



CSU Regular Council Meeting

Wednesday, April 11th, 2018

RF-335, 18h30, Loyola Campus

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. TiohEá: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 Montréal community."

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 – March 14th (RCM)
- d) Chairperson's Report
- e) Orientation Post-Mortem

5. Presentations & Guest Speakers

6. Appointments

- a) CCSL
- b) Appointments Committee
- c) Policy Committee
- b) Gender Advocacy Committee

7. New Business – Substantive

- a) Anti-Gentrification Position
- b) Food System
- c) Privatization of War Position
- d) Annual General Meeting
- e) CEO Pay
- f) Bill 62 consultation
- g) Audit RFP Committee

8. New Business – Informational

- a) University Financial Statement
- b) Online Voting
- c) Executive Statement
- d) Tickets

9. Question Period & Business Arising

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 19h02.

2. Roll Call

Executives present for the duration of the meeting were:

Kamden Biggart (Finance Coordinator) Asma Mushtaq (Academic & Advocacy Coordinator), Veronika Rydzewski (Internal Affairs 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:

M. Gabriela Polanco, O. Riaz

Councillors present for the duration of the meeting were:

Rim Hamila (Engineering and Computer Science), Thompson-Marchand (Arts and Science), Dylan Applebaum (John Molson School of Business) Patrick Magallanes (Arts and Science), Rowan Gaudet (Arts and Science), Tabea Vischer (Arts and Science), Eamon Toohey (Arts and Science), Mikaela Clark-Gardner (Fine Arts), Rossi (John Molson School of Business), Alexis Searcy (Arts and Sciences), Jonathan Roy (Arts and Sciences), Charlotte Genest (Arts and Sciences), 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). Camille Thompson-Marchand (Arts and Science), Mustafa Bokesmati (Arts and Sciences), Alienor Lougerstay (Engineering and Computer Science), Peter Zhuang (Fine Arts)

Councillors absent for the duration of the meeting were:

R. Blaisdell, T. Vischer, M. Clark-Gardner, J. Sutura-Sardo, K. Komah, A. Jemma, A. Sherra, S. Younis, A. Zebiri, M. Bokesmati, J. Haas.

A. Badr moves to excuse the absent Councilors.

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the excusal.

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 0

The excusals carry.

L. Sutherland moves to excuse both Executives.

D. Abrams seconds the motion.

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 0

The executives are excused.

3. Approval of the Agenda

A. Mushtaq moves to approve the agenda and all items under consent

S. Hough-Martin seconds the motion

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 0

The Consent Agenda has been approved.

4. Consent Agenda

a) Executive Reports

b) Reports from Committees

c) Approval of minutes – March 14th (RCM)

d) Chairperson's Report

The consent agenda has been ratified.

5. Presentations & Guest Speakers

(None)

6. Appointments

b) CCSL

L. Sutherland: The CCSL grants money to projects and disburses funds to projects involving student engagement , the next meeting is this Friday at Loyola. There are now two open seats for CCSL.

P. Magallanes: I am interested. I haven't tried that committee.

P. Magallanes moves to nominate themselves.

D. Applebaum seconds the nomination.

P. Magallanes: I got involved with a similar committee, and I would like to continue with something like that. No matter what happens with elections, I would still be involved and engaged in that way.

In Favor: 8

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 0

P. Magallanes has been appointed to CCSL.

C. Thompson-Marchand: Point of personal privilege, was the new Agenda sent out?

Chair: I posted that not in the right place. Hm. It is now gone. A bunch of people on my soccer team will be confused by that. Moving on.

C. Thompson-Marchand: Thank you.

6) B) **Appointments Committee**

V. Rydzewski: We appoint to many CSU standing committees and University Committees that have seats reserved for the CSU. We might be meeting once or twice before the end of the semester but it is not reoccurring. There is one seat.

R. Gaudet moves to nominate themselves.

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the nomination.

R. Gaudet: You got to fill those seats, I've sat on it before twice. It is a fun committee.

In Favor: 8

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 1

R. Gaudet has been appointed to the appointments committee.

C) **Policy Committee**

A. Mushtaq: There is a seat available after a resignation on Policy Committee. We look at Policies referred to us by Council and the standing regulations. It is fun to work on.

Chair: Would anyone like to nominate themselves?

P. Magallanes: How many seats are there?

Chair: One, it's until the end of the year.

