



Concordia Student Union Council Meeting
Wednesday October 13, 2010
AD-210 Time 6:30PM, Loyola campus

Chairperson: Marc-Antoni Taronde, assisted by Sohrab Mossaded

Minutes taken by: Christina Gentile

1. Call to order

Meeting was called to order at 6:50 pm.

2. Roll Call

Councillors present:

Yaniv Gidron

Tomer Shavit

Teresa Seminara

Taylor Knott

Tamara Gordon

Stephen Brown

Rasim Hafiz

Paul Gillett

Michaela Manson

Menachem Freedman

Melanie Hotchkiss

Luis Cordero

Lex Gill

Kyle Goforth

Johnnie Vu

Joel Suss

Jean-Francois Baillargeon

Heba Abdel-Hamid

Fernando Barbosa

David Feldman

Carlos Puerta

Asma Omar

Alison Revine

Alexandra Baptista

Alex Gordon Gordo



Abdullah Husen

Aaron Green

Executives Present:

Heather Lucas

Morgan Pudwell

Adrien Severyns

Andres Lopez

Ramy Khoriaty

Hassan Abdullahi

Zhuo Ling (arrived later)

3. Approval of the agenda

Motion by Cox to move 7.2 up to before executive reports, seconded by Suss

MOTION PASSES

Motion to amend 11.1.5 policy reform, 11.21 sustainability, 11.22 (academic), 11.2.3 (Loyola)

Motion to amend the agenda to include those changes

MOTION PASSES

Motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Seminara

MOTION PASSES

4. Approval of the minutes and business arising

Green asks about the lists of members appointed, chairperson says it was sent

Motion to approve the minutes by Green

Motion passes

5. Chairperson's report

Tarondo encourages everyone to wait for their chance to speak, keep it brief, don't repeat points, limit to 2 points per discussion

Councillors ask about clarifications about Robert's Rules

Motion by Cox – whereas accountability and transparency are important to the CSU, whereas making council meetings accessible to the most students possible is a priority for the CSU, be it resolved CUTV be invited to film and make available all council meetings.

CUTV representative says there is no bylaw that prohibits CUTV to film the council meetings, there have already been motions to allow CUTV to film, when entering public office, individuals' right to privacy change, not everyone can come to the CSU meetings Husen asks that since there is no bi law prohibiting CUTV to film, so why are we discussing this?

Cox explains that CUTV is filming now, before other CSU executives claimed that CUTV wasn't allowed to film (which was illegal) so now we are council needs to vote on this motion in order to extend the invitation to CUTV to come, promoting transparency at the CSU



Gill says that meetings are always recorded by the secretary, some councillors are uncomfortable with being recorded, but the benefits of being filmed outweigh the costs, we owe it to the students

Green says he is against CUTV filming, he says newspapers are good enough, he trusts the secretary to record minutes accurately. He believes it will discourage students from actually coming to the meetings, he feels it invades his privacy, filming will take quotes out of context and it will never recreate the atmosphere of the meeting

Suss reminds council that the motion is to invite CUTV to film the meeting, since they are already allowed.

Point of information: Gordon asks, if we vote no, will they continue filming?

Cox answers yes, CUTV will continue to film

Point of information: Lucas asks, will it cost CUTV anything?

CUTV rep answers that they are a fee levy independent of the CSU, it is their decision and their right to be here, maybe the CSU would like to have it filmed out of their own budget, right now CUTV pays, there's no cost to the CSU

Knott asks if this will mandate CUTV to film us? Will the council meetings be edited?

Gill explains that it only extends the invitation to them to film

CUTV rep explains that no cutting of arguments or major editing of meeting will happen, it will only be edited for aesthetic purposes

Cox says it should be chopped up into segments according to the agenda

Lucas likes the idea and spirit of the motion, but thinks it will cause councillor intimidation, fear that councillors will be pressured, contributes to student apathy, infringes on council's right to be there, we have a secretary and so minutes are available to everyone

Andre points out that in minutes just the final result of the vote is reported, who voted for what should not be available

Suss explains that intimidation factor will already be there, they are free to film anyway

Manson says that the minutes and student newspapers argument is not good because people access information through visual media these days, filming provides appropriate access for the time in which we live, the argument that it will increase student apathy is unfounded, having better access to these things will help students be more engaged in student life

