus to bring it up at Senate. The representatives will do that as well. The executives could add it into their mandates. They could advance the notion. If one of the committees wants to take on a project to further this it would help a lot to set the ground but right now the university says they're a feminist university but have nothing written down to hold them to it. It has to be approved by three committees that aren't adequately representative.

M. Clark-Gardner: I'd like to say that for people who don't know there is a long point (Point 12) in the positions book about feminism.

It is part of our values and viewpoints. It was mentioned that a strategic direction can be superficial but they do much further in depth, it is one of the ten and it goes into different committees and subcommittees. What needs to happen is for this point to be put through caucus. Feminism is a very book word and encompasses many fields. We need a concrete report to bring to senate to put this forward or it might fall short. That is my suggestion.

**A. Sherra:** Rescind  
Ally Rescinds

R. Hamila: I want some clarification. What is the definition they want to work with? I want to know what this would change if we have it under the positions book, what actions would follow?

**J. Suter Sardo:** The strategic directions are Concordia's game plan. If it's not part of their game plan, they're not actually doing it. If we adopt it as we have in our Positions Book, and that definition is the one we would advance. It is the universally accepted position. We would gain from this a certain

position, and the action-based response as CSU is the executives would implement this in our mandates. The policy committee, academic caucus, student life committee, they could write something up so then the CSU could take concrete steps forward.

If you come up with a project and it doesn't fit their strategic directions, they won't take action on it. Sometimes they don't think very far to see if it fits or not, so a tenth strategic direction would open a huge door for proposals that we'd like to propose that the University has continually shut down.

R. Hamila: Since we have a position already, everything you mentioned falls within the CSU position on feminism. Not to be redundant, isn't it already there? What does it add?

**J. Suter Sardo:** Sofia came up with that last year for the CSU, this would be to pressure the University itself. The actionable point would be adding the strategic direction. Sometimes we have positions in the positions book we have multiple positions with a similar theme but a different aim. This position compliments that one, but the action-based response is very different. The CSU in five years will look through its position book and they will verify if they've met that position.

L. Sutherland : I really like the spirit of this motion, and there's lots of reasons to advocate to the university, that said I don't think that this is necessarily where the CSU's role falls to advocate for another strategic direction. The CSU isn't guided by the strategic direction. We already have reason to pressure the University to do better and to make it a feminist university. The university itself will never be historically feminist, but as far as to perceive the intention in this it has been said Feminism is already part of our mandate. The University should already be aware that they ought to care about this, putting so much energy on this effort takes energy away from active feminist projects underway, like our campaign for unpaid tuitions. I'm advocating for a strategic direction.

A. Mushtaq: What they said covers most of it, the project is very valuable if taken on as a project on its own. But a lot of work is to be done, it might be seen as a bit of an overstep, but there are steps we can take. If the definition needs revision that's one possibility. It's probably not the best place to have this discussion, elsewhere would be best.

**J. Suter Sardo:** This is exactly what Alan Shephard did to Kimberly Manning and the reason why the CSU exists is to give the community access to what they need. The whole women studies department is being underfunded because feminism is a showpiece priority.  
My motion is:

To add this to the positions book: Adding Feminism as the Tenth Strategic Direction among other things. This is exactly like what was said at other meetings. Feminism should be their own strategic direction so that the University actually funds this. They fund the natural sciences but they don't fund projects dealing with equity, equality, and feminism. If they don't have this position solidified, Senators can't bring it up as an active position. Our other position is good but it is not precise enough for what I think we should be doing as board. Our goal is to implement things, and talking about it is one thing, but actually doing things and preparing for the future is another thing. People always shut this down. We have a duty to our students.

**C. Thompson-Marchand:** I prefer the positions book than stating that Concordia is a feminist university. They would be able to say it without it being true.

C. Robinson: Can we consider the amendments friendly?

**J. Sutura Sardo:** R. Blaisdell also posted a good companion piece about the doublespeak by the University.

R. Blaisdell: They stole my thunder but I did post something because this was a little confusing when I got it. When I googled Concordia plus Feminism, they thought about what a Feminist University be, so I thought it would be useful. There's some confusion around the table on a position about mandating the University to do something. We have a position to support feminism but it doesn't necessarily mean the University will go forward.

Instead of taking another position on this, we move to promote and encourage the administration to convince the school to adopt what we want. We can't motion they add things, but we can motion that we can try to get them to do it.

M. Clark-Gardner: This is really something for Academic Caucus or Policy and we ought to push the University to integrate this into the strategic directives. We shouldn't rush anything, we should discuss and create a concrete plan. We can't just throw around that word. It can become empty. We need to about this the right way and this is not the right setting for this topic. It should be done by Academic Caucus.

**A. Sherra:** I want to move to discuss this elsewhere, this is becoming circular and we have other things to discuss.

C. Robinson: Was that a motion to table? Do we have a second?

A. Mushtaq seconds.

**A. Sherra,** Motivating: This isn't getting anywhere. I don't think this issue is well understood.

**J. Sutura Sardo:** Out of order. You can't assume that.

C. Robinson: All in favor of tabling the motion? Did you want to set a date?

**A. Sherra:** Next council meeting?

C. Robinson: There was a point of information.

**C. Thompson-Marchand:** Are we going to table it to next meeting without anything happening in between.

**A. Sherra:** Okay we haven't all read this article, I feel that we are going in a circle and things are being repeated, stuff must be considered and we already have a position. It's nothing against the motion itself and making sure the motion is being dealt with properly.