P. Magallanes: I'm considering it. Can we come back to it? Okay fine.

P. Magallanes moves to nominate themselves.

D. Applebaum seconds the nomination.

P. Magallanes: There are things I want to see and change in Standing Regulations, like the election stuff. It would be a way to get something done that way.

In Favor: 8

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 1

P. Magallanes has been appointed to Policy Committee.

D) Gender Advocacy Committee

L. Sutherland: There are no empty seats, that is a miscommunication. There is no seat that must be filled.

Chair: If there is nothing to discuss on this point..?

L. Sutherland: If they'd like to attend meetings there is no restriction but if they'd like to join they can do that too.

7. A) Anti Gentrification Position

A. Searcy presents the following motion:

“Whereas gentrification is the process by which impoverished and often racialized communities are displaced from their historical neighborhoods because of increases in the cost of living caused by an influx of affluent developers, business owners and property owners;

Whereas students tend to live on a moderate budget and are also pushed out of formerly affordable neighborhoods because of increasing costs of rent caused by gentrification;

Whereas students, as a group, also often contribute to the process of gentrification because we live in working-class neighborhoods, are often transitory and ill-informed about rental rights

Whereas students need affordable housing and have a responsibility to join in the efforts to keep housing affordable and accessible for not just ourselves but also communities;

Whereas the CSU has been actively working to educate and empower students about their rights as tenants, most notably through the Off-Campus Housing and Resource Centre (HOJO);

Be It Resolved That the CSU take a position against gentrification;

Be It Further Resolved That the CSU actively support initiatives working against gentrification and promote community organizations working on these issues

Be It Further Resolved That the CSU help promote anti-gentrification campaigns around Montreal”

L. Sutherland seconds the motion.

A. Searcy: I think it's pretty much written here. Gentrification affects a lot of the student community. It ruins our communities, takes away businesses we love and replaces them with ones we cannot afford. And students contribute to these problems by moving into working class neighborhoods, not knowing our rights, not pushing landlords to maintain facilities and not raise rent, and the work HOJO does is tied to this issue. It is obvious.

D. Applebaum: I am curious about this. I believe students want affordable housing but there is nothing illegal about these things. When there is large demand in areas and create student ghettos, these are common recurrence. It's not a problem or causing issues. Areas in Montreal have fluctuated and changed between different classes at different times. Why not endorsing creating more affordable housing or something like that?

S. Hough-Martin: To respond to that, the issue of gentrification may not be illegal but legality and morality are not the same thing regarding political issues. The CSU is already undertaking affordable housing projects, this is regarding taking a more proactive stance in protecting marginalized and vulnerable populations by supporting anti gentrification bills is important.

L. Sutherland: The many positions that we have that take stances against things that aren't illegal so it's not a bad precedent. I was evicted from my apartment this year, they bought the building, kicked everyone out and jacked up the rent. It affects students in the ways Lexi described. There is a point where education is affected by housing and rights, it's important that such a mandate be involved with our work in the CSU.

D. Applebaum: How would taking a position affect gentrification at all? We can stand against it but like, what are we gonna do about it?

A. Searcy: There are a lot of groups and community organizations that work against gentrification. The CSU does some education regarding tenant rights, we could bolster that.

C. Thompson-Marchand: We have many positions, as Leyla was saying. This creates a foundation for projects based on these propositions at Council.

D. Applebaum: The way it's being discussed here seems more like the development of neighborhoods to the local population. The large demands are what cause these prices and create condominium developments. Large organizations come in and move into certain shops because there's a demand for it. This doesn't seem like the right direction, endorsing student housing or affordable housing rather than being against the self-progression of neighborhoods. Students cause gentrification when they move near campuses.

R. Gaudet: The CSU already has several positions and referendum questions about affordable student housing. This adds onto it. One of the main reasons behind this motion isn't about changing completely what we're doing but how we work toward student housing in an ethical manner that isn't destroying communities. Like Hochelaga, I used to live there or the fancy student housing near the Plateau-Lafontaine area, if we built that in Hochelaga it would be very problematic for the community. So this motion ensures when we do these things it's not directly harming other communities, even if they're not student communities.

S. Hough-Martin calls the question

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the motion to call the question

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 0

The question has been called.

In Favor: 6

Opposed: 2

Abstention: 1

The motion carries.

Chair: The positions book will be coming back to Council through the consent agenda.