Khoriaty reminds councillors they can motion against CUTV filming

Baptista says that she feels uncomfortable being filmed, transparency and accountability is already being taken care of

Severyns says that this meeting is not held in a public area, it's a reserved place. If a grad student wants to come, they need permission. Since it's not a public area, a person has the right not to be filmed, he can sue CUTV

Pudwell reminds councillors about vote by secret ballot in which CUTV wouldn't capture on film

Cox also has confidence in newspaper and secretary, but wants to give people a window into the council meeting, as for the discourages attendance argument – people don't come to the meetings for pure interest, won't discourage attendance because people don't come as it is, people will be more motivated to come after they have seen the video online, when someone is quoted in the newspaper, it's very easily taken out of context, video is



better, the newspaper can record how we vote, these meetings are in a public area, students will be upset if we reject CUTV now, it's a good thing if students can see how you vote, people will get to know you, involves those students who elected you, don't be afraid, its good PR, democracy, allowing access to the largest number of people, students should be happy with how you vote, if they are not happy they should be able to tell you, show students we want to do things differently, we have nothing to hide, we will do it publicly, it's a terrific opportunity, let's be different, let's show the students that we care more about them

Gillett motions to call the question

Seconded my Cox

Motion passes

VOTE ON THE MOTION:

“whereas accountability and transparency are important to the CSU, whereas making council meetings accessible to the most students possible is a priority for the CSU, be it resolved CUTV be invited to film and make available all council meetings.”

MOTION FAILS

Point of information, Lucas, says that CUTV can't be here because they weren't invited
Sohrab clarifies on point of information

Cox says they can't pass any motion that violates the law. Cox says he has the right to film the meeting and that he will do that if someone motions to kick out CUTV

Khoriaty wants vote numbers

Husen reminds council that they can move to closed session if they need to discuss something private

Green says CUTV needs consent from students, according to personal information and documents act

Cox says that doesn't apply to a public meeting

Point of order, Cox says it's not on the agenda whether we should be filmed, needs to be put on the agenda for the next meeting

Abdel-Hamid says filming violates her civil rights, shouldn't that take precedence over the agenda

Mossaded explains we must stick to the agenda, submit the motion to council and we will discuss it at the next meeting

Severyns says this is not a public meeting

Abdullahi says CUTV should stop filming and then we can clarify the issue later

Cox says we need to stick to the agenda

Abdel-Hamid motions to have a recess to look up more about this issue

Motion seconded by Gordon

Cox clarifies that he knows that this is a public meeting

VOTE ON MOTION TO TAKE A RECESS

MOTION PASSES at 7:34

7:50 meeting continued

Tarondo tells council that should the meeting go very late, taxis will be reimbursed up to 20\$



Tarondo states that CUTV was invited here, issue will be brought up next time, these are open meetings, CUTV are undergrads, we need to move on

Severyns, point of personal privilege, tells council to have them stay in room without filming, the earlier motion failed therefore letting CUTV film this meeting shouldn't be done, council should vote against it

Tarondo says they must move on with this agenda

Severyns argues that CUTV, motion failed, therefore they should leave

Tarondo decides that CUTV will stay

Abdullahi says that the motion to invite CUTV failed, therefore they are not invited

Tarondo says they invited them today, another motion can be for future meetings, appreciates personal privilege, but they have to move on

6. Executive Reports

- a. President – Heather Lucas
- b. VP Loyola and Advocacy – Hassan Abdullahi
- c. VP Sustainability and Promotion – Morgan Pudwell
- d. VP External and Projects - Adrien Severyns
- e. VP Student Life – Andres Lopez
- f. VP Clubs and Outreach – Rami Khoriaty
- g. VP Finance – Zhuo Ling (absent at this time, present by Heather Lucas)

Please see detailed executive reports attached.

Green is confused over ATM fees collected during Reggies and outside JAVA U, where does the money go? (50 cents per transaction)

Lucas says that Ling can respond once he arrives

Manson asks what the CSU is going about BOG trying to shrink the number of student reps,

Lucas answers that the CSU hasn't taken a stance on it yet

Cox tells council that the ATM fee is 1.50, not 50 cents per transaction, doesn't like that Reggies is taking money from students on one hand and using it for students on the other hand, doesn't agree, thinks it should be a subsidized ATM machine

Hotchkis says that she couldn't fill out the CSU survey about living conditions

Severyns answers that their study was focused on undergrads, undergrads at McGill were not taking in to account, offered a more decentralized research side, every page that would be drafted in French will be translated in a day in English, research is 250 page document, suggests we need 25-30 page document that is more accessible to easier to read for students

Gill tells council that Windsor did submit a position with regards to CFS, they got 3000 votes to leave CFS, school number 14 in 16 months

7. New Business

7.1 Proposal for Fee Levy Increase – Student Center

Severyns presents a Powerpoint presentation

Severyns suggests students fee to increase 0.5\$ per credit and that a referendum question be brought to students

Suss says students voted against it by 72 % last year, what has changed?