C. Robinson: We have a motion on the floor to table it to next council.

**J. Sutura Sardo:** R. Blaisdell wants to amend it.

C. Robinson: I want this to be more collaborative. I don't want this to be repeated next council.

R. Blaisdell: My suggestion is to find a compromise, I hear to things. **J. Sutura Sardo** wants an action now; it's been a long time. In order to satisfy that need, and the need of a discussion for a better solution, why don't we put a three-person working group together and mandate them to work on this issue with **J.**

**Sutera Sardo** before next council. So at least by then the interested parties work on it together and work out the issues and come up with the solutions so we're not debating the issue unknowingly and we can open up those possibilities.

C. Robinson: I don't want to deprioritize the speakers, so I'm not going to accept the table because we will return to this.

R. Gaudet: I motion to send this to Academic Caucus.

Motivation: This is very similar to what R. Blaisdell suggested and what M. Clark-Gardner suggested. I believe A. Mushtaq is the chair of both Academic Caucus and Policy. We're not getting anything done in this room, doing it that way would be much more efficient.

A. Mushtaq: I want to second what R. Blaisdell said, I think the working group is a good idea. I wouldn't send it straight to Caucus. A policy committee can review it and then we can strategize, it would be more progressive and would be more helpful to the process. A vote on policy and then to caucus.

**J. Sutera Sardo:** I agree with that completely it should go to policy. I amend to switch it to being sent to Policy instead.

A. Mushtaq: Is a working group created? Or is it being sent to Policy right away?

**J. Sutera Sardo:** If Policy wants to create a working group that'd be good.

C. Robinson: We can move back to the speaker's list.

**P. Zhuang:** I was kind of agreeing with R. Blaisdell, the three people group. The problem is that we can send it to the Caucasus. At this moment this has been going on for a long time and the students want us to take some action.

C. Robinson: Can the amendment be considered friendly?

C. Robinson: The motion on the table is to refer to policy.  
All in favor?

F: 12 O: 1 A: 1  
The motion carries.

J. Sutera Sardo point of personal privilege, please avoid making assumptions during heated discussions.

C. Robinson: Noted and will be respected.  
There is nothing else, we can go on to

### **8D) CAF Standing Regulation Amendment**

A. Mushtaq: The committee would like to recommend an amendment to the standing regulations. It was supposed to happen earlier but fell through the cracks. It was recommended for it to be brought to Policy committee, it was going to be done last year. The motion is just to have a check be signed by two members of the committee.

A. Mushtaq motions the following:

*“The CAF committee would like to recommend an amendment to the Standing Regs. governing the CAF, which the addition of one article précising who has signing authority. It's something that was supposed to be passed last year but fell through the cracks. The amendment is in red in the word document (and [...]the renumbering of the articles).”*

R. Gaudet seconds.

F: 10 O: 0 A: 1

8 E) Closed session point

R. Gaudet moves into closed session

M. Clark-Gardner seconds.

F: 11 O: 0 A: 1

***The meeting returns to closed session at 22h28.***

V. Rydzewski:

**“Whereas** according to the Point 7.6 of CSU Bylaws, the responsibility to represent - or appoint - undergraduate representation on academic bodies falls within the jurisdiction of the academic and advocacy coordinator.

**Whereas** due to personal matters the academic and advocacy coordinator is unable to attend senate at this point.

**Whereas** due to these unforeseen matters, the senate work load will now shared with another executive.

**Whereas** the senate secretary has been discretely made aware of the circumstances and foresees no contention.

**Be it resolved** that Council approve the appointment of Leyla Sutherland by the executive committee, as the official representative to senate and its standing committees, in lieu of the academic and advocacy coordinator.

**Be it further resolved** that this be notwithstanding point 236. b of the Book VI, of the appointments book, designating the seat ‘ex-officio’.”

V. Rydzewski: Motions to appoint L. Sutherland

F: 11 O: 0 A: 1

The motion carries.

J. Sutura Sardo motions to move into open session

V. Rydzewski seconds.

F: 11 O: 0 A: 1

The motion carries

***The meeting returns to open session, 22h36***

C. Robinson: We’re back in session.

J. Suteria Sardo moves to ratify the minutes of closed session  
C. Thompson-Marchand seconds  
F: 10 O: 0 A: 2

C. Robinson: We'll move to 8f), accessibility.

J. Suteria Sardo: Point of information, have the positions from last year added to the positions book? I remember writing out the Right to Die or Accessibility. Is it in the book?

M. Clark-Gardner: Sometimes online you'll come up with older versions, so you'll have to be precise on Google.

C. Robinson: There's a thing in the standing regulations about this, it will come back next meeting.

R. Blaisdell: So is Right to Die coming back today?

C. Robinson: It should but it will come back next week.

J. Suteria Sardo: Can we ask the IT person to make it easier to find the real positions book?

C. Robinson: I'll add it to my server issues email.

#### **f) Accessibility**

R. Hamila: We didn't find a position on it when we looked for it.

C. Robinson: It was the second point.

R. Hamila: *"Whereas CSU represents all undergraduate students at Concordia  
Whereas independent students don't have a seat in CSU 2017-2018 council  
Whereas independent students don't have faculty association.*

*Whereas independent student don't have a channel to voice their concerns  
Be it resolved that the appointment committee gives priority to independent students to sit on the  
student at large positions in the CSU's committees.*

*Whereas the CSU is the representative student union representing all its unions, all Concordia buildings  
are used by student groups, etc have offices located at these buildings, be it resolved that the CSU ask the  
Concordia administration to make these buildings available to all students."*

R. Hamila (motivation): Some of the buildings are not accessible, especially the ones given to associations. Association offices are not accessible to students with special needs. It was also put up during the discussion of buildings. It is important to integrate all students, even if it costs more money for a different type of access.

