



CSU Regular Council Meeting

Wednesday, February 14th, 2018

MB-2.130, 18h30, S.G.W. Campus

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) Executive Reports
- b) Reports from Committees
- c) Approval of minutes – January 24th (RCM)
- d) Chairperson's Report
- e) Position's Book

5. Presentations & Guest Speakers

- a) Bill 62 Contestation
- b) CAF
- c) CSU Operations Budget

6. Appointments

- a) AVEQ Committees

7. New Business – Substantive

- a) Letter
- b) Territory Acknowledgement
- c) CSU Chair & Minute Keeper

8. New Business – Informational

- a) Student Congress
- b) Election Reform Committee
- c) Letter of Support Bill 62

9. Question Period & Business Arising

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 18h39.

2. Roll Call

Executives present for the duration of the meeting were:

Omar Riaz (General Coordinator), Kamden Biggart (Finance Coordinator) Asma Mushtaq (Academic & Advocacy Coordinator), Veronika Rydzewski (Internal Affairs Coordinator), Maria Gabriela Polanco (Loyola Coordinator), Leyla Sutherland (Student Life Coordinator), Ahmed Badr (External Affairs and Mobilization Coordinator), Devon Ellis-Darity (Sustainability Coordinator)

Executives absent for the duration of the meeting were:

(none)

Councilors present for the duration of the meeting were:

Rim Hamila (Engineering and Computer Science), Sally Younis (Engineering and Computer Science), Camille Thompson-Marchand (Arts and Science), Dylan Applebaum (John Molson School of Business), Patrick Magallanes (Arts and Science), Rowan Gaudet (Arts and Science), Ali Sherra (Arts and Science), Aouatif Zebiri (Arts and Science), Tabea Vischer (Arts and Science), Eamon Toohey (Arts and Science), Mikaela Clark-Gardner (Fine Arts), Mustafa Bokesmati (Arts and Sciences), Marco Rossi (John Molson School of Business), Alexis Searcy (Arts and Sciences), Jonathan Roy (Arts and Sciences), Charlotte Genest (Arts and Sciences), Jarrad Haas (Fine Arts), Mohammad Hafiz (John Molson School of Business), Sophie Hough-Martin (Arts and Sciences), Daniel Abrams (John Molson School of Business), Kathy Khánh Trân Du (John Molson School of Business), Tabea Vischer (Arts and Science), Camille Thompson-Marchand (Arts and Science), Julia Sutura Sardo (Arts and Science)

Councilors absent for the duration of the meeting were:

Ahmed Jemma (Engineering and Computer Science), Khadidja Komah (Engineering and Computer Science), Rory Blaisdell (John Molson School of Business), Mustafa Bokesmati (Arts and Sciences), Alienor Lougerstay (Engineering and Computer Science), Peter Zhuang (Fine Arts).

A. Sherra moves to excuse the absent members of Council

S. Hough-Martin seconds the motion

In Favor: 11

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 1

The motion to excuse the absent members of Council passes.

3. Approval of the Agenda

SH moves to approve the Agenda and all items under Consent

J. Haas seconds the motion.

In Favor: 16

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The amended Agenda is approved.

5. Presentations & Guest Speakers

A) CSU Operations Budget

Chair: The CSU's lawyer has to leave at 7h20

Guest Speaker (1): We have two lawyers here from a law firm specializing in social justice issues. They were involved in the student demonstrations from 2012-2015. We are looking at the

possibility of the CSU file an intervener status in contesting bill 62. We will explain to you a little bit what they're proposing along with the CSU's involvement.

We were informed we would be starting at 18h30 so the lawyers were only scheduled until 7pm, so we will work with the time as best as we can.

Guest Speaker (2): Thank you for having this time to exchange with you. My colleague has to leave at seven. I'd like to start by giving you a very brief overview of the law that we're contesting and the court motion itself. It's really important for us as attorneys that if the CSU intervenes that you understand clearly what you are intervening in, what the issues are, and what mandate you are going to give to the attorneys.

We will go over the law and look at the context of the interventions. We are a member of the association progressive jurors who coordinate the efforts of the interventions. The law we're contesting is a Law on state neutrality, and to provide a framework for religious accommodation. There are two controversial aspects of the law.

The first is the provision (Article 10) and it requires that every citizen receiving public services do so with uncovered faces. Of course the discriminatory impact is squarely on Muslim women who wear the niqab or the burka. This is the main object of the challenge that the parties challenging the law are asking the Court to strike down, because it contravenes the federal and provincial charters. The second controversial part is (Article 11), the religious accommodation portion.

The parties that filed the challenge initially hadn't challenged it specifically, and it is not yet in effect until July 1st. With respect to religious accommodation, human rights organizations see it as problematic. It specifically names educational institutions as belonging to the purview of these guidelines. As intervenors you would still have the possibility to address these issues, because the Government defending this bill will bring that up as a defense, "The discriminatory aspects of section 10 can be addressed by how we accommodate those with religious needs", and so on. There is an opportunity to put in the positions of student rights groups regarding the framework of religious accommodations. Very briefly, that is the law, that is the motion, and as you may also know in November the parties that challenged Law 62 they also asked to suspend the application of the law. The Government proclaimed that the law would be enforced the day it was passed, but at the same time there are components not in effect. A judge issued a suspension of the law. There are other parties interested in becoming intervenors.

Maybe before I let them explain the process of the intervention, I'll explain it. Parties not directly involved in a court challenge can present themselves and tell the judge that they have important information that can inform their decision making process, because the parties seeking certain conclusions may not have considered their specific situation or the effects on certain sectors of the population that would be harmed or directly affected. So there is more flexibility for you to add what you feel needs to be considered by the Judge.