Severyns says that the project has evolved over the summer, land is not acquired yet, will be in 1 or 2 years, students voted against student center because the other 4 referendum questions on the ballot were negative....”poster vote no, no and only no”

Knott says that 72 percent of students already voted no, why should we vote for it now, we need to represent our students, the motives of this student center are fuzzy, why hasn't the cost been alleviated? Why are we still asking the same question?

Severyns says that council voted against the 2.5 \$ increase all at once, now it's a 0.5 \$ per credit, per semester, therefore the referendum question is different

Cox clarifies that it will increase to 50 cents, then a dollar, then 1.5, then 2.5...he states that the question is misleading and that it invites students to misunderstand, worded in a very tricky way, be clear about what you're asking.

Cox says that student center is important, to clarify, commercial enterprises shouldn't be invited, should be student run shops, explicit space for tabling and political activity by students, not reclaiming our space – building a new space.

Cox also asks: why do we need to give up 38 percent up to the administration? Says this is a better proposal than a few years ago, but it's still not good enough, should be administered entirely by the students

Cox states again that referendum question is misleading

Severyns says that the question was drafted by the CEO, it's been approved therefore it's not misleading, it's a staggering increase for the benefit of the students, we're doing it slowly to make it easier on the students rather than rushing through it,

Pudwell says to put question up so council can see it

Cox doesn't care that the CEO reviewed it, question needs to be clear

Severyns says go see the CEO about your concern, we are taking a different approach then last year, spaces will be run by the board, students will have the last say on what gets put in there, whatever students want, the administration is important because it provides services to students, administration keeps cracking down on space, the student center will have administrative offices as long as they are there to serve students, we are the only campus in Canada not to have a student center

Mason doesn't think that students were be confused by the NO campaign, insulting because students can read, wants more clarification as to why administration will own some part of it, she asks what would become of the student spaces we have right now? ie. Health services, financial etc.

Severyns says the university would own 38 %, the students own the majority, the students will have the final vote, any decisions will be made by the students. He says he knows that students know how to read, this is why they are bringing back the question, according to the survey, most students agree, there is a clear demand for the student center, let them vote again

Cox asks if there was the cost of the student center included in the survey – cost wasn't included.

Severyns says a staggering increase will help students, the vacated space that would result would belong to the university, services won't have to pay the administration anymore for rent

Abdullahi says that last year's campaign was different, we built off them, student body should be given a second chance to vote on the same topic, help us and well make the question clearer



Gillett says that last year it was a massive fail, 2.5 \$ didn't work, were looking for the same amount in the end. If it fails, then the whole campaign was a waste of time, suggests changing it to 1 dollar a credit

Manson reminds council that the current levy is 2 \$ a credit

Freedman asks how much a would referendum cost

Severyns responds: 750 \$

Knott asks how much would a campaign would cost

Severyns responds: 375 \$

Suss asks council to consider why 72 percent of students voted against it. Maybe it's a because of the proposal, not the cost itself, and not because of a NO campaign. Maybe it's the plan itself that's holding it back, we should amend the referendum question, it's not different enough besides the cost. It's worthwhile to examine all the parts of it, and change it so it becomes more appealing

Severyns says students voted against it in the survey for 2 reasons: the price and the no campaign, he invites Suss and other councillors to his office so he can show them

Husen says it would be a good idea to amend the motion, but if we don't like the motion, we shouldn't amend it on the spot, we can revisit it for a future meeting

Cox (point of information) reminds council that there is a deadline for the motion to be on the ballot. The new motion wouldn't be eligible for this semester for referendum because we need approval 35 days in advance

Green compares our campus to what McGill has, we don't have enough student space

Hafiz says that other universities have independent club spaces, there are a lot of opportunities for us to grow as a student union, last year the same questions were asked, let's just give the students the chance, they will decide, the motion is clear