R. Blaisdell: I'm really happy this is brought forward. I had an issue a couple years ago trying to make an appointment in one of these buildings and I had to go through a Dean to get access and they weren't very cooperate. As a student registered with disabilities I know that sometimes that there can be easy ways to go around these issues, and we should call on Concordia to make those changes. Like giving

students elevator access keys, it is a nightmare to get keys for reserved elevators. Students who don't need them take them, but this would be a good step.

A. Zebiri: Point of information: Was R. Hamila's motion sent out?

C. Robinson: It was sent out as one of the last documents, and it's also on the facebook group.

J. Sutura Sardo: I also wanted to echo that in the Annexes like the Philosophy building, they're not accessible. Professors also don't change their location based on you and so on, and it needs to be taken seriously. Maybe O. Riaz would be able to answer this, would the CSU daycare be completely accessible?

O. Riaz: Not yet, but we'd like to see ramp access.

C. Robinson: All in favor of the accessibility motion?

F: 13 O: 0 A: 1

J. Sutura Sardo's for vote has been noted.

### **8 G) Independent students**

R. Hamila:

"Whereas the CSU is the representative Student Union that promotes the educational, political, social, recreational and cultural interests of all its members.

Whereas not all Concordia buildings are accessible to all undergraduate students

Whereas many of these buildings are used by student groups and associations

Whereas some of the CSU clubs/association have offices located at these buildings

Whereas accessibility to these buildings hinders the ability of students with special needs to be active on campus.

Be it resolved that the CSU asks Concordia administrations to make these buildings accessible for all students."

A. Zebiri: It would be great if we clarified this, the requirements for applying to Student At Large, isn't it required to be a full time student?

R. Gaudet: Independent Students can be full time students.

C. Robinson: All in favor of the motion?

F: 12 O: 0 A: 1

The motion carries.

### **Ten minute recess called at 22h48**

R. Gaudet motions to Excuse Gabby and D. Ellis-Darity.

C. Thompson seconds.

F: 12 O: 0 A: 1

## **8 H) Board of Governors Seat**

V. Rydzewski presents the following motion:

*"Whereas Asma Mushtaq was appointed to the Board of Governors at the June Regular Council meeting,*

*Whereas Asma Mushtaq resigned from the position,*

*Whereas the executive committee chose to appoint Leyla Sutherland to sit on the Board of Governors,*

*Be it resolved that council ratify the executive committee's decision to appoint Leyla Sutherland to the Board of Governors."*

A. Mushtaq seconds.

V. Rydzewski motivates: We need to appoint another executive and we chose L. Sutherland as she is the best bet.

F: 14 O: 0 A: 1

The motion carries.

## **8 I) SUDS**

R. Gaudet: The original point was someone else's.

O. Riaz: We attended a conference at the University of BC, to look at how they help mental clients. They have a new student building as a response to the demand for student space.

They were there for four days. The first two days we met up to discuss the process for their student union building. We discussed and met with their consultants and attended workshops for the conference itself.

R. Gaudet: It's important to discuss this document. It's flawed. Rather than going point by point, I want to go over two large issues. It's very vague, names an idea, three line blurb, it doesn't describe any of the process. Just as other associations have less executives or whatever it may be, it doesn't discuss it at length.

There is no understanding of the difference between student associations in Quebec and the rest of Canada. QC has accreditation laws, which mean that when we have our funding, if we annoy the university the university can't cut our funding. If we do we take them to court and sue them to pieces. In any other part of Canada Universities can. This is what things are like outside of the province. We've had this since the 60's and 70's so our culture has developed very differently. The points brought up in this document shows a lack of understanding of how things work here.

An example the relationship with the University, like the Daycare is a co-project. But other times we oppose the university like International Student Tuition Hikes. No other associations outside of the province would be able to do that. This is an inherent flaw throughout this document. The Health and Dental plan is extensive but it's not new, it's stuff we already knew. The student space thing was again to buy that space, it's a continual effort to push that on council. I want to be clear, I think this document is very flawed.

S. El Alaoui : Quebec being different, we understand that and McGill and UdeM their student unions also went to this conference. Their goal is to bring together many universities and groups not only to look at administrative processes but also internal processes.

The other thing about the relationship with the University, we had just seen that as worth commenting about. You didn't mention the strategic plan these associations take on, among other things. The student building isn't something we're trying to push on council, it is something we agreed to discuss further. The information we have here it to keep having those discussions. As said before, there is a lack of space. It's not necessarily the Bishop building.

The Health and Dental stuff that UBC does are in-house services and they have different cost and refund systems. In our current contract with ASEC we have the option to move these services in house, so we wanted to weigh it as an option. They're mentioned here, it would create jobs for students manning these posts but it would also decrease our costs and increase our revenues by decreasing the revenues ASEC makes as a fee. For now that's all I'm going to say, O. Riaz and I have written a big statement.