7. B) Food system

R. Gaudet presents the following motion:

“Whereas the CSU adopted the following position in the 2013 General Elections;

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

Whereas the University’s upcoming food contract is set to expire by 2020;

Whereas the upcoming Request For Proposal (RFP) process represents an opportunity to increase students’ involvement and control of the Concordia food system;

Be it resolved the CSU commit to supporting student led initiatives attempting to increase student control of the food system through the upcoming RFP, including but not limited to the following ways: Printing, design, outreach and campaign resources;

Be it further resolved the CSU executives be mandated to work with student groups to facilitate and fund research to increase knowledge of the Concordia food system and its possibilities.”

C. Genest seconds the motion.

R. Gaudet: A lot of this is fairly clear, essentially the University's food contract will expire and there will be a negotiation period. It is a good time to increase control within the food system, many student groups are organizing to work around that. The CSU has positions on this and should support it based on its position book and it did in 2015 when the same thing happened. I thought it would be good to make a motion specifically for this RFP for next year's executives know clearly what they need to do. And then for research, another thing in 2015 there was a project based on the food quality at Concordia whether or not that will be the focus, it makes sense for the CSU to work with that research. It is an ongoing discussion but it makes sense more research be done so the groups mobilizing about this know the most to make the best decisions.

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 0

The motion carries unanimously.

7. New Business – Substantive

d) Privatization of War Position

R. Gaudet presents the following motion:

“Be it resolved that CSU Council add the following to the positions book under the heading “International Affairs”;

That the CSU oppose the privatization of war and the military industrial complex.”

S. Hough-Martin seconds the motion.

R. Gaudet: A lot of people assume we have a position towards this, but we don't. It's worded broadly on purpose, specifically to keep veteran's affairs separate. I don't want this motion to have any effect on that. Essentially there was a recent CSU event which changed in its dialogue, it was originally posted about information surrounding the military complex as "job opportunities" and it seems like something the CSU should not be doing.

A. Badr: I want to know the link between the motion and the event, what were we promoting or endorsing during that event?

R. Gaudet: I don't remember the description off the top of my head, but the description was eventually changed. But the description was discussing military technologies and discussions on job opportunities within those markets. As it went on it shifted toward discrimination against people of certain countries within these fields, but the original one didn't have a focus on that as much.

A. Badr: The original name was International Traffic and Arms regulations, the description was about the Aerospace Industry. Written on purpose for people working in the aerospace industry, I do not know where it was mentioned we were endorsing it or something. The event was changed because an executive mentioned it didn't look good. I was open along with others working on it to make it clear it was not related. From the beginning, to the end, it was not about military work force. There is lots of areas, but that one specifically I can reply why we had that event and how it is affecting students. I would like some clarification, what is the military side of this?

R. Gaudet: I've given the best answer I got from what I understood of the description, I don't have it in front of me. It was trafficking of technologies, but it is not directly related to the motion at hand. I mentioned it as something I saw, not in the whereas's or the positions.

A. Mushtaq: I have a bit of information that might shed some light on these concerns. Originally the description was problematic to hear, so I looked into it with the cohost to see what was being addressed and it was racial discrimination in the aerospace and engineering industries. The focus was not about military anything, but the concern was addressed. So the description was revised by the cohost.

S. Hough-Martin calls the question.

C. Genest seconds the motion

In Favor: 7

Opposed: 2

Abstention: 0

The question has been called.

In Favor: 6

Opposed: 2

Abstention: 1

The motion carries.

A. Badr: A clarification for everyone to know what the event was, I'm really upset of having this discussion right now. If someone has an issue, I am not perfect, I don't know everything about the CSU history, if anyone has any issues to bring up or advise, address it to the executive or someone else if the executive is difficult to help us improve the work. This work is not helpful for me to discuss an event that happened 15 days ago. I feel we should be working for the benefit of students rather than catching mistakes, not to call out anyone but I want to say this. IT's about classification of technology, and unfortunately in Aerospace for 75% of the technology being used is classified as military whether it is a space shuttle or a satellite. Anyone with a degree with Aerospace they won't have a chance to be employed with anything, International Students spending money coming here to get a degree won't have a chance. Please send us a message, an appointment, anything. I was personally and the cohost were very open to concerns. It's not fair.

R. Gaudet: I want to reiterate that this motion was not meant to be tied to the event. It was something I mentioned in passing.

Chair: If there is nothing further , we can move on.

D) Annual General Meeting

L. Sutherland: Be It Resolved That an Annual General Meeting be held April 30th <motion>

C. Thompson-Marchand: Seconds the motion

R. Gaudet: April 30th, does it give us enough time to select an Auditor and bring a recommendation?

K. Biggart: I think so.

Chair: Any more questions or concerns regarding the date? Good.

