



CSU Special Council Meeting – Preliminary Draft of Minutes

June 23rd, 2011 – 6:30 PM, Room H-760

Minutes taken by: AJ West – Interim Secretary

Verified by Melissa Wheeler – Council Secretary

1. Call To Order

The Meeting was Called to Order at 6:34 PM by the Council Chair

2. Approval of the Agenda

A Motion to approve agenda is introduced. Seconded by April

Motion to Approve Agenda passes Unanimously

AJ West: Where is the Council Secretary?

Chair: Unfortunately the Council Secretary, Melissa Wheeler, could not attend tonight because she has an exam. We will need to appoint an interim secretary.

Motion to appoint AJ West as interim secretary.

Motion Passes unanimously. AJ West is now acting secretary.

4. Reforms to CSU Bylaws and Standing Regulations

Lex Gill: I would like to introduce Patrice Blais, who is with us tonight. Many students, including councilors had questions and recommendations that were taking into consideration, referring to the proposed changes to CSU Bylaws and Standing Regulations. There are major changes to improve the electoral process and to give more political autonomy. The definition of a day has changed from a 24 hour day, to a business day. Anytime you see general manager, it's not granting the general manager more power, it's only because there are no longer some titles that exist, so it has all been changed to reflect the fact that general manager preforms all these tasks anyway.

The TJ Building was taken out because it no longer exists, and the MB Building was added.

Bylaws and standing regs are “living documents.” Nobody is saying this is a perfect solution, but it's much better than before. Things can always be changed later by committee, or other ways,



it's a broad process. The goal is to approve the documents unanimously, and pull out the pieces that people want to discuss.

Patrice Blais: Thank you for the introduction. There's a few documents that you have in front of you. I was very happy with the response with the people who were involved with this process, including the political people from the past few years, students at large, the media. It was a process where everyone was working together and in the best interest of the students. One part of the documents of the CSU that was reviewed was the minutes, when we're talking about the code of standing regs, here's a little history: When the CSU was founded in 1979, motions would end up being more forgotten than others. There was a set of rules here and there, various sets of minutes, etc. In 2003, after I myself held a few positions, throughout the years I find it sad that there's a lack of institutional memory. So all the motions from the past were put into a single document called CSU Code of Standing Regulations. it was adopted May 14, 2003. After that, there's a way when you write a code, you put the dates when stuff is added and modified. You need to have a certain upkeep to your documents. People have neglected this process, they've added things without record and we've ended up in a chaotic process. So we've reviewed the past years since 2003 for motions. Certain years, the minutes were terribly kept, especially in 2007, 2008. Sometimes we knew there was a change, but no record of which change was made. A revision of the standing code of regulations... it's probably better to start with a clean slate. The Revised CSU Code of Standing regulation, would start its existence fresh in 2011; there will be no modification dates.

For those of you who don't know me, I am a lawyer specializing in not for profit corporations. I wrote a short description, with recommendations so that the CSU doesn't have to do this again in another 6 years. There are two important people at council to keep these records, the chair and the secretary. There are all kinds of reasons that these positions are selected, but as my first recommendation says, these positions should be explained this legal process so that if it's new to them, they have the training. Rec #2 would have a handbook with a reference guide that explains how to deal with legal documents. These are legal documents that can be binding with legal ramifications that you guys are dealing with.

On the website there were sets of minutes that were simply not there. Some we were able to find by digging in archives, but part of the job of somebody should have the job of putting it chronologically on the website. Before adopting minutes, somebody, ideally all of council, in reality it maybe somebodies task to come and read all of these things to ensure that key elements aren't missing. I'm sure that at some point these documents were approved by council, with nobody taking note that these documents were not up to par.

There are many things that you could do that could have you personally legally responsible. When we're talking about taxes and payroll, etc... if the CSU doesn't pay these things, then the



government could for example take your personal assets. That's the most important example, but there are a few circumstances like this.

The last recommendation about online voting is a heated topic/debate.. All that we're saying, don't change your whole rule book using the notwithstanding clause, try it out, then change after [if it works].

There are 3 main csu documents that will be touched tonight, two are in front of you. The remaining one can only be changed by the judicial board, so hopefully they will change the rules with my recommendations. The Standing Regulations need 2/3 of council tonight. The bylaws require referendum.

There are some things that don't make sense to change in the standing regs until the bylaws are changed. The idea is that most of the changes in the standing regs will come into effect now, but the rest would come into effect after the referendum, when the bylaws are passed. We need to make sure that all the democratic processes are in effect. We need to make sure that they're all into effect by march first so that it's before the election and provides enough time after the referendum. The documents have been explained, I have made a few presentations. What I would propose is that if people have questions, there might be two issues that members of council may have with the approval of the documents. For council, what I would like to do, is if you have a question on something, you could ask it. If there is a strong objection. We should take note of it, pull it out of the document, then if we have a few items we can have a consensus of the document to adopt it, then deal with the other issues specifically. I think it's the most efficient way to deal with this.