R. Blaisdell: It's interesting you mention the schedule and the things that they cover at this conference, like sustainability student life these types of things. I wonder why the sustainability coordinators for the clubs and student life didn't go. I am also concerned about this report, one of the big takeaways is to have a Strap plan. Where S. El Alaoui and O. Riaz sat on CASA last year and these things had been implemented last year. You don't have to go to BC for this, I created a workshop on CASA and they were both there when that happened. One of the big benefits of this conference is supposedly that they learned that we needed to do something we already agreed on.

They also missed the keynote workshop from the schedule. It is given by the ASEC representative and doesn't say what it's on. I'm concerned when we talk about going to this conference about learning about a health and dental plan, and you don't touch on that workshop.

S. El Alaoui : We went from August 16<sup>th</sup> to August 20<sup>th</sup>, the conference being from August 18<sup>th</sup> to August 21<sup>st</sup> when people leave. The days we went prior to the conference was to meet up with the ASEC and them to discuss how they do their health plan.

The keynote Mr. Burkeman gave had something to do with the health plan but was mostly a motivator for projects. The workshops didn't include the keynote speeches, there were a couple, I have already reached out to AES for the slide notes from all of the workshops to share with all the of the executives. We have a conversation to see who should be going to this conference. As for the strategic planning, yes you're right we were both on CASA but we also there was a lack for the CSU and that other schools had a similar design to theirs to what we wanted to do. We wanted to reach out to other student unions, and most of it was through referendum on an ongoing basis.

R. Blaisdell: But why did you have to go to BC to do that? There are other groups in Quebec or in Ontario. That was my direct response to his direct response.

S. El Alaoui : We had the opportunity to meet different schools across Canada, and not just focus on Quebec.

M. Clark-Gardner: I have a big issue with the wording and the things being added to this document. The Union is not a business. On page 4, saying that the Strategic plan should operate as a business is dangerous. We ought to be careful of the wording of these documents, especially when it's talking about merging the executive teams and having fewer team members and having a hierarchical structure when there's been so much work put into the structure. You're not presenting a two-sided argument, you need to look into how these methods actually work. It's very simplified, and another simplified version of why I think coordinators are very important. All voices are heard and it's a collaborative process.

J. Suter Sardo: In order to function well as a board we need to be transparent and accountable.

We appreciate collective decisions. I don't care about the conference but the cost which is outrageous. Some CEO takes money without the CSU council's consent? The executive was appointed to represent the CSU. This needs to be taken very seriously and we have measures to address this. You call a meeting, call a special council meeting, and use your executive decree. We have mechanisms in place to deal with this. We have rules and regulations and this just defeats the whole person.

And clearly this was not discussed and it was not consensual and there are no Executive Meeting Minutes. Having this sort of information circulating and finding out way after the fact that you were in BC for five and not three days, you want to be reimbursed a thousand dollars, it's not okay to do this. We're holding you accountable as a board, you need to talk to your executives about it. The only way this works is if we talk and agree. What R. Blaisdell said earlier was true, there was a workshop that would have been super beneficial to D. Ellis-Darity. It's expensive and you're accepting a gift (ADDRESS THE CHAIR), it wasn't decided collectively but we found out after. It wasn't thoughtful, we need to be transparent. We have a group on facebook if you can't call a meeting. We need to figure out a way for things to work and I would like to hear from the other executives how this decision was made, your thoughts on this, we hear this from the grapevine and then I'm sent this random document? I don't think that's fine. the CSU's standards are higher than this, we're above this kind of behavior and it's not okay.

O. Riaz: I rescind.

R. Gaudet: I'm going to ask that we talk about one thing at a time. I didn't put my motion forward to discuss the document and the last point was not directly discussing the content of the document so I will continue on that part.

S. El Alaoui stated I did not go through all the points.

To clarify I didn't criticize the Health and Dental plan, only that there was no new information.

The New jobs, costs, all that, none of it was new. It's actually poorly implemented in this document, the general manager who went on this trip with you point out that it doesn't increase the revenues because ASEC still collects. There are problems, but it's still not new information.

And yes, technically Loyola could function without A sustainability coordinator and so on. But we're greatly benefitted by them. So yes we can, but we absolutely should not. It includes more students and supports our mandate. I've already discussed online voting because of tampering. You can walk around with an iPad, I can reference the GSA that almost had their elections discredited for these issues. Coming from BC they've had issues with online voting as well, and the fee levy system sounds like an absolute mess. A referendum question for every fee levy sounds terrible, and saying you should pay a flat fee doesn't make much sense either.

S. El Alaoui : The point of this document isn't to push an Agenda. Not to push anything but to have a discussion at a council level. nothing we did had any decision making power, it was just for information to relay to council.

A. Sherra: There is another point on the document about keeping the CSU academic and professionally focused, which is also a little problematic. We are here to protect the students, that is the point of all this. That is why we are here .That is why we were voted here. It is very important that our mandate include academics and professionalism, and protecting them in their current environment as students. Focusing on those things draws the CSU away from its accredited role and weakens it.

V. Rydzewski: I would like to clarify that we had no say in them going. It was just kind of "hey we're going" and nobody responded, which isn't the same thing as agreeing.