I'm trying to explain complex issues in simple terms, and I can stay for another 10 minutes.

Guest Speaker (3): The interest for the CSU is to present the viewpoint of how students will be affected. There is not necessarily that perspective, how young people going to or wanting to go to school will be affected.

Guest Speaker (4): The committee created to work on Bill 62, we support court challenges and there are other organizations interested in getting involved in the court challenge. It's also important for us to challenge it on a political side, too. There was a letter in French we wanted to publish in the media, we want to attack the bill on both levels. We're a few lawyers on that committee.

Chair: Any questions?

C. Thompson-Marchand: The whole bill is being challenged or only the two articles?

Guest Speaker (1): The main motion filed in the court to challenge Bill 62 only addresses Article 10, the requirement to receive public services to have faces uncovered. We will need to tailor the intervention around that. As we said with the interim order, it was suspended until the Government does it work. The Defense of the Government was to say "Well regardless of the potential impact of Section 10, we have a whole door open for religious accommodation right here". So in terms of that defense, we could also challenge the section on religious accommodation.

Guest Speaker (3): As an intervener, we have more flexibility as to what could be brought forward. Once again, it gives us flexibility in looking at it from a different perspective for the Court to show that maybe there are viewpoints that need to be taking them into consideration. It provides the CSU and the students a voice, and you can be certain whatever intervention we make, it will be circulated and published and it's a form of legal advocacy to a certain degree.

Guest Speaker (1): An idea, one of the things we looked at was the international convention on the rights of women. Part of the objective of Bill 62 is to promote equality between men and women. We can point out Canada signed this convention about the rights of women, and among the fundamental rights of women is the right to education. This is something Concordia and its students can bring to the attention of the court.

O. Riaz: Are there any other Student Unions that have already signed on?

Guest Speaker (1): Not yet, we haven't publicized our work yet. We're still at the organization stage. As they were saying, the Association of Progressive Jurors, we have two strategies. We're in the legal strategy but there is a huge political component to this bill, and we know it was passed for extremely political reasons and we feel we need to invest as much energy on the political side as on the legal side.

O. Riaz: Is there any costs for the CSU or other groups?

Guest Speaker (1): For the moment the only cost we know of is the Court fee to file the motion, which is 202\$. Because several organizations have expressed their desire to intervene,

the FFQ, the biggest body of organizations defending the rights of Quebec women, their voices are extremely important. Especially when the bill purports to defend the equality between men and women and it doesn't quite do that. What we'd like to do is help people who express their interest in intervening to identify clearly the issues they'd like to bring to the court's attention. We have a legal working committee; we also have a fundraising committee. So once we go public with the list of intervenors we will make a call for donations. For the moment what we can commit to is to do the work for the intervenors that we deem important, and there are some lawyers who can do more pro bono work than others, but we would like for the interventions to be done well in terms of cost-sharing. Ideally what we'd like donors to do is to understand that this is a contribution of solidarity towards a common goal and people would donate what they can.

Guest Speaker (2): In the past, for a factum for intervenor status it can cost up to 5,000\$ in preparation of the factum, going to court, the representation follow-up. We're not saying it would cost that, but usually how lawyers work is they might ask for a certain amount up-front which we put into a trust account and then from that amount whatever work is done then they deduct it from that amount in trust that's given. That was what was proposed previously, if you remember the commitment of the CSU dates back from October 23rd 2017 there was a resolution by the CSU to commit morally and financially to such issues. I'd say a budget of about 5,000\$. It won't necessarily cost that much, but for core practical reasons if you needed a figure it could be that.

O. Riaz: Thank you

Guest Speaker (1): To be clear, many of our clients are on social aid. We accept to compensate for the lack of resources for our time, what we can commit to doing is a good job of preparing the intervention both on the legal and the political front, and we would want to make sure that groups with fewer resources have their concerns taken into account.

Guest Speaker (2): And if necessary the lawyers can return next meeting if you need more information and they will be in ongoing contact with the CSU regarding their progress.

Guest Speaker (1): For sure if you give us the mandate to work on filing the intervention on your behalf, we will need to work together.

Khánh Trân Du: In the letter you were talking about the Day against Islamophobia. Is it simultaneous, or are you working on these separately?

Guest Speaker (1): Right now it's easier to focus on the legal issues because we're in the middle of preparing interventions to file in the superior court. The day against islamophobia is a political campaign, and we encourage everyone involved in the challenge against bill 62 to sign on for the call for the day against islamophobia. It would be hypocritical to support one without the other. Bill 62 is a shameful expression of islamophobia, so we must support this day.

A. Badr: I want to clarify that I did send, the French document is about the application going to the government but the presentation is about the contestation of this law to the superior court.

Chair: If you think of any questions, you can email either of them (or Ahmed). Thank you for coming.

Guest Speaker (1): If you think of questions, don't hesitate and we're very happy the students are rising up and making themselves heard once again and we're looking forward to working with you.

R. Gaudet: Question for the executives, are we meant to call the General Election tonight?

V. Rydzewski: They don't need to be called. The CEO has to announce it. We only call it if we need by-elections. So if we're missing people in seats.

R. Gaudet: Do we have any idea for the timeline of the elections?

V. Rydzewski: The CEO will have to call the elections by the 26th.
Nomination: Feb 26th-March 9th
Campaign: March 13th - March 26th
Polling: March 27-28-29

A. Badr presents the motion: Be it resolved that the CSU will sign the letter of support to challenge Bill 62.

J.Roy seconds the motion.

A. Badr: It's clear we have many positions in our book, not just the ones we voted on in November but we also have the referendum question to work against Bill 62. We had a second motion about racism and discrimination, it's clear that the bill is discriminatory and the CSU has to take more action in challenging it. It's affecting a portion of Concordia Students and the CSU is representing and defending them.