In Favor: 7

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 2

The motion carries. The Annual General Meeting will be held on April 30th at 6pm.

E) CEO Pay

K. Biggart presents the following motion:

“Whereas council approved a budget of up to \$9000.00 for the Chief Electoral Officer’s honorarium.

Whereas the CEO has worked 487 hours at \$16.50/ hours for \$ 8,035.50 from the time he was appointed to the previous pay period which ended on March 18, 2018.

Whereas the CEO has submitted a time sheet with additional hours totaling \$ 2904.00 for pay period ending on March 18, 2018.

Whereas that would surpass the limit set by council by \$ 2,285.50 for a total of \$ 10,939.50.

Whereas the additional hours have already been completed by the CEO and there is a requirement for additional hours to follow the directives of the Judicial Board for a recount and complete the CEO’s report to be presented at the AGM.

Be it resolved that council increase the budget for CEO’s honorarium a total of \$13, 300.00.

Be it further resolved that the CEO be required to track the hours worked and budget as no further increase will be considered.”

S. Hough-Martin seconds the motion.

K. Biggart: It was flagged by the accountant that the CEO was going over in November. I wasn't aware of it. They flagged it to me. I thought we should be aware of it before we go over budget, it could be by a couple thousand.

D. Applebaum: What has been the pay in previous years?

K. Biggart: I think last year it was less, it was in the minutes of Council and rounded up by a few hundred dollars. The reasons are in the document provided today by the CEO themselves.

D. Applebaum: Where is that document?

K. Biggart: Was it not sent out? I can share that.

L. Sutherland: Isn't it in the Final Docs email?

S. Hough-Martin: I don't see it.

K. Biggart: Oh the title is misleading, CEO pay increase. I can't justify the information in the document but it's there for our reference.

P. Magallanes: I know why it increased, because of the things he did wrong. For FASA. I find it though, worrisome because he has to be involved and not just give it to us.

Chair: I as the chair I am the official channel of communication between Council and the CEO, let me know, tell me after Council or email me.

L. Sutherland: To be clear the 10,000\$ did not come out of the CEO pay. The Money that's there is only related to the hours worked, not any election expenses.

R. Gaudet moves to amend to add a Be It Resolved That the increase be contingent on the CEO presenting their report to Council during the Annual General Meeting.

D. Applebaum seconds the amendment.

R. Gaudet: According to the standing regulations the annual election report should be at the Annual General Meeting, and according to the same standing regulation they were supposed to present the by election report and that is part of their job in the Standing Regulations. It's important that these reports be presented to Council because it was never done. And they didn't show up last time to present their report, it's important that they show up. If Council wants to amend that it's only the Annual General Meeting, but at least one of the two.

L. Sutherland: I would suggest making this separate to the issue of pay. For one I don't know if it's illegal to withhold pay, I don't think it's a fair way to operate. If we were going to make things contingent, it would be for hours not yet worked. I feel uncomfortable holding someone's pay check in them showing up to a meeting where they're going to have to face the fact there are people who are frustrated with them. Maybe a separate motion would be more appropriate to reaffirm they have an obligation to attend the meeting.

D. Applebaum: One thing we could do is grant them an honorarium of X amount in completion of the work. I'm concerned about getting another report about additional hours because they weren't complete the work in a timely manner, it had to do with their own decisions in hiring while they were DEO. They took the decision to take over the work, I don't believe they're considered a full on salaried employee with specific hours designated to them. That way the honorarium would force them to complete the work.

K. Biggart: So everyone knows as well, the 2900\$ on the table is hours already worked to be processed this coming week. It would make sense to tie conditions to upcoming hours that haven't been worked. But this motion is on pay already earned. I don't think we should wait to pay them.

S. Hough-Martin: Do we have timesheets? I don't want to tie this to my own experience but as a candidate when there was no posted hours for the CEO for the majority of campaign period I find it a little difficult to look at the report that was submitted because I'm not sure how it's possible.

K. Biggart: I don't supervise them, so normally the General Coordinator was in contact with them ,so their timesheets was going to the Accountant and the General Coordinator would be in those emails.

D. Applebaum moves to change it to 'salary' to honorarium, conditional on providing the reports that Rowan mentioned previously.

Chair: The only thing is the amendment on the table is to change pay to honorarium but currently they are not receiving one.