Hotchkiss says that fee levy groups were penalized because of No campaign. If we believe that student centre question didn't pass last year because of then why are we changing the question? We should mention at the end of the question that the total increase is 2.5 \$, we need to fight for student space, it's not right to make the students pay to get our space back, we should fight for that space back while we do our student center fighting, it's not ok that the admin took the space

Abdel-Hamid thinks the no campaign did affect the ballots, asks if there will be any other referendum questions this time, Severyns answers no

Brown asks how do we plan a good campaign? In the end, spending 2.5 will save you money later on....we need to address this, people who are going to be using it won't want to spend, fighting for student space with the administration has been lost – student body is growing and we need classes, that takes priority, things that seem less important to administration will get bumped, let's not waste time doing that, let's fight for power over our own space, let's target the benefits more and show students how the cost is fair.

Pudwell says that 0.5 cents per credit per semester is effective because the gradual change is a gradual adjustment, graduating students won't have to pay as much right away, students who are here longer will pay more

Gidron says it'll be important that campaign tell students why 0.5 cent increase is good

Cox proposes a motion:

“ whereas putting questions to referendums is a good idea, whereas the question could be more clear, be it resolved that the motion be changed to: –



...for a total of 2.50 cents per credit at the end of 4 semesters, for a total of 2.5 cents in addition to the existing 2 dollars”

Gill suggests adding that the final fee will be 4.5 \$ a credit. She says that uberculture has not chosen a side on the student centre issue

Cox motions to add explicitly stating 4.5 dollars per credit

Husen motions to approve the amendment, seconded by Joel

MOTION TO APPROVE AMENDMENT BY COX

Councillors vote

MOTION FAILS

Husen motions to call the question, seconded by Gill

Morgan points out confusion of 4 vs 5 semesters = 2.5 \$

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote

MOTION FAILS

Revine says wording was still confusing

Freedman reminds council that they need to vote to call the question on initial motion

Cox proposed

Husen motions to call the question, seconded

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT BY COX

Councillors Vote

MOTION PASSES

Husen motions to put question on referendum ballot, it's seconded

Gill points out wording is confusing

Tarondo says wording should be submitted to CEO

Severyns clarifies question

Husen says wording is no longer pertinent, now we must focus on the referendum –

Gordo motions to reconsider the amendment that was made to the motion, seconded by Manson

Knott says many problems still with the wording

Barbosa says a lot of students still won't understand the new question

Manson says it's important that we reconsider the amendment

Husen motions to call the question, seconded by Gordo

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION



Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

MOTION TO REOPEN DISCUSSION ABOUT AMENDING WORDING OF

STUDENT CENTER REFERENDUM QUESTION

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

Abdullahi says we are assuming students are stupid if they can't understand this motion

Pudwell and Manson are offended by his comment, Abdullahi apologizes

Brown asks how can we make it concise without making it redundant at the same time

Suss doesn't understand why people are against making the question more clear

Gillett motions to increase the existing fee by 1 dollar per credit, the motion is never seconded, therefore the motion fails.

Severyns reminds everyone that council already voted in favour of the question earlier

Gorforth says that the current amendment has too much information in it, not clear

Lucas says don't be redundant, don't add jargon, make it simple, just add the numbers you want to add

Shavit is against the total of 4.5 \$ being added, he thinks it would scare the students, and trusts the students to add the numbers

Hotchkiss says this discussion will go around in circles for a long time, council should make a recommendation, vote on what we want to include in the amendment, and then let the CEO rewrite it

Husen says let the CEO do the technical job, this is a redundant discussion

Gidron points out that 4 semesters x 50 cents = 2.50, that's the problem, change the 4 semesters to a 5

Severyns – clarifies, will start paying in jan 2011

Knott moves that council recommend to the CEO that he revise the question to address the following ambiguities :

Total 4 semesters

Total 2.50 increase

To a total of 4.50

Initial fee levy is 2 \$

Second by Husen

Knott says council needs to work with the CEO and address concerns formally

Husen moves to call the question, its seconded

MOTION THAT THE CEO REVISE THE QUESTION WITH THE 4 CRITERIA ABOVE

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

Tarondo will forward the motion with the ambiguities to the CEO



Hafiz motions to put question on referendum ballot
Husen motions to call the question, seconded by Seminara