O. Riaz: Is it coming from the misc. or the legal budget line?

K. Biggart: It could come from either line. Let's say misc.

Chair: Amending it to add "misc." to the end? Okay.

O. Riaz seconds the motion.

R. Gaudet: I'm hesitant for us to pull from misc., it might be more appropriate from legal and this is very much a legal fee. It's indirectly related to the CSU, it would make more sense for future budgets.

D. Applebaum: When you use MISC money, don't you include the intended purpose? At the end of the year you'd see the amount allocated to above line items.

K. Biggart: We could do that or create a budget line for this specific amount, or it can come out of the legal budget line. It would let us plan ahead for future expenses. There are advantages to both.

Chair: There is an amendment on the floor to have the money come from the misc. budget line.

In Favor: 0
Opposed: 8
Abstained: 8

The amendment fails to carry.

A. Sherra: I had a question in regard to the elections, if we were to add a referendum question when would we do that?

Chair: I am going to defer that to Question Period and Business Arising.

R. Gaudet: I move to amend that the money come from the Legal fees budget line.

S. Hough-Martin seconds the motion.

R. Gaudet: I think the allocation makes more sense.

In Favor: 13
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 3

The amendment carries.

In Favor: 13
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 2

The motion carries.

Chair: With that we're back to the general point of Bill 62.

4. B) CAF Presentation

Guest Speaker (1): I'm the External Coordinator for the Sustainable Action Fund, I'll read from a PowerPoint.

The CAF was created in 2017 with the objective of using the interest created by the student contingency legal fund for the support of student projects. It's part of the student fees collected each semester by the CSU, it can be used to improve student spaces, legal action to protect the CSU, and the interest can be used to fund initiatives or student groups in line with the positions book or to help out of the CSU goes on strike. The CAF has 50,000 a year set aside, cumulative to a maximum amount of 75,000, and 10,000 is reserved in the event of Student strikes. The mission is to finance on and off initiatives, prioritized for marginalized group initiatives or groups without access to other sources of funding. There are three categories of funding, an operational grant of a maximum of 2,500\$. The second is a project grant maximum at 3,000\$ for organizing events, and the third type is a strike grant of 1,000 for an undergraduate association with a strike mandate. There are four externally appointed members of CAF, and four groups with it. There are three CSU appointed members, a CSU coordinator, a member of the CSU Council and a member from the BIPOC committee. There are two vacancies, the University Student at Large committee appointed by the BIPOC and the International student exchange. We funded projects like the bookstore, Food Against Fascism, for the GenX camp, a youth-co-op space created in Columba house in Point St Charles, a neighborhood grocery store in Point St Charles, and Rap Battles for Social Justice community events on campus. To apply for funding there is a drop-down menu on the CSU website. We're encouraging everyone to spread the word, we would like more applications.

Chair: Thank you Emily. Any questions?

A. Mushtaq: I want to know more about the BIPOC project that was mentioned.

Emily: For the bookstore? It was a Feminist Bookstore that applied for an operational grant to increase organizational funding. We wanted to support this initiative.

Chair: Thank you for your time.

Emily: Thank you.

5. C) Operations Budget

K. Biggart: There are hard copies at the front and a spreadsheet with budget lines and brief explanations. It's almost finished, it just needs polish.

I'd like to go over the actuals and the lines causing variances in the budget.

Net revenues: we have a 200,000 deficit due to the fact that we have yet to receive the majority of our operating revenues from Student Fees. Moving on to Operations, line 405, advertising we received 3,000 more than budgeted. We have no control of the flow of levy funds but they tend to balance out. Line 40-25, the Orientation decided against having sponsors this year so there's no income there.

Like 40-45 Rental Income, there's a pending transfer according to the General Manager for about 17,000\$. Those are the revenues, we've received 150,000\$ less than expected so far but that's due to levy's.

Then Executive salaries, that went almost exactly to budget. The next subject is Total Council and Electoral Expenses, we're on budget for this section as well. We're expecting to go over for Council Retreat, we incurred a 700\$ penalty for rescheduling.

We're on budget for administration salaries, there is some variance because the receptionist salaries were higher than expected. The total admin and office expense section, we're on budget. Total IT, we're forecasting to go over as we're between IT directors and we are currently paying for an outsourced IT service.

Lines 40517-and 4522* will be merged. There is no budget for external labour, and we have incurred 17,000\$ from the firm we work with. The next section is total financial and legal fees, we've incurred around 3,000\$ more than budgeted for the year, and we will be allocating 5,000\$.. For Audit fees we already incurred them for the year so that's why the actuals are so large. Legal fees, collective bargaining, we have around 3,000\$ we didn't budget. That's because the collective agreement was not finished during the last fiscal year as planned. We spent less than was budgeted for the total year. We recently changed Payroll service providers so we will save money moving forward.

O. Riaz: We haven't paid them the initial setup fee, it will be a little more for a couple months.

K. Biggart: Total student engagement initiatives, we spent less than expected. Then the Reg Activity Expense, normally we would split this amount during the year but they were given an advance to help with the cash flows early in the year. Concordia's Farmer Market payment was not budgeted but it was approved. Loyola Lunch and salaries, the second half of the budget will be incurred as we're getting paid in two lump sums. And then the Misc. budget line we recently allocated 7,000\$ for the JMS tax clinic and that will come from there.