D. Applebaum: It would be to...you're right. It wouldn't work on this motion. Forget it. I'll wait.

C. Thompson-Marchand: I have a question, the CEO was to report to the General Coordinator, but the current General Coordinator was running for election?

K. Biggart: During the election they had no communication, that's why I was in that email.

C. Thompson-Marchand: You were delegated to deal with the CEO at that time?

Chair: They're overseen by the General Manager and Council appoints the CEO but they don't have a boss. The General Manager oversees their work, the closest thing to a boss.

In Favor: 3

Opposed: 3

Abstention: 3

The amendment fails.

C. Thompson-Marchand: So we're still on the main motion.

Chair: Yes.

K. Biggart: It would be useful if based on the document that the CEO provided Council decides on an amount of hours they'd accept for the remaining tasks and append it to the motion as a maximum.

D. Applebaum: My only worry with treating it as a salary is if he does not complete the work in time he will still receive the amount and we'll be stuck in the same situation later on. In the report it was caused by mis-staffing and mismanagement on his own part. People are questioning the amount of work they're doing, and there is no oversight on their timesheets, the estimates might run over.

L. Sutherland: It makes sense for someone to be paid for the amount of hours, elections can take very different amount of time based on different circumstances. There are things we can do policy wise to strengthen the way hours are reported. Honorariums would drastically change that. If this boils down to how much we pay them in the end, it can be problematic because Council would be deciding how much to withhold.

D. Applebaum: I think the fact that nobody actually knows if they're clocking in and out, do we know? Do they go on a computer?

Chair: The CEO would report the expenses, I don't know about that.

K. Biggart: I have one example of that I could pull up.

Chair: IT would go to the CSU's accountant, right?

K. Biggart: I think they just draft it, there is no check-in.

D. Applebaum: So one day they could report they're working but they can be out having a slice of pizza, Okay.

K. Biggart: I'm looking for the timesheet. There's no information on the hours worked, no task breakdown.

A. Mushtaq: I'd like to advise to keep the two issues separate, the lack of oversight and the issue of pay and that. Or we'll complicate the matter more.

R. Gaudet: When we're talking about lack of oversight and pay, it feels like one issue. If we're discussing the hours we have and have no way to verify them, it's related.

D. Applebaum: To clarify what Asma was saying, we should talk about it as a separate issue, right?

A. Mushtaq: If we don't have a mechanism in place right now and it's not clear then trying to hold a person accountable to a higher standard doesn't seem fair. If we had something to benchmark against, that would be better. As far as the motion a maximum is a good restriction. We don't know what level of detail they were requested to provide. There's ways of complicating the conversation or looking within our operating jurisdiction.

Chair: We'll proceed to a vote.

In Favor: 0

Opposed: 3

Abstention: 6

The motion on the table fails.

K. Biggart: If we don't have a motion tonight to cap the budget, they will continue to be paid.

C. Thompson-Marchand: I understand that it's not fair to hold their pay over their head while waiting for a report, but I feel uncomfortable giving this money without having any idea what was done. It could be not an Annual General Meeting, but maybe at Council they present their report before we agree to a certain amount.

L. Sutherland: We have a position about a Living Wage, I am uncomfortable we don't come to a decision to pay them for their work. The fact that the CEO does not have a direct supervisor means no one is in a clear position of responsibility, but there are several people who can bear the one of needing a better system before it became an issue. Perhaps if there weren't so many contentious issues during this election we might not be scrutinizing their hours. If there was going to be an issue, it probably should have been identified beforehand. I mean to say that this person has worked for the CSU for several months, and I believe they were tracking their pay the same time, if ever there was a time to discuss this issue of transparency that should have been recognized earlier and not now. Part of that responsibility isn't on the CEO as much as those who are supervising them, which makes it harder. All that to say that the appropriate thing is to make sure we have a motion reaffirming the CEO's presence at the Annual General Meeting to present their report and from now on that hours are tracked and that information is sent to

Council. I agree with what's been said that it's strange to approve a large amount of money without a clear idea of where it's coming from, but it's not necessarily fair to withhold and then demand information at this point now.

C. Thompson-Marchand I rescind.

P. Magallanes: I know there's a lot of work involved, I had a chance to work with elections. I think there are certain things about the report on the By Elections. Maybe they should be present to answer the questions whether it's an Annual General Meeting or Council because there are a lot of things I don't understand in this report. If they were there, they could answer. I am uncomfortable with this amount cited. We don't know anything about their work, so we need to know to have a fair way to clock their hours. Maybe look at past CEO's or something.