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

Husen proposes motion, seconded by Gill
“whereas we accepted the motion to commission the CEO to address the specified ambiguities, I would like to move to put the revised referendum question on the ballot”

MOTION TO PUT REVISED REFERENDUM QUESTION (AS SPECIFIED BY CEO) ON THE BALLOT

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

7.3 Motion for OCW information campaign

Gordo motions for a 5 minute recess, seconded by Green

MOTION FOR a 5 MINUTE RECESS

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES at 9:58 pm

Meeting called to order at 10:11

Gillett presents OCW powerpoint: it is a free educational resource for people around the world, there are audiovisual recordings of lectures, free/open to students, makes use of creative commons, which is a free type of copyright that anyone can take, gives people the right to use works as long as they accredit the author, encourages people to adapt information, Gillett shows councillors the website

Gillett proposes motion:

WHEREAS, OCW would allow students to view course material before registering a course and continue to access the material long after graduation.

WHEREAS, OCW allows students to complement a current course, enhance personal knowledge, and plan a course of study.

WHEREAS, OCW advances education around the world through a global community in which knowledge and ideas are shared openly for the benefit of all.

WHEREAS, Students have access to OCW materials and are free to take and transform them.

WHEREAS, If students use OCW on campus, it will enlighten and educate, as well as promote the use and creation of OCW at Concordia.



BE IT RESOLVED THAT, an OCW information campaign be created to educate students about the benefits of the use and reuse of existing OCW materials, as well as the benefits of creating a Concordia OCW website.

Brown asks about the cost

Gillett explains they operate on a shoe string budget, there is no exact cost yet, but materials can be published online for free, essentially we would be asking professors to open Moodle to the entire world, MIT will show them how to modify it to make it open
Pudwell asks what is the goal of the campaign?

Gillett says that students can't make the decision, but they need educate the professors about it, so they can bring it up to the Concordia administration, the goal is to educated students so that there is a demand for it

Mossaded says that who would be responsible for the committee needs to be included in the motion

Gillett proposes the academic committee, but this requires further discussion

Revine says her teachers don't use Moodle, she needs more clarification

Gillett explains he wants to educate students about it, and then students can educate faculty and promote it by using it. He recognizes that it's an ambitious project and it can't be handled tonight

Freedman asks if his motion is about having an information campaign about it, Gillett answers yes.

Freedman asks if by passing this motion, is the CSU obligated to spend money on an information campaign?

Ling says it's a good idea, but it should be addressed to the ConU senate, there is a student rep on Senate, those students can submit it to APPC, and Gillett can motivate for it in a committee of 5-6 people, which would be more effective, as for campaign costs, the CSU would need a campaign proposal

Freedman says if the campaign budget is small, he's ok with it

Lucas reiterated that this issue is not within the CSU's power, all council can do is support, it must be taken to Senate

Abdullahi suggests to address to it to senate, and to create an ad hoc committee with Gillett as chair, versus implementing the academic committee

Abdullahi proposes motion :

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

An ad hoc committee of 5 be appointed to create an information campaign to educate students about the benefits of the use and reuse of existing OCW materials, as well as the benefits of creating a Concordia OCW website, seconded by Freedman.

Green agrees with ad hoc committee, thinks ad hoc committee should present information at next council committee after talking to Senate

Pudwell says CSU supports the creative commons already, therefore they should take it on as a CSU

Brown motions to call the question, seconded by Freedman

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote



MOTION PASSES

Gillett says he already brought it to the secretary at senate, it was put to a committee already, agenda was full at that meeting so it was pushed on to next month's agenda. He says there is still much to be done by students, students need to promote the idea. Hotchkiss asks what would be the goal of the ad hoc committee? Why is the committee going to be there?

Gillett answers to handle the information campaign, a committee that will do what the motion states, need help from students and administration, need to get OCW to have an opportunity to be a leader in Canada, Freedman agrees.

Khoriaty suggest opening a new club about OCW that could work with the CSU.

Gillett raises concern that if club is created, they have limited funding.

Brown motions to call the question, seconded by Hotchkiss.

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

**MOTION TO AMEND GILLETT'S ORIGINAL MOTION WITH DETAILS OF
AD HOC COMMITTEE AS SPECIFIED**

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

MOTION TO POSTPONE APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE

Freedman says the meeting is going too long, it can be done next meeting.