Then there's the services section, for HOJO there is one major change this year, they normally receive 20,000 this year from the Dean of Students Office and they decided against it due to their surplus. Advocacy has a variance but it was just a line created for accounting purposes so their budget looks more balanced. So the final one is legal information clinic. Their salaries are slightly over budget but it's not causing too much of a variance. The General Coordinator and I made some decisions to merge budget lines together because they were either empty or they could be easily combined. Any questions?

R. Gaudet: The dish project was mentioned, we had revenue for that. What was that? I can ask later.

D. Applebaum: I was curious about the Orientation Contribution. They didn't get sponsorship, they didn't get money? Whose decision was that, if they could have added additional value I'm concerned why they didn't.

L. Sutherland: We chose against sponsorship because the budget was enough to cover our needs. The only partnerships we felt comfortable aligning with were giving us in-kind donations like better prices, we partnered with Santropol coffee to get their coffee at cost but we didn't get anything for free.

Khánh Trân Du: Why is the list for the Clubs so empty?

K. Biggart: I don't make the Clubs budget, I'm guessing they're either inactive or they don't have approved budgets for the fiscal year

V. Rydzewski: The finance coordinator had to input all the approved budgets so I guess it hasn't been done yet.

Khánh Trân Du: so they have no approved budgets?

V. Rydzewski: they're just not in the system yet

D. Applebaum: But they're not spending any money yet. They've had a budgeted amount and they're not spending?

V. Rydzewski: They are spending money but they will bring me the check requests, they usually do that in May.

K. Biggart: From what I've seen when there's a new club that's budget isn't visible, when they do the first requisition their budget line is created and the amount is allocated then. It's a weird system but that's what I gathered.

M. Rossi: Do you think a monthly system would be better?

K. Biggart: It's up to them. when they incur their expenses they can chose to be reimbursed as soon as it happens. I think what Veronika was saying is that they chose to wait until the end of the year. There is no specified period

M. Rossi: That wasn't quite my question, do we think the system could be improved? They should maybe file a report based on their spending or lack of spending. This would keep clubs more regularly scheduled in terms of giving in their receipts.

Chair: The question was directed to the room but we have people on the speaker's list.

D. Applebaum: For the HOJO account there was an account created for balancing services?

K. Biggart: The Advocacy and CSU Support, when I allocated the line they were under the umbrella of the CSU and they're allocated to them.

O. Riaz: The advocacy center's budget hasn't been increased in several years but they have grown as a service. During the referendum we gave them money so they could remain functional.

D. Applebaum: At the beginning of the year there was an account created for collaboration between the CSU and the other faculty groups. What is it at right now?

K. Biggart: Do you know the budget line number for that? I can find that out for you.

L. Sutherland: Being the person who approves that budget line, I can say under 1,000\$ has been spent this year.

D. Applebaum: Has the CSU done any outreach for that? Everyone was excited about that budget line.

L. Sutherland: I reached out to all the Student Life representatives from each faculty at the beginning of my mandate to inform them, and I continue to let them know it's available. Given I suggested it at 4,000\$ and Council decided to increase it to 10,000\$, I'm not sure how that fund is supposed to be spent when no guidelines were attached to the fund itself, and I would encourage all Councillors who know people working on projects including more than one faculty please let us know. There aren't a lot of guidelines and I haven't gotten many responses.

Khánh Trân Du: Concerning expenses for clubs, on the last line Other Expenses, 22,000\$, compared to the club budgets it's a very big variance. Do you know what it is?

K. Biggart: As I inherited this budget I did inquire about these kinds of budgets, this line acts as a catch-all for all expenses that are out of the ordinary. It's kind of a placeholder for the surplus. I haven't used it during my mandate, yet. Except for small things like a small club expense they aren't able to allocate yet.

D. Applebaum: What is your projected ending position with these actuals?

KA: The largest variance is the fee levies, and they're hard to predict. I would say that the projection based on the bottom line is what we could say for now and it's by far the largest variance.

Chair: Any more questions or comments regarding the operations budget? It's not specific but it's customary for us to make

CMT moves to approve the operations budget

Rowan seconds the motion

In Favor: 16
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 1

The motion to approve the Operations Budget carries.

Veronika moves to go into recess.

The motion is considered friendly.

The meeting went into recess at 19h41.

The recess ended at 20h.

6. Appointments

A) AVEQ Committees

A. Badr: I emailed AVEQ and they're welcoming anyone who would like to sit on this committee. They're the provincial student association the CSU is part of, They were working on two campaigns: Accessible Education and Climate Justice. Anyone can nominate themselves, and there are unlimited seats.

8. New Business Informational

A) Letter to CSU membership

*Omar moves to go into closed session.
J. Sutura Sardo seconds the motion*

In Favor: 14
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 1

The motion to go into closed session carries.

(The Meeting is Now in Closed Session)

R. Gaudet moves to go back into open session

J. Roy seconds the motion.

In Favor: 14
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 0

The motion carries.

7. B) Territory Acknowledgement

J.Roy:

“WHEREAS Concordia’s Indigenous Directions Leadership group has updated the Concordia University territorial acknowledgment after consultation with Indigenous elders,

WHEREAS the new Indigenous territorial acknowledgment emphasizes and forefronts the Indigenous Experience,

BE IT RESOLVED that the CSU update its Indigenous territorial acknowledgment to the following:

“We would like to begin by acknowledging that Concordia University is located on unceded Indigenous lands. The Kanien’kehá:ka(Ga-niyen-gé-haa-ga) Nation is recognized as the custodians of the lands and waters on which we gather today. Tiohtiá:ke(jo-jya-gé)/Montreal is historically known as a gathering place for many First Nations. Today, it is home to a diverse population of Indigenous and other peoples. We respect the continued connections with the past, present, and future in our ongoing relationships with Indigenous and other peoples within the Montreal community.”