D. Applebaum: I'm curious of why our CEO isn't present here today that way we can have a back-and-forth, for this to go forward that the CEO adheres to our Standing Regulations and submit the proper reports. I am also curious about the state of mind they were in when they submitted these timesheets, they knew the maximum was 9,000\$ and then continued submitting timesheets in excess. How did they think this would work?

Chair: The CEO told me they could not be at the meeting tonight.

K. Biggart: It was this last Timesheet that put them over.

C. Thompson-Marchand: IT was for the last two weeks?

K. Biggart: Yes, the last pay period.

Chair: To clarify someone said they didn't submit the by election report.

R. Gaudet: They didn't present it, and according to Standing Regulation 374 they also have to report to Council for By Elections.

Chair: Was that meeting cancelled? No it was not.

R. Gaudet: They have to be there to answer questions. That's how it happened.

L. Sutherland: It's not explicit.

D. Applebaum moves that Council approves a budget with an honorarium not exceeding 13,000\$, they'd have to do the presentation and adhere to the conditions there to receive the remaining amount.

P. Magallanes seconds the motion.

D. Applebaum: The motivation is that this work still needs to be done, we are concerned they might not get the work done in the timeframe or go over their hours. With this current condition they would receive the pay once they represent it, and they would still be receiving a living wage throughout.

K. Biggart: This motion doesn't address the money already worked off, we could amend to pay them that as well.

D. Applebaum: What would happen in this case is up to the 9,000 they would get that outright and any additional money would only be allocated once those duties are done.

L. Sutherland: Those hours are already worked and logged. We cannot not pay someone who has worked an hourly wage for those hours.

K. Biggart: And if it's applied to the work that's to-be done, it would be done in separate.

Chair: What's the amendment?

K. Biggart: It's regarding the 2,285\$.

D. Applebaum: That would be awarded but the additional pay would only be awarded after.

Chair: Can that be worded coherently as a motion? To avoid ambiguity involving issues like pay.

D. Applebaum: Be It Resolved That that Council increase the budget for the CEOs honorarium for a total of 13,000 that all work done up to march 18th 2018 be awarded, so that the requirements of the standing regulations be fulfilled.

Chair: Please cite the standing regulations. There could be something in there that doesn't fit in. For example the minute keeper is supposed to take the minutes of committee meetings and...that doesn't happen. So check to not make them fulfill a condition they don't actually do.

C. Thompson-Marchand: Could you clarify, the amendment you're proposing if it's going to open a window on the CEO asking for more money. It was part of Kamden's motion, no further increase will be considered. Yours doesn't.

D. Applebaum: There is no a cap, it's setting the cap at the 13,000 and having the additional pay for future work it has to fulfill those requirements.

R. Gaudet: Standing regulation 374 is the standing regulation for it to be submitted.

Chair: And for the Annual General Meeting that's a bylaw.

Bylaw 5.2 A) Receiving the CEO's report on the Annual General Meeting of the student union or any referendums or by elections held concurrently.

The room is amendable to that specification.

D. Applebaum: Making sure, Standing Regulation 374, Bylaw 5.2 A?

L. Sutherland: Asma pointed out that the numbers of the Standing regulations have changed, it's a different number now. I'm getting the current numbers. 377 and 378 for clarity's sake.

D. Applebaum presents the motion:

“Be it resolved that Council increase the budget for CEO’s honorarium a total of \$13,000.00.

Be it resolved that any accrued hours for the pay period ending March 18, 2018 be granted.

Be it resolved that any additional salary be remitted once the condition outlined in the standing regulations 377, 378, and bylaw 5.2A.”

Chair: We can move to a vote on the main motion.

In Favor: 4

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 5

The motion carries.

Chair: Anything else to be discussed in the matter of CEO pay.

C. Thompson-Marchand: It's not about the pay, it's about the report itself. I know you're the main contact. Would you prefer I tell you after or now? I want to quickly, could the CEO put more detail on final week of office hours put in the salary increase thing they sent?

R. Gaudet: One of the tasks they have to do is the recount for the Arts and Science minutes, could the Chair ensure they know that?

Chair: Yes, and you can "you" me.

R. Gaudet: Thank "you".

7. F) Bill 62 Consultation

A. Badr: I am bringing this motion back for two times. When I was signing the check I made the mistake of mixing the names. The General Coordinator needs to sign for the intervention. So for the Be It Resolved, I uploaded the motion on the group.