Pudwell suggests not putting it off.

Brown says council is not as to the individual responsibilities, he suggests that Gillett outlines the responsibilities and it can be taken care of in a month.

Gillett says first they can find professors who are already publishing material online, contact them, find out if they'd agree to putting their stuff on a centralized website.

Gillett says he's not opposed to postponing, those interested in helping can send him an email and he'll start working on it.

Green says it should be done now, to allow more time to prepare.

Hotchkiss says that the only reason to table it would be to add a student at large.

Freedman motions to call the question.

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

MOTION TO POSTPONE APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES



8. Standing Committee's Reports

8.1 Clubs and Space committee

Green proposes motion, it's seconded

“Whereas the Clubs and Space Committee has met to approve the creation of 6 new clubs, deny club status to one club and encourage two clubs to re-apply for club status

Whereas the standing regulations of the CSU mandate Council to approve any decisions made by the Clubs and Space Committee

BIRT Council ratify the decisions regarding approving & denying club status that were made by the Clubs & Space Committee”

MOTION TO RATIFY DECISIONS OF CLUBS AND SPACE COMMITTEE

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

8.2 Events committee

This committee is taking care of Halloween events and Hive events

8.3 Custodial and Services Committee – hasn't met yet

8.4 Appointments Committee - hasn't met yet

8.5 Sustainability Committee - hasn't met yet

8.6 Academic Committee - hasn't met yet

Freedman wants to withdraw from Loyola committee and join academic committee

Pudwell explains there needs to be a vote to elect him into academic committee

Abdel-Hamid wants to withdraw from woman's caucus

Mossaded reminds council they need to vote on withdrawals

Freedman doesn't know much about Loyola

MOTION TO ALLOW FREEDMAN TO RESIGN FROM LOYOLA COMMITTEE

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

8.7 External and Campaigns Committee discussed about upcoming campaigns ie. peace week, including interfaith dialogue and Elie Weisel

8.8 – Finance Committee submitted 3 out of 4 projects

8.9 Women's Caucus - hasn't met yet

Mossaded suggest that the Women's caucus find out what happened to the money that was raised last year and what is it being used for

Abdel-Hamid wants to withdraw, seconded by Goforth

MOTION TO ALLOW ABDEL-HAMID TO WITHDRAW FROM THE WOMEN'S CAUCUS

Councillors vote



MOTION PASSES

10. Report from university bodies

10.1 Senate

Talked about Curriculum changes that were suggested last year

10.2 Board of Governors

They are restructuring the internal structure of BOG, CSU is still looking into how they will go about formulating their question

10.3 CCSL

Talked about strategy to communicate with CCSL and the deadline for projects

11. Unfinished business

11.1 Student at large appointments

MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

Meeting is now in CLOSED SESSION

[...]

OPEN SESSION

Luke is appointed to Clubs committee

Oscar is appointed to Appointments committee

Khalil is appointed to Finance committee

The sustainability appointment will be postponed until next meeting

11.2 Appointments – Council

Seat open for sustainability and academic committees

Abdullahi motions for Freedman to join the academic committee, seconded by david

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

MOTION TO APPOINT FREEDMAN ON ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

Sustainability committee has 2 positions

Pudwell nominates Goforth and Gidron, Goforth accepts, Gidron recinds

Revine nominates Abdel-Hamid, she accepts

Green nominates Gordo, he declines

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote



MOTION PASSES

MOTION TO APPOINT GOFORTH AND ABDEL-HAMID TO THE ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

There is a free space on the Loyola committee
Lopez nominates Cordero, he accepts

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

MOTION TO APPOINT CORDERO ON LOYOLA COMMITTEE

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

12. Question period and business arising

Green asks Ling about ATM fees in Reggies, what is the money used for?

Ling says that Reggies collects 50 cents per student transaction, it pays utilities, makes Reggies break even with JAVA U rent

A Concordia newspaper representative asks if the VP Services of CSU will be filled?

Lucas says the CSU will not be taking on a VP Services. The president oversees the main services. George is hired by CSU to coordinate services, tasks are delegated by Lucas

13. Announcements

Green week next week, and peace week coming up – Wear purple on Oct 20th

Lopez reminds councillors they can get half prices on Halloween party tickets

14. Adjournement

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Councillors vote

MOTION PASSES

Meeting adjourned at 12:22 am.