J. Sutura Sardo seconds the motion

J.Roy: This was presented at the Arts and Sciences faculty Council by the indigenous leadership direction group. We found it inclusive and it forefronts the indigenous experience which is what we are doing when we acknowledge the land on which we meet.

In Favor: 16

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The motion carries.

7 C) Minute Keeper

S. Younis:

“Whereas the CSU has adopted a motion for a 15\$/hr a the minimum wage

Whereas the CSU standing regulation states that:

- The Chairperson shall receive an honorarium of \$12 per hour for the equivalent 15 hours plus the length of the meeting. Notwithstanding should the meeting not reach quorum the honorarium shall be \$100. Additionally, should Council direct the Chairperson to perform additional duties, the exercise of which causes him or her to exceed 15 hours of work, then the Chairperson shall be remunerated for those additional hours at their regular honorarium rate of \$12 per hour, contingent on maintaining a timesheet for all such work done that shall be approved as a part of their Chairperson’s report.*
- The Minute Keeper shall receive an honorarium of \$12 per hour for the equivalent of 5 hours plus twice the length of the meeting. Notwithstanding should the meeting not reach quorum the honorarium shall be \$100. Additionally, should Council direct the Minute Keeper to perform additional duties, the exercise of which causes him or her to exceed 5 hours of work, then the Minute Keeper shall be remunerated for those additional hours at their regular honorarium rate of \$12 per hour, contingent on maintaining a timesheet for all such work done that shall be approved as a part of the Chairperson’s report.*

Whereas both the CSU chair and Minute Keeper are getting paid less than the minimum wage

Be it resolved that the CSU will increase the salary for the CSU chair and the Minute Keeper to 18\$/hr

Be it further resolved that this raise will be applied retroactively from June 2016”

J. Haas seconds the motion;

Chair: If anyone has any issue with me chairing a discussion about me chairing my own pay.

S. Younis: I believe the minimum wage is low, and they're doing a great job. And last year we passed a motion to raise the general salaries of the CSU employees to 15\$. Looking online for similar jobs to this the average was 18\$.

S. Hough-Martin: I'm all for people getting paid above the minimum wage, I was wondering about the June back pay since 2016, why then?

S. Younis: We hadn't applied it to them then.

S. Hough-Martin: But June 2016 is two years ago, a year and a half ago.

S. Younis: That's when it was adopted.

D. Applebaum: So is the idea to increase it to 18\$/hour is to reflect the average wage at the CSU?

S. Younis: I looked online and that's what I found.

D. Applebaum: The average wage of who at the CSU is 18\$?

S. Younis: Yes, the CSU's employees.

D. Applebaum: If it's similar to how the administration works, they have seniority which is why they are paid more. If you take the average wage of those people you're taking their seniority into it.

L. Sutherland: I guess for one I'm not sure which numbers you took, so maybe you're more in place to take that average. But the CSU staff is varied with some with many years of seniority. I also really support people being paid well for jobs they do and having well-qualified minute keepers and chairs is important. There are a few amendments I think would be important, the CSU doesn't actually have a motion for a 15\$/hour a wage but a living wage. Living wages can be constantly checked back to the indexes on living wages. Currently the CSU chair and minute keeper aren't being paid less than minimum wage in Quebec. Honorariums are a different way people are being paid for work. There could be a better way to have the payment of the minute keeper and chairperson not be in an honorarium form. I think that the first amendment I'd suggest would be to change the wording to 'living wage' and removing that they're currently being paid less than minimum wage. Involving it retroactively would involve other chairs and minute keepers and not just the current ones, a retroactive payment would affect all the other

people. The budget was made prior to the motion being adopted for people being paid above the living wage but below the minimum wage so if we were to adjust that it would affect orientation staff workers and it would be a large can of worms to open. If we do it we would need to do it across the board, and moving forward we can adjust those things.

D. Applebaum: I wanted to reiterate that minimum living wage is different.

L. Sutherland: It's 15,87 for this year I think.

D. Applebaum: I can see the importance of sending this off to Policy or Standing committees to confirm the numbers.

A. Badr: I want to speak about the minimum wage. I had to circulate the job posting and I spoke a lot of the salary. I think it was 16.5 but it was above 16. That being said and these people were hired this year I think the minimum is somewhere above 16.

J. Suter Sardo moves to send this to policy committee.

O. Riaz seconds the motion.

J. Suter Sardo: It would be great to determine a feasible way and vote on it when it's better worded.

O. Riaz: I would suggest sending it to finance committee as an amendment.

J. Suter Sardo: I am open to the amendment.

S. Hough-Martin seconds the amendment.

Chair: The amendment was considered friendly.

A. Mushtaq: All of our reviewing of salaries for executives and how it reflects the workloads, I wondered if the scope suits Policy specifically or if it's more about the payments specifically. But I suppose it's going to Finance.

Chair: Do you have dissent?

A. Mushtaq: I'm wondering if that fits the research that's been done.

Chair: We'll keep it on the table for it to be sent to Finance.

J. Suter Sardo: I think it would be nice if Asma would like to sit on the finance meeting to see if some policy needs to be written, but as long as somebody looks at it to make sure it was worded adequately then that's fine. But I think Finance Committee is also capable of wording a motion.

S. Hough-Martin: I'm a finance committee and policy committee member so I have no issues looking at.

In Favor: 16
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 0

The motion carries, the issue will go to Finance Committee.

Chair: If there is no more discussion on this point, we can move on.

8. A) LETTER TO CSU

O. Riaz: The letter was updated keeping in mind what some Councillors have mentioned and I'd like to state I'd like to make it as clear as possible that I take responsibility that it wasn't clearly disclosed to Council. The major part at the beginning of the letter, that I understand why it was wrong.