I would like to add two provisions, In book 1, council changes, in article 5, article 200 there was a change that was being proposed to guarantee a minimum representation for arts and science students. It's a bit irrelevant for tonight, because Concordia has not provided stats as to how many people are in each program, so there is not enough information to deal with this. We should take this out for now, and then send them to committee to deal with this.

Book 1 chapter 4: the events committee that is struck out in your copy, was chosen to be kept in, so that the events committee is there to accept the change.

To article 35 in the same book 1 of council, consider that there is for the issue of the consent agenda for council meeting there was a discussion by the previous council but they didn't have quorum. Somebody raised a point that for the members of the public, they would have to have access to the documents in case there were issues to address.



with the consent agenda, there is an understanding that these documents would be available online before the meeting to take care of that specific concern.

For the job descriptions of the vice presidents, there were discussions about elements like Loyola campus that should be specific VPs. This is a discussion that could take a long time. The idea was to have VPs individually elected. The job description that is met there, should be given to the policy committee, to make changes before September. Finally, coming out from the executive, there was no request except for one article to be pulled out and discussed separately. Article 265 about honorary membership. It will be a separate discussion by council.

Council Chair: We are currently 11 councillors this meeting. For these changes, to be made, if nobody abstains we need 8 to pass.

Lex Gill: You've all read this document. We're going to go in order, so say the number you want to discuss, so that we can do this process quickly.

Nadine Atallah: POI Old Article 45 in standing Regs has been struck out. Is it written somewhere else in the document that I haven't seen?

Lex Gill: POI - You're not working off the correct document.

Patrice Blais: There is a history of that article, because in the past there was a member of council who was very active who also did certain things that the university did not like. The university ended up suspending that student. On the rules, when the university suspends the student they are not allowed to set foot on campus. the csu brought the issue to court in support of that member of council. At the time they had to have meetings off campus. In the years that followed, despite being expelled, ran again and won their seat. But this time the executive and majority, and because these new people didn't want that person to be in council, they put in that article so that this person could not set foot on campus because they weren't in.

Nadine Atallah: The old Article 81 - why is it now 40,000 more?

Patrice Blais: it's really for contracts. Before it was a policy that was simply not followed and broken all the time. If you look at orientation for example, there are a lot of contracts that are not traditionally followed that are more than 10,000. These numbers have been the same for years, and have never been updated. We felt that 50,000 dollars was a fair amount. For example your handbook contract will come to council. If you have to renew something major, like health plan or student centre, you're not going to call a special council meeting for every meeting and



speaker. So the idea was to make a policy that was easier to follow, rather than having people breaking the rules. It gives council and the financial committee an easier procedure.

April Underwood: 6.6.1 in bylaws, change in number of council meeting that occurs during certain months.

Patrice Blais: Traditionally council has been sitting on the 2nd Wednesday of the month 10 times a year, plus a bunch of special meetings when needed. A lot of months had exceptions, so the compromise is what came in 6.6.1, for example, in July and August it's difficult to mobilize the people. During September orientation is very busy. 2 meetings is too much. October and November are crucial months of working, so it's good to have 2 meetings. People leave in December, Jan they come back and lots get done. In Feb the 2nd one is during spring break. In March the 2nd occurs during CSU elections, it's more political than productive. April and May is after election is more of a lame duck council. So it came with these three months where there are high times of the council, which is where this came from.

April Underwood: Also in the bylaws, 12.2 - I feel like there's something missing regarding membership status. Is there more to it?

Lex: They should be deemed not a member. /// To be corrected.

11.8 12.5

Irmak: instead of % in the elections,

Morgan: those numbers are as close as we can find because it's hard to get exact numbers from the university. but it's because we can't get the numbers from the university.

Lex: It also means the university could also withhold information. So we put them as solid info - strike count for example

Morgan: obviously council should adjust these numbers

Nadine: to table: Standing regs: old article 76 - old article 83 on office space - I'm not arguing against it, I'd just like to discuss it.

new article 81 - the different amounts

chair - they've been removed from standing regs. We're considering tabling 76, 83, then new article 81. Discussion regarding tabling of this motion.



Lex: I've gotten this question a bunch of times. The reason why that was removed, is because clubs can't exceed their budgets, that standing reg was from a process that hasn't exist for a decade because clubs can't requisition cheques

Nadine: So the other.

Lex: It was deleted because it was also assumed. We have about half as many of offices

Nadine: POO - with the new standing regs, can a club reapply for the same place.

Gonzo: A club could still apply for space, but without priority, the same level as other clubs.

Nadine: So basically they'll be considered on the same level of any club.