A. Badr presents the following motion:

“WHEREAS the CSU has in October 2017 approved of resolutions that declare that Bill 62 is unacceptable and unconstitutional state-sanctioned discrimination and Islamophobia against Muslim women and their families on the basis of gender and religion, among other grounds, and that the CSU will publicly and actively advocate against Bill 62 and all parties involved in its passage;

WHEREAS in January 2018 following a presentation by lawyers from the Association of Jurists Progressistes and the law firm of Ouellet, Nadon, the CSU Council approved of a letter of support and an amount of \$5000 IN TRUST to the law firm OUELLET NADON to pay for the necessary legal fees and expenses for a Court Intervention on behalf of the CSU in the Application for Judicial Review (Declaration of Invalidity) against Bill 62 filed by NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CANADIAN MUSLIMS, MARIE-MICHELLE LACOSTE and CORPORATION OF THE CANADIAN CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the CSU has duly mandated the law firm of Ouellet, Nadon as its legal representative in the CSU Court Intervention in the Application for Judicial Review (Declaration of Invalidity) against Bill 62 filed as mentioned hereinabove;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the CSU has duly mandated the acting CSU General Coordinator to sign for and represent the CSU in any legal proceedings involving the CSU Court Intervention in the Application for Judicial Review (Declaration of Invalidity) against Bill 62 filed as mentioned hereinabove.”

Chair: In theory we should have a motion to revisit something from last meeting with a couple of amendments. Is Council amenable to that? Thank you.

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the motion.

A. Badr: It's to have the motion with the correct wording in the minutes, and for the future Archivals to have the correct motion. And now the General Coordinator is in the process of signing interventions.

In Favor: 8

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 0

The bill 62 consultation amendments have been approved.

7. G) Audit RFP Committee

K. Biggart presents the following motion:

“Whereas the CSU Council of Representatives appointed members to an Auditor appointment committee in April 2018 to recommend an auditor for the 3 proceeding years.

Whereas the committee received 5 qualifying proposals from different firms and considered five criterions for selection: Pricing, Student Experience, Reputation, Team and Quality of proposal.

Be it resolved that as per the unanimous recommendation of the committee based on the abovementioned criterions, the CSU appoint Deloitte LLP as their official auditors for the next three years (2018-2019, 2019-2020, 2020, 2021)."

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the motion.

K. Biggart: This is something the general manager has put in motion, if anyone else wants to sit on the committee it would be considered a friendly amendment.

In Favor: 8

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 1

The motion carries.

Chair: The Audit RFP committee will exist. We can move on to Informational.

8. New Business – Informational

a) University Financial Statement

Chair: This was Rory's point from last week, if Councilors want to discuss it feel free but there was nothing to add.

R. Gaudet: Briefly, I was given by a friend of mine the professor's union in Canada created a document, how to understand University Financial statements, it's a step by step guide. I got a paper copy, I want to upload one to Council. If anyone wants, message me!

B) Online Voting

P. Magallanes: Sorry, I am recovering a cold. I'll read the motion.

Chair: It's not a motion, is it?

P. Magallanes: It would be carried over to the next meeting. I'll read what I have.

*“WHEREAS THE VOTING VOLUME IN THE CSU ELECTIONS IS DECREASING,
WHEREAS THE PAPER BALLOT IS AN OUTDATED SYSTEM THAT RESULTS IN DEFICITS”*

P. Magallanes: We should change it. There's a lot of stuff to think about for future elections.

D. Applebaum: Is this a motion that you plan to bring forward at next Council?

P. Magallanes: In a way, yeah. We need to look at stuff in Policy and adding the Ad Hoc committee that we have now. The idea is for the campaign to be more permanent and we can bring it up then to change the policies to make it better. Eventually it would go to that level because it is transitional. My idea is basically Executive, Council, Senate, greenlight the initiative first and keep it for the whole year and see how it goes, what can happen with audits. We should have audits done for the election. A lot of things can be improved for next year.

S. Hough-Martin: This is going to be brought forward next Council.

P. Magallanes: I was thinking about it.

S. Hough-Martin: I noticed there wasn't a supporting document.

P. Magallanes: I've been looking at that. I haven't had a chance to look at some of the stuff they have now. I haven't had a chance to talk to the association at McGill, I wanted to know about this system they have now.

S. Hough-Martin: I didn't notice any citations in this supporting document.

P. Magallanes: I'd need to add a lot of stuff in there, I haven't had a chance to confirm the information. It came to mind when I wrote that part.