S. Hough-Martin: I acknowledge it's bolded, it's a formal apology and the rest of the letter sort of detracts from the apology. It felt like a justification despite the first paragraph, considering the motion in question and I went back to the video of that meeting. The former sustainability coordinator mentioned specifically that Council should have the final approval of whether gifts can be accepted, and it is to further transparency.

The motion was not only just about gifts, it was specifically related to trips to British Columbia specifically for student centers and buildings. It was mentioned in the SUDS document, and when considering an apology letter involved in something as problematic as accepting a gift that according to the minutes that the General Coordinator was in attendance for, it didn't just create a potential for a conflict of interest it went against the motion and broke a resolution that was made in Council.

O. Riaz: My actions were clearly in contravention with the motion passed in February, other than that I don't have any comments to add. It's clear what was wrong, and the potential for conflict of interest would be if we were in a negotiation but no decisions were taken by me thereafter.

R. Gaudet: I drew issue with the conflict of interest part of the letter. It states that you're bound by the Quebec Corporations act during the September 20th meeting, it was never stated by the General Coordinator that this part of the Act was addressed. This is what we discussed back in September. According to that act this was breaking the conflict of interest, and the letter does not state that. Another thing I noted was near the end the General Coordinator states they'd be

working with Policy committee to create guidelines or standing regulations. I had resigned from Policy in December but no actions had been taken by then. Did anything happen?

O. Riaz: I worked on a Gift Policy for the CSU, but Policy wasn't available for that right now.

Khánh Trân Du: I first read about this issue as a normal Student from The Link. Was this letter disseminated to the students? After reading this letter they apologized and they explained the reason why they attended. As a regular student that felt that the CSU wasn't being transparent enough, the letter provided an explanation for what the CSU does with our fee money. I thought this was good and provided transparency and an explanation. They apologized, took responsibility, and further discussion about conflict of interest I don't feel that changing this letter would change the perspective looking in from the outside.

S. Hough-Martin: It's not whether or not there is an explanation, the matter is that the actions were taken at all. When the motion was passed it was explicitly mentioned that the former general coordinator explained the gifts accepted by executives. The motion was for it to be prevented from happening in the future. The problem is that it did happen after that point. It does not detract from the fact that this was not brought to Council, it's a huge issue and it was not disclosed at that time.

O. Riaz: The reason for the following part, I owed an explanation to Council and the larger student body. I took full responsibility and I know what I did wrong and what the motion on February 8 includes and my thought process.

R. Gaudet: I want to agree with something Sophie said. The First paragraph was solid, but the longer part reads as an argument. That's not the purpose this letter was mandated. A law was broken and things weren't disclosed to Council pertaining to a multimillion dollar deal we have with a corporation. Moving on to another point I want to draw a question of Omar's statement that he didn't think Policy was ready?

O. Riaz: That happened in December, there were other issues Policy was dealing with. I have the draft to submit right now.

D. Applebaum: I do see that it is an apology, I think that the added explanations to the end are beneficial for the student body at large because they provide an explanation and shows that the actions were not taken with malicious intent. With the amount of rewriting done I see it stripping the genuine nature of the apology. If we keep asking for changes, it stops coming from the individual's own words. We're starting to getting to the stages of nitpicking on wording.

S. Hough-Martin: I would like to reiterate that whether or not the intention was malicious, it does not excuse the issue. Adding a paragraph to the beginning to an apology that goes on to justify the behavior, whether or not it was intended to be malicious, it poses a large problem that should not be ignored.

M. Clark-Gardner: I'd like to state that I am also not pleased with the letter. In a sense Dylan is right when they said that the letter at this point the General Coordinator doesn't seem to want

to change anything. It's pretty much the same letter, an issue I have is that there was no discussion with Council or the executive team. They said during the first meeting the need for this apology letter was brought up there was no discussion or agreement with what was happening and it impedes the non-hierarchical structure of what is supposed to occur here. There have been two tries and it's been a little disappointing.

Khánh Trân Du: In that case would this letter be good for the student body and ask the General Coordinator rewrite one for Council? It might be good to explain more, apologizing is the intent of this letter. He created a potential conflict of interest and at the end of the day it was a potential. Students weren't happy about it but it explains it. I feel like talking more about the conflict of interest would take from the reason the GC and FC did this.

D. Applebaum: I can understand that individuals are upset this even happened but the most productive thing to do would be to move forward with it and ensure the controls are in place to prevent it. At the beginning of the year it wasn't required, and our policy books weren't quite up to date. From what I remember the team was made aware that they were planning to attend, and I was hoping that if they had objected it would have been taken into consideration. But going forward we should be proactive and it will have a positive effect.

A. Mushtaq: Proactive about what, exactly?

D. Applebaum: Making sure these situations cannot arise, with our non-hierarchical structure that these things can be discussed openly with the executive team in accordance with our bylaws and regulations.

A. Mushtaq: Policy committee was not approached with a policy, I was approached in a conversation by Omar saying they would submit something. I wasn't too busy to look into that, it is in our mandate to accumulate these submissions. We need to work with Omar on this, but we were told a document was on its way.

A. Badr: I want to touch on the summer discussion we have and the non-hierarchical system, we were discovering many issues in our work for example I can speak of myself. Some stuff wasn't clear to me yet and I spent a long time researching the HR parts, there's a learning curve and right now in February my experience and knowledge about my role is much higher than it was in June and July. For the trip itself and the benefits, we had that discussion but it wasn't clear to me what the benefits were. It was a brief discussion. That being said, I want to also mention the non-hierarchical system yes it's new but unfortunately it has advantages and disadvantages. One advantage is being able to work on a horizontal level. One of the disadvantages is not having someone following up on our rules, with no one working above us.