R. Blaisdell: To quickly summarize, the reasons or benefits cited in this report are the building, Strap plans, a non-hierarchical structure, decreasing number of execs, fee levy's, and health and dental plan. It seems as though these reasons for attending this event are either relevant, inapplicable, or insufficient as explanations or justifications for this. This 107 million dollar building doesn't compare to what we've done. It seems a little bit off context from what we'd benefit from. If we went to other universities in Quebec, that'd be one thing, but BC doesn't have a legal accreditation act. It just seems that all of these reasons for going aren't valid. Why did you go? Was it for the purpose of this conference? Was it because someone said, "Hey, you should go, I'll pay for it".

O. Riaz: We appreciate and acknowledge that the counsellors don't see the value in that. We didn't want to impose anything, this was just our finding. We wanted to leave it open for interpretation. how can we transpose information, but it's for everyone to decide. It was just to compare and contrast. Although the Quebec student movement is different but it has a lot in common. The UdeM also went, they were extended the same offer. Other unions sent more, we sent us to focus on the Health and Dental plan but it would have cost more to send more of us.

M. Clark-Gardner: Council's job is to make sure that executives are holding up their standards. I am a little disappointed with the authors of this document. ultimately it is your job to understand how the union works. This is not a hierarchical structure. I understand but you say it's just information in this document, but it is biased or prescriptive. You can't just say that something is confusing. That is putting you in a poor light saying you don't understand how this works because that is your job and you are paid to do it.

D. Toohey : This isn't about the wording or intent but the impact of the document. From all the recommendations we can take that the content of this document is against the values of this union.

Julie: I have a question for O. Riaz or S. El Alaoui , when you went to the workshop did you discuss how this benefits us? Our health and dental plan has been fixed for the next little while. A concern that I've received from students was that people know it exists but don't know how to access it or what submissions are valid. If you included that kind of information in the report, I would have felt that the trip is worth something.

O. Riaz: we went through a rigorous evaluation of the online services present at Concordia. But yes there are large costs for in house solutions, the people who provide those services would work for ASEC. The value we got was seeing the offices in place seeing what kind of questions and concerns students are expressing to them and to see if they are meeting student needs. It's a completely different experience when you see it directly.

J. Sutera Sardo: This kind of thing needs to be discussed first. I want to know how much time you had to decide on this and how much time you gave your fellow executives to respond to this.

O. Riaz: We did post it on the group chat including how long we'd be there and what we'd be doing. There were some who brought up their concerns and others who didn't.

J. Sutera Sardo: My question was what was the timeframe between the invitation and notifying the executives.

O. Riaz: It was early July and we made it available right away.

R. Gaudet: “ *Whereas the following motion was passed by council February 8th 2017:  
Be it resolved that all CSU executives be mandated to describe in their monthly reports any and all gifts received courtesy of their position at the Concordia Student Union;  
Be it further resolved that should the CSU or its executives be offered any benefit or gift (trips, donations, grants, etc.) that is offered with the required consent of the executive(s), the council will have final approval as to whether it can be accepted or not while taking into consideration the position book;  
Be it further resolved that Policy Committee be mandated to draft clauses for the Standing Regulations to this effect.  
Whereas Omar Riaz was a councillor at this time and can thus reasonably be expected to know said motion;  
Whereas Omar Riaz and Soulaymane El Alaoui accepted flights to British Columbia as gifts in their roles as CSU general coordinator and finance coordinator respectively, yet neither asked council for approval, nor reported these gifts to council;  
Whereas further costs of over \$980.00 were incurred with the expectation of reimbursement by the CSU;  
Whereas the document (titled SUDS) sent to council regarding the conference bears a lack of information, and much of the information provided is not relevant to the unique reality of student unions in Quebec;  
Whereas these flights were given as gifts by Lev Bukhman, CEO of Studentcare/ASEQ whom the CSU has its health and dental insurance contract with, a contract worth between approximately \$9,000,000 to \$15,000,000;  
Whereas Studentcare/ASEC was one of six main sponsors of the conference;  
Whereas in December 2016 Lev Bukhman was found by the courts of Quebec to have previously given \$123,000 in gifts to student associations;  
Whereas this offense could be considered worthy of impeachment;  
Be it resolved that council present Omar Riaz and Soulaymane El Alaoui with formal warnings.”*

Seconded by A. Sherra

R. Gaudet (motivates): The motion passed in February was in direct relation to our contracts. When the health contracts expired companies would start sending ‘gifts’ to executives. This is why the word ‘trips’ are included in this motion. To be fair if it was passed in 2014 or 2005, they could say they weren’t aware. But O. Riaz was an executive in February when this motion was passed. They had plenty of time to call a special council meeting, it takes three days’ noticed. This document was late because I was waiting for their reports to see if they would declare these gifts. They did not. If this weren’t known, they would never have disclosed this to council or two the students. In my role as signing authority I signed checks for a ridiculous level of expenses, the budget line this was taken from was the Health and Dental Line. This is not a line to incur expenses from your trips.

If done last year, these would have easily been considered bribery. This is still absolutely unacceptable. This is a huge deal. They still attempted to conceal this from council. This is coming near a very fine line and if something like this happens again. There’s a strong reason why this clause approaches impeachment.

O. Riaz: I would like to accept responsibility for this oversight. There should be no perception of conflict of interest in this case. The CSU went through a rigorous in the selection of a Health and Dental caretaker through an RFP.

It will allow us to improve the services we offer students. This change would decrease the amount of funds transferred to ASEC. ASEC offered to provide airline tickets. Other student unions accepted this offer and attended. The trip was not considered a personal gratuity. We will be working with Policy committee to include the policy in the standing regulations and move it forward during the next policy meeting.