D. Applebaum: I want to say moving to an online system has a lot of benefits and it would benefit the CSU, but there are a few things to bring up: Dual systems can cause a lot of problems. If there were to be a transition it could be decided later.

The second element for systems, Concordia has the ability to vote online the system is very safe. If anyone can access the My Concordia portal, they'd have access to all your financials and so on. It's unlikely.

S. Hough-Martin: Yes, I wanted to point out that this isn't in the motion but as someone who studies electoral systems there are a lot of issues with Dual systems but there is already an electoral reform ad hoc committee formed to try to address some of these issues. The information that has been put forward has been kind of open-ended, and there isn't a lot of research to back it. There was a report done in 2014 by the CSU could be updated, maybe reaching out to the ad hoc committee that already exists before moving forward might be useful before it is brought back to Council.

P. Magallanes: Mikaela asked me to take charge of that committee, but the timing of getting something together for that meeting based on this, because what's going on with finals and exams I was trying to find a way. I'm open to anything. Also making the committee permanent and expand the number of people involved.

Chair: Any more discussion to be had?

8. C) Executive Statement

L. Sutherland: I'm going to read it.

In view of the recent allegations regarding sexual harassment caused by the Arts and Science Councillor Jonathan Roy and his subsequent resignation.

The Executive feels it is important to reaffirm our commitment to creating safer spaces and protecting survivors. It is of absolute importance to us as an executive and as an organization to support and most importantly to believe survivors. We believe that it is our responsibility to maintain safer spaces and our reaction to allegations like these must be both survivor centric and cognizant of the power dynamics that are in play. We are addressing council following these events in an effort to increase transparency given that there is presently no internal policy in place to handle situations such as these.

In our own capacity, we are working in collaboration with other student associations to develop a strong policy that would provide a clearer path to holding elected individuals accountable in situations of sexual violence and misconduct. This is something the CSU is lacking and though the creation of a strong policy takes time, we are confident that we can do better on this front and are taking steps to improve accountability and procedure.

D) Tickets

L. Sutherland: In accordance with our policy about gifts, I am informing Council from my Exec report, I am part of an event and we were given five tickets to give away, but have also offered me five tickets to share among the executive team. I am informing Council before accepting that gift, and leaving it up to Council to decide if it is appropriate or what to do with it.

C. Thompson-Marchand: What are they tickets for?

L. Sutherland: The same music festival we're giving tickets away to, a three-day music festival itself.

C. Thompson-Marchand: The proposed tickets, they were after that conversation on that organizing the event?

L. Sutherland: After we started planning collaboration they mentioned they would provide tickets to organizers, it was not part of a decision to collaborate.

Chair: If there is no further discussion..

L. Sutherland: I'll make a motion then.

L. Sutherland moves that the Executive be allowed to accept the five tickets.

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the motion.

L. Sutherland: If I had been offered it from the start, I'd suggest them be raffled off but it is being offered on top of those tickets, if Council is uncomfortable it would be understandable but if they're just going to sit there it would be nice to enjoy them.

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 0

The motion carries.

9. Question Period & Business Arising

D. Abrams: What festival?

L. Sutherland: The one mentioned in my Exec Report.

10. Announcements

L. Sutherland: As some Councilors may remember we have a collaboration budget being used for the event this Friday, ASFA, FASA, CASA to a certain extent, ECA and the International Student association. It is an 8 hour on the terrace with a barbeque, 2\$ beer, 2\$ cider, free non-alcoholic drinks, games, activities, dogs, a DJ in the evening, raffle tickets. It's a nice opportunity to relax before exams. It's going to be at least 9 degrees with a tent.

It's going to be so fun!

A. Badr: A mother of three is facing deportation this Friday, I urge everyone to take the time to send letters and contact the Minister of Justice it is an urgent issue. Unpaid Internship Survey is out, please complete it, it is more important to get more information from the point of view of the faculties regarding the issue.

L. Sutherland: Another event happening tomorrow the CSU is posting a public training on how to reverse the effects of a Fentanyl Overdose. I highly recommend you attend, it is affecting students and people in Montreal right now and so it would be good to know about. Even if you yourself don't use recreational drugs. Some of your friends might be or you might be in a situation where you can potentially save someone's life. I'll share the event.

Chair: A quick note, the student status check is done, and everyone is okay. I thought I'd throw that out there.

11. Adjournment

R. Gaudet moves to adjourn

P. Magallanes seconds the motion

The meeting adjourned at 20h37.