S. Hough-Martin moves that the apology be rejected by Council.

S. Hough-Martin: Whereas the apology letter is not following the stipulations outline in September and the numerous requests for revision, that the CSU formally reject it.

J.Roy seconds the motion

S. Hough-Martin: It's clear that the apology is inadequate whether or not the explanation shows malicious intent. The gift was not disclosed to Council, there is work that can be done with Policy committee. As a Council member I would not feel comfortable having this sent out to Council.

O. Riaz: It does meet the requirements, so if any part has been missed please say so. It outlines what I did, why I did it, and I made a mistake and I'm sorry and here's why it won't happen again. It's better than just a paragraph without explanation

D. Applebaum moves to call the question

P. Magallanes seconds the motion

In Favor: 10

Opposed: 1

Abstained: 5

The question is called.

In Favor: 6

Opposed: 6

Abstained: 4

The motion fails to carry.

Chair: We're back on the main speaker's list.

M. Clark-Gardner: I would like to clarify that a non-hierarchical system doesn't mean aggressively rejecting something, it's about consensus-based decision making. It affects the entire working dynamic of the group.

Khánh Trân Du: I wasn't here, I wanted to know the outline of the apology letter discussed in September.

A. Mushtaq: To add to the non-hierarchical structure discussion, there were no clear indication as to how it would affect the roles. In speaking with a service manager what they were told when the change happened, it would simply be a change of titles and there was no clear facilitation of the process. I think it has to go back to how our changes were integrated and it's an area we could work on it to make sure anyone who succeeds us works under the right framework.

R. Gaudet: They did some of these points, the issue is directly on the Quebec Companies Act point where it explicitly states what a conflict of interest means and it was pointed out to Council that the actions of Omar broke the outlines mentioned in the Act.

S. Younis: This letter was to teach them a lesson to follow, not to make a conflict of interest and follow the CSU and we should move forward and stop oppression them with requests to change it. I think the GC did a great job of writing this.

Khánh Trân Du: Would you have the definition of the conflict of interest?

R. Gaudet: From the Quebec Companies Act. I don't have a copy of that. Rory brought the *book*, not me.

Khánh Trân Du: Is this CSU a company?

Chair: Yes, it is a non-profit corporation.

Khánh Trân Du: As Dylan mentioned earlier, it was discussed within the Executive team?

D. Applebaum: From what I remember there was a conversation between the Executives that they would be going to this event and it was discussed briefly from my understanding.

Khánh Trân Du: Who was part of that conversation?

O. Riaz: It was a message sent on Slack for at least four executives, five executives asking what it was for. In the message it was clear how the trip would be paid for, where we'd be going and who it was fun, there were questions not about the free flights but the benefit of going to the conference, if there was a benefit. It was okay with the Executive who asked that question.

Khánh Trân Du: It was discussed and no one was against the idea or thought there would be a potential conflict?

O. Riaz: They had questions about the trip itself.

R. Gaudet: For background because a lot of Councillors weren't here for the original discussion, one of the issues was the discussion but it's not the main issue when it comes to conflict of interest. According to the Quebec Companies Act, because this was worth a certain amount (a gift, sponsorship, whatever) and because Omar represents the CSU who has a huge contract with that company, because that gift came from that corporation to a representative of the CSU it had to be legally declared by the Board of Directors, so Council would have had to be notified.

D. Applebaum moves to accept the apology and make it available to the public

S. Younis seconds the motion.

D. Applebaum: We've had the conversation of whether it's acceptable or not, multiple drafts of it, their belief that this is perhaps the best that would come out of it, I'm going to see if the board is in consensus.

Chair: The motion on the table is to approve the letter and make it available to the student body at large.

In Favor: 7

Opposed: 6

Abstained: 2

The motion carries.

Chair: The apology will be approved and made available to the public.

A. Mushtaq: There is discomfort for executives being mentioned in discussion of this process as being in agreement. It is very different for every member reading them. The matter of if it raised the question of gift policy is very misleading. The information I was given was all the information I was satisfied with. No one wants to be used as token person as having committed an agreement.

A. Badr: It's about the legal point and the conflict of interest. I had a discussion with executives and a lawyer and had a decision. One of the points made is that it doesn't seem like a conflict of interest. I'm not defending and I don't want to say anything, I would like for someone studying science and facts have a consultation on this from an expert and not from a book. It might affect some of us or one person. We have to be 100% certain of the definition of a conflict of interest.

A. Mushtaq: From what I understand the conversation has different aspects that are raised. And the other is the definition of conflict of interest and the gift policy, specifically. When we refer to these conversations we can get a little lost. some of the concerns about the letter weren't intended to be oppressive in nature, but in conjunction with the gift policy...the general coordinator was present when that policy was created. Consulting with external members or legal advisors, it would be useful to Ethics to address those concerns before mixing everything else between sending things around. It prolongs the conversation.

C. Thompson-Marchand: What did you mean by whether the situation was a conflict of interest?

A. Badr: It was a casual conversation of a former CSU Executive who is now a lawyer about the definition and the situation. I have zero background in law, but I would like since we already mentioned, we referred to a book, to a law, and we came to that conclusion. We need to be certain it is because it is affecting members of the CSU, one person sitting with us and one who resigned. I am not defending or accusing anyone, we should be more certain about the law.