A. Sherra: A new generation of drugs will increase the amount claimed by students, I've learned. I am concerned this coincides too neatly with this issue arising and am concerned the conflict.

S. El Alaoui : I wanted to address the budget line. The contract signed in April 2017 implies that there will be certain costs to implementing the services in-house. The CSU has the option to overtake any services;

The "Pen – S D" is a breakdown for the claims, which the CSU would no longer be paying ASEC if we were to bring it in-house. The transfer implies costs for training and cooperation. If we were to have proper training from student care we'd likely need to pay for that. It was an oversight of last year to not include a budget line for this. We created a placeholder account, It would have been approved at the signing of the contract last year so it would also have been approved by council. We'd need to discuss it later.

A. Mushtaq: I wanted to be excused, someone agreed to pick me up.

R. Blaisdell motions to excuse A. Mushtaq,

J. Sutura Sardo seconds,

F: 12 O: 0 A: 1

R. Hamila: I have a lot of questions. I see a big conflict that happened. I feel that there is a part of the room is very aware of what happened and some are not. I wouldn't want to make a decision without more documentation and more time.

R. Gaudet: A few things, I do want to echo a sentiment of the general coordinator from the RFP process from last school year. I sat on that committee. Bukhman brought two boxes of croissants, as an aside. To respond to what R. Hamila said to create more background context so that councillors are in a better place to act.

There's an insurance company we've been with for decades. Bukhman is the CEO. We resigned the contract, it is worth between 9-12 million dollars. Bukhman offered this same trip and we refused. This is something that is pretty common for the insurance industry and this was kind of an extension of that. So when this trip was offered again to the current executive, there's nothing to say that they couldn't have gone, but due to the motion, common sense, and good practice is to act the board of directors. Furthermore it was revealingly concealed from their documentation.

To move on, the cost of going in-house, I really don't see why flights to BC are part of that.

My final question is for the general or finance coordinator, what is the reason for these flights not being mentioned as gifts?

O. Riaz: It was pure oversight, there was no deceptive purpose. I take responsibility. But it is not me trying to actively hide it. It's not true.

M. Clark-Gardner: It is evident that many councillors and executives who were informed but did not consent, it is clear that they didn't agree with the trip or the recommendations in the document. I hope that it doesn't happen again and that you realize this is not transparent, it is a big oversight.

R. Blaisdell: This is a deficiency as leaders, O. Riaz and S. El Alaoui are members and student leaders within their executive teams. This is early in our mandate and this has resulted in a situation where teammates have been placed in positions where they weren't asked for active consent. There was dissent voiced that was not properly addressed. This is creating a situation at the beginning of your mandate that your team doesn't trust your decisions and how you make them or whether you're taking their opinions within your team. To see this so early because of these decisions you've made is really worrying to me. I hope it doesn't poison that dynamic, this isn't just something that affects the CSU. It affects everyone working in these executive positions.

Omar said something very specifically, you said this was not a conflict of interest because there was no RFB process currently acted. I disagree as a matter of fact.

It is indeed a conflict of interest. Section 120 of the Canadian Corporate Business act. As soon as an officer becomes interested... *"A director or an officer of a corporation shall disclose to the corporation, in writing or by requesting to have it entered in the minutes of meetings of directors or of meetings of committees of directors, the nature and extent of any interest that he or she has in a material contract or material transaction, whether made or proposed, with the corporation, if the director or officer*

- is a party to the contract or transaction;*
- is a director or an officer, or an individual acting in a similar capacity, of a party to the contract or transaction; or*
- has a material interest in a party to the contract or transaction.*
- The disclosure required by subsection (1) shall be made, in the case of an officer who is not a director,*
  - ii. immediately after he or she becomes aware that the contract, transaction, proposed contract or proposed transaction is to be considered or has been considered at a meeting;*
  - iii. if the officer becomes interested after a contract or transaction is made, immediately after he or she becomes so interested; or*
- Time of disclosure for director or officer: If a material contract or material transaction, whether entered into or proposed, is one that, in the ordinary course of the corporation's business, would not require approval by the directors or shareholders, a director or officer shall disclose, in writing to the corporation or request to have it entered in the minutes of meetings of directors or of meetings of committees of directors, the nature and extent of his or her interest immediately after he or she becomes aware of the contract or transaction.*

We've already made a contract with ASEC. After it's been made and you two have an interest in that matter because an executive pay for your travel somewhere. That is a conflict of interest. That is a benefit you have received. We also have the Quebec business law about this. And a proposed contract included related negotiations is also a conflict. Omar talks about this and Soulaymane describe examining these changes. You're looking at making the customer service in-house. You know and you're trying to bring about changes, they're renegotiations, it's going to require a transactional relationship with ASEC. You knew all this but still didn't disclose when that company gave you a gift.

I find it sort of juxtaposed that the report on this conference discusses student building and all that, student leadership conference and all that, but all of the expenses related to this trip are budgeted under health and dental, that is an issue. If it helps you do your job better and pay for it, it's one thing. It seems like it was for something else and it was paid for by a Health and Dental insurance provider. It seems extremely dishonest.

R. Hamila: How was the decision made? How did we arrive at the trouble for this? This is why I want to have more information about how this happened, details. My opinion for now is not to rush into making a decision. I'd like to establish the situation and to postpone the motion to the next meeting.

C. Robinson: It would have to have been done at the beginning. If you want I can put you back on the speaker's list to do it after.

J. Sutura Sardo call to question the current motion.

A. Sherra seconds.

The call to question is on the table.

F: 10 O: 0 A:3

The question is called.

R. Gaudet's motion is put to a vote.

F: 12 O: 0 A: 2

The motion passes.

J. Sutura Sardo: As a council we understand this was most likely done with good intentions, but it's important to know that these decisions need to be made collectively. I also don't understand why it was under Health and Dental.

As an executive maybe they should decide with an external facilitator and not reimburse this until we're sure about this, that they can continue working together in a healthy collaborative way. Have it come as a point again during one of the next meetings.

If executives discussed this this might have not come up. It's important to be transparent as body, the CSU represents transparency. This is a misunderstanding of the roles of the CSU. Maybe have a meeting with the CSU Lawyer to discuss the responsibilities of the executives.

R. Hamila: Point of privilege. For the future I would like that big issues of information were presented earlier. Being presented with information late keeps me from being able to have a vote or a say.

S. El Alaoui : I completely agree with what Julie said, figuring out where this expense will come from. I would also like to suggest that either policy committee or ad hoc committee write down a process and puts it in the standing regulations so that this situation does not occur again. As far as I know the 'gift thing' is not in the standing regulations.

R. Blaisdell: Just because the procedure isn't explicitly in our standing regulations...I want to make a sternly emphasized point....what the CSU decided in February is only in addition to what already exist in all of the corporations business acts in Canada, Quebec, and in the civil codes. These obligations and legal liabilities are repeated in crystal clear conditions when all of these things were meant to be disclosed. Your job is to understand what these obligations are. Claiming ignorance doesn't affect legality, doesn't it just feel wrong when a multimillion dollar companies coming along offering to pay for your flights? I don't think we need all of this to tell us that's wrong. At the very least just put your hand up and say 'I think this is wrong, what do we do?'. I find it a bit insulting that it is proposed that this be pushed to Policy so that new policies are made or that the executive team must ensure this doesn't happen in the future. This didn't happen because of a mistake that can be rectified by talking about it. You don't accept flights and go "whoopsie". I like that there is a formal warning but feel that a more serious reprimand ought to be set in motion. There was another motion that has been sent around regarding the laws that were violated, what they have done, and what can be done to fix it. I would like guidance from council on what we feel is appropriate. If I can discuss my "be it resolved", I will come forward to produce the motion we all regard as fair.

R. Gaudet: I want to re-emphasise some of what Rory said. There were so many opportunities to fix this. If it was a slip up there were a continual stream of chances to deal with it, and no mentions were made. Looking at the website and looking at the dates recorded by the coordinator. The fees total 1090 dollars. Who paid for these fees? Yourself? Lev Bukhman? Student care? Did you expect them to be reimbursed, and if so why have I not seen a check yet?

S. El Alaoui : they were put on the CSU credit card.

R. Gaudet: This has already been paid for by the CSU. And it's gone and paid already.

S. El Alaoui : Yes.

*J. Suter Sardo moves for the CSU executives to have a meeting with their lawyer to discuss their responsibilities and their role in the CSU to ensure they are adequately representing them before the next council meeting.*

M. Clark-Gardner seconds it.

J. Suter Sardo (motivating): Look at what budget line this will be reimbursed from at the next council meeting just so that it is formalized. The could comprise a one-page document, the non-hierarchical values and the bylaws and so on.

This money was spent off the CSU credit card and it should not come out of health and dental.

R. Gaudet: I don't think this has anything to do with a role as an executive. It's not like the finance coordinator went off to deal with sustainability issues. If they see a benefit sure but as for the decision on budget line I really don't like this because this isn't something the executive should decide. Council should look at this and it should not be decided by the people who spent it.

V. Rydzewski: I don't like the idea of sitting down and deciding where money should be taken from. I don't understand why the six of us who weren't part of this should decide on it.

S. El Alaoui : I rescind.

J. Suter Sardo moves to amend the last part of the motion with the budget line.

M. Clark-Gardner seconds.

J. Suter Sardo (motivating): I think it's still important to talk with a lawyer. It hasn't been done appropriately. I know the firm the CSU uses and they are very good at establishing peoples' roles. It's an informative thing that could really help them in the future and how they are accountable to council. They ought to learn from their mistakes but yes, this is more than just about us. It's an important learning process that should be taken up by everyone.

V. Rydzewski: I find it a little insulting to meet with a lawyer to discuss my roles and responsibilities. We've had a whole month of training. I'd like to be excluded from this.

L. Sutherland : I feel similarly to V. Rydzewski. The nature of the CSU versus a lawyer as to insights are very different. Legal obligations don't extend to our other obligations, which I feel are more relevant to this issue now. I don't know if doing this through a lawyer will achieve the objective of this motion.

D. Toohey : I think that what Veronika and Leyla said was very important. There's a sort of flaw about this lawyer learning experience thing. It's not a "whoopsie". It's a "this money is gone, this is wrong, how do we fix this thing".

R. Blaisdell: I rescind.

J. Sutura Sardo: I was just made aware of R. Blaisdell's whole documentation. I would like to rescind my motion.

C. Robinson: Can we unanimously consider it rescinded? Perfect.

R. Blaisdell: Caitlin has sent out this document that I put together, I'll give you a summary.

The context of the motion is a refresher of what the laws are that are applicable to this situation. The summary is that these two individuals had a loyalty to this institution, one to disclose. The Quebec civil code addresses failures to disclose conflicts of interest upon the implication of anyone.