Chair: We can move on to ‘Student Congress’, but tiny sidebar:

We need to discuss the gender pronouns and the ‘you’, because it is my objective for those words to be removed from your vocabulary. If you accidentally say ‘he’ or ‘she’ and say, ‘sorry, I meant ‘they’, that’s good. That’s evolution. Remember that when you’re speaking try not to misgender your colleagues. And we don’t use “you”. I went on a little spiel about this at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. We’re all on equal terms and we do not point anyone out during Council. Remember, Robert’s Rules. It separates us from the dolphins. You’re not singling somebody out, you’re not arguing with them. When you say “you” it weakens your argument. I do let a couple slide because I don’t like being a disciplinarian, I like being a facilitator. This was a reminder to be mindful when speaking.

8. B) Student Congress

L. Sutherland: This is to inform/remind everyone that the Student Congress on Campus sexual violence is February 28th. The goal will be to have representatives from every departmental organization on campus. If you’re involved in any associations please speak to people to see if a delegation is being formed. Our outreach plays a large role in people attending these events, and it would be wonderful for a lot of new people to be in the room. It would be a chance for you to interact with new constituents. It will be happening during the nomination period so it would be a good time for those running to meet other people getting involved and having important conversations about sexual violence, especially regarding the climate of the discussion and how the administration is trying to talk about it. In a hopeful way we’d like to talk about what we’d like our campus to be like and how to see issues of sexual violence and misconduct dealt with in

the future. It's something that touches everybody on campus. We represent students from many faculties, and it is something no individual person can do alone. If you can reach out, even if you only have 20 minutes go talk to your department organization and grab some posters to put up. It will be a wonderful and successful event if we have a lot of student representation. It would be an incredible success for student voice on campus. I will be away as of tomorrow so if you have questions, direct them to Asma or Veronika. If you would like to be involved I posted the links to the mobilization committee on the Council page.

8. C) Election Reform Committee

S. Hough-Martin: We met with the CEO last week; we'll be announcing a special Council meeting to go over the report from by elections. At the meeting we had we tried to pose questions about the committee but they preferred to answer them in writing, asking the CEO about how to improve the election process. We're waiting for those responses. The CEO wrote recommendations they sent to the election committee and we're still waiting for those to be sent to Council as well.

8. D) Letter of Support Bill 62

A. Badr: Back to the presentation that was given, the same group has a letter to pressure the government to address the issue of islamophobia and discrimination. I posted these letters to the Facebook page, referring to the mandate we already have from our referendum. I will be signing this letter to show transparency, and if anyone wants to discuss that or has an issue with it, it is time to share your ideas.

Khánh Trân Du: Support means adding the budget line?

A. Badr: I did name the agenda points similarly, but this is to tell the government that not confronting the issue of racism and discrimination is a big issue to open the discussion.

9. Question Period & Business Arising

Chair: There were excusals requested from Rim and from Aouatif who could not make it today.
A. Sherra moves to excuse them

J.Roy seconds the motion

In Favor: 15
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 0

The motion to excuse them carries.

S. Younis: The other Councillors didn't give reasons?

Chair: I didn't receive anything from those who aren't here who weren't already excused. Reminder you need to ask to be excused.

A. Sherra: I wanted to ask about the referendum question, what is the date for that?

V. Rydzewski: We'll be calling a SCM on the 26th, the Monday we return from the break to ask those questions.

A. Sherra: Is it possible to post that on the group?

V. Rydzewski: Absolutely.

R. Gaudet: Correct me if I'm wrong, anyone who wants to add a referendum has to reach out to Veronika in order to make sure it's on the Agenda beforehand?

Chair: Whoever calls the Special Council Meetings (either Omar or 3 Councillors), as people which as long as when the call-out is made that the Agenda points are sent to me and CC the person who calls the meeting. And as a reminder after Friday it can't be changed. I'd have to get it Thursday (two business days for a special). If somebody submits late, we'll try to consider it but the names of the points have to be on the agenda here.

A. Sherra moves to call a special Council meeting on Monday the 26th

M. Clark-Gardner: Thursday the first?

Chair: Can we clarify the dates?

M. Clark-Gardner: I was going to call a Special Council Meeting for the first.

Chair: We should poll this in the Facebook group because we don't want three different SCM's called the same week.

A. Sherra: If we change that does it mean it goes against the dates?

V. Rydzewski: Not necessarily

O. Riaz: You can still add referendum questions if Council approves, I think.

Chair: So that doesn't fall under the General Election, so based on the dates that we have the 1st should be acceptable. As would the 26th so Council.

V. Rydzewski: I'm fine with it being moved to the 1st.

J. Sutera Sardo: I would prefer the Monday.

R. Gaudet: One Councillor calling it for a specific date is a bit inappropriate, we should do a poll.

Chair: The motion's been seconded so it's up to Council now.

D. Applebaum calls the question.

M. Clark-Gardner: I made a poll for the ad hoc committee and five said they could come, so I think it should be Thursday so it helps for Quorum.

In Favor: **0**

Opposed: **9**

Abstained: **3**

The motion fails to carry.

R. Gaudet: I think Mikaela has been taking a lead, would a poll be okay?

M. Clark-Gardner: I can email Caitlin for the SCM on Thursday.

10. Announcements

MGP: We have the annual Sexpress Yourself event, there will be raffles and talks about sexual health and we would appreciate it if you could come to show that Loyola is not that far away.

A. Badr: March is a busy month for us, there are many events. There is a community consultation about racism photo op event, discussing racism in classrooms as some of the group work and participations in the first consultations related to student experiences. I would like to encourage everyone to come and be informed of the problems CSU members are facing, for sure many of you are first and second year students, that being said someone has to continue this path. We are facing problems on campus, they exist. We need to know more about them and address them. There's other events that would be taking place, please share them.

11. Adjournment

O. Riaz moves to adjourn

C.Thompson-Marchand seconds the motion

The meeting was adjourned at 21h26pm