If they've received a benefit from this company, they shouldn't be involved with this company in the future. Moving forward they can no longer negotiate on our behalf. It's important that Omar has stated that he accepts responsibility for it. It is not disclosure of the conflict of interest. It's not the same as an admission of accepting the gratuity. Having them understand and describe in their own words what they did and what they must do. They must apologize for betraying their loyalty. They must understand that elected people can be trusted with their money, with their health and dental plan, that they won't be peddled to by external parties. There are four Be It Resolveds, and I'd like to feel the room regarding these.

Not just a warning, but a signed apology. We don't know the whole amount of these benefits. It's important that they render a complete and total numeric amount of everything given to them. Every drink, every taxi, and all those values should be remit to the CSU.

A. Sherra: I would like to add the fact that the apology should be submitted to one of the Concordia Newspapers and presented in public.

C. Robinson: It will automatically be submitted to the public mailing list.

R. Blaisdell: Everyone under our purview.

*O. Riaz tables the motion.*

*S. El Alaoui seconds the motion.*

C. Robinson: All in favor of tabling the motion?

F: O: 6 A: 3

The motion fails. We're back on the speaker's list.

*A. Zebiri rescinds.*

O. Riaz: I don't have anything in regards to the Be it resolved, I wanted a Lawyer to let me know if something illegal took place. I have quickly tried to contact a lawyer that I do know, and according to them it is not a violation. I'd like a professional opinion reviewed at the next council meeting.

R. Gaudet: "An officer of a corporation shall disclose to the corporation, [...]the nature and extent of any interest that he or she has in a material contract or material transaction, whether made or proposed, with the corporation...." some of this is blatant. It's pretty obvious that it at least goes against the spirit of the laws. There's a lot of good points in the Be it Resolved, especially the public apology. It's extremely important and necessary.

O. Riaz: The BCA doesn't apply in Quebec.

S. El Alaoui : It doesn't apply for non-profits in Quebec. But I agree with the apology and the be it resolved's.

J. Sutura Sardo: The whereas's are just for information, the Be It Resolveds are what have effects. What we're talking about the Be It Resolveds. They mention the legal documents but even if we omit those they would have the same conclusions. Rory literally brought the book with the law in it. Thank you, Soulaymane, for apologizing.

D. Toohey : I'm not going to quote legal codes, I think all the be it resolveds stand even without the legal content. Given that council is supposed to be representative of the separate parts of the union, we weren't made aware of this as representatives. It's doubly pertinent that a public written apology is written and account for using the CSU credit card and any and all gifts are accounted for. R. Blaisdell's motion speaks very well to all of this.

O. Riaz: Councillors say that the decision was not knowingly made. It also says that a failure in our legal obligation, I do not think that is true. For us to move forward without verifying that would also be wrong. Those things need to be verified.

C. Robinson: I think Rory was next to speak. Sorry.

R. Blaisdell: Two things about this law business. I spent extra time to include both the Canada, Quebec and Civil code acts. They all say exactly the same thing. I put those there to create context of these laws. If you want to check, I have the book. Anyone can check; The only thing that sounds like it relates to a law in my Be It Resolveds is paying back the money. That section in the civil code of Quebec is not for council. That civil code says that any student can go to a court and ask Omar and Soulaymane can demand they pay back the CSU. That's what section 326 says. So I want to explain that my Be It Resolved is not us following a law. We're not applying to a court. I'm saying that in accordance with this we'll render a complete account. We're making that decision that they will account for everything they received. This isn't based in a law, even if you destroyed that this would still stand. They can check if they want. It's obvious to us that this an ethic issue, you should have known.

R. Gaudet moves to call to question, Rescinds.

S. El Alaoui : I have a point of information about the motion. I am completely for the paying back and the accounting. The prohibition from representation and further actions from ASEC, we'd have to talk to them to get their full amounts.

R. Blaisdell: We can ask. You don't need to.

S. El Alaoui : Another point of information if I may, the 90 days, I'm not sure about that.

J. Suter Sardo: You know when you nominate yourself or appoint yourself, you usually abstain, and I want to say Soulaymane is doing a good job of abstaining. Everyone involved should have the same attitude. Council's goal is to make sure we move on. We shouldn't debate this. We should take responsibility and go home. Let's not waste any more time.

A. Badr: I think it's a bit late. If both parties could make this available, I'm finding about this now. All those in favor of R. Blaisdell's motion?

F: 10 O: A: 2

J. Suter Sardo's abstention noted

The motion carries

J. Suter Sardo: I would like to table everything else to another meeting and adjourn.

R. Blaisdell: We can't adjourn in the same motion.

C. Robinson: I didn't accept it. All in favor of tabling the meeting to the rest council meeting?

F: 11 O: 0 A: 1

## 10. Announcements

R. Blaisdell: I had another motion to make before we leave. I move to exempt Alienor Lougerstay from the June 14<sup>th</sup> meeting for her space and rocket team. And because this council is two councils after.

**J. Suter Sardo** seconds.

F: 10 O: 0 :A0

## 11. Adjournment

**J. Suter Sardo** moves to adjourn

S. El Alaoui seconds

F: 14 O:0 A:0

Meeting adjourned.

## APPENDIX