Patrice: Let's be more efficient and pull stuff out, then discuss it.

Nadine: I think the first two motions have been discussed, I took it the wrong way, I thought clubs wouldn't be able to reapply for space,. I would like to table the motion regarding cheques and balances.

Chair: Article 81 is on the table for tabling. Discussion.

Melanie Hotchkiss: Question about process.

Patrice: Let's consider that it's pulled, we'll deal with it one by one afterwards.

all in favour of tabling until later in council meeting.

pass unanimously - tabled for discussion later.

Mel: quick question 6.2.5 - why was this taken out.

Patrice - it's been taken out everywhere. if you look at section 25, office holder, it's been added. that should explain to you why all of those have been taken out. it's a new section on the last page.

Irmack: In standing regs 67-c directed at gonzo- funding for new clubs. from my experience it has been limited to photocopying in the past.

Gonzo: We wanted to give them a little more flexibility.



Nadine: above new 727 7.1.4 was deleted. Why

pat: it has been replaced with 12.2

Melanie: Book 1 Council Representatives

Chapter 2 #5: Arts and Science: x number of seats allocated to arts and x number of seats allocated to science. Who decides whether or not a double major student is considered an arts seat or a science seat.

Pat: this was referred to policy committee. the way to differentiate has changed. it has been tabled for later.

Shubert: would it be possible to table 6.1 in section 6 of the bylaws? More specifically 6.2.3

I agree with striking of faculty associations, Faculty associations

Nadine: motions to table
seconds Sabrina

passes unanimously.

Emran Ghasemi -nomination of candidates in section 2. after article 162.

Patrice - because the proposal is that councillors would now be running independently and individually . so all the election rules had to be changed to comply with those rules.

Emran: is it just for the team, or execs too?

Pat: two fold. from now on they'll run individually and exec will run together. exec could run as a team, but they would elect individually.

Morgan: I would like to suggest that we get everyone to have a roll call regarding

Anthony: seconds

passes unanimously to adopt roll call procedure.

Emran: I want to table regarding affiliation. 11.1.2



Nadine: 8.4 bylaws

Irmak : 12.5 in bylaws

151 in standing regs and 92 - Sabrina

Melanie: standing regs 130, 132

1.1.3 Anthony bylaws

April standing reg 5

Lina 181 in standing regs clarification

Kyle

second by Nadine

to table for further discussion

passes unanimously

Nadine motions to accept standing regs and bylaws as they are,
seconded Anthony

All those in favour of approving the bylaws and standing regs with exception of those that have
been tabled.

applause

Emran recess

Kyle

Unanimous 5 minute break

Called back to order

We are going to start with all questions related to bylaws, then move to standing regs. 9 topics.
Bylaw 3.4 - definition of an Associate Member.



Patrice: 3.4 the issue of membership, normally what it is, if you're an undergrad taking a course you're a member. it's always been tied to you're in a course or getting a credit and you're paying some fees. It led to some ambiguity who tried to take advantage of the definition, so there was nothing to cover for "what if I finish my classes in the fall but I haven't graduated yet?" Or "What if I took a winter class and then I can register for another winter class?" During times when people could be suspended for example, then not be able to use the services provided by the advocacy centre technically. So now there's a normal member, which is 3.1, you guys in a program in a course and pay your fees. 3.4 is for all those registered for these other cases. It says you're an associate member, you still have the right to attend events, use services, but not hold office, or vote.

3.4 temporary membership is the second part, and the reason that it was put there is because sometimes you can't be a member beyond your control. At one point, there was a person expelled from the university, was no longer a member. He fought and then won, and the expulsion was removed. So with this case, it allows the csu to consider their own membership. Otherwise, you give the party to a third party, the university most of the time. So when you're a union, you need to hav

Gonzo: Points out that "a" should be "Concordia University"

Nadine: So he remains a member if he requests membership until the next council meeting. What I propose, is when he requests temporary membership, he is not a member until we accept that he's a member.

Lex: Totally independant of this process. This was proposed by advocacy and legal services. You have to give a member the benefit of the doubt. This isn't something that's easily abused so that they can access the services when they're needed the most.

Patrice: Example, lets say you're taking a course and the prof gives you an F instead of a B. It's just a clerical error, but you get kicked out of the university. It complicates itself. It's going to take a month or two to figure this out, so you could get kicked off council. It's in order to try to safeguard rights of a member.

Morgan: In most cases it's to access services, so it's not like it should become a huge political issue. There aren't going to be all of the sudden 800 people requesting membership.

April: temp member instead of associate member. It doesn't clarify in the clause that a temporary member only has access to services.



Patrice: Temp membership should be 3.5. Honorary should be 3.6. temp member is with full rights. For most of the time because they're not involved with the csu...

Mel: Approve

Kyle: seconded

Unanimous passed for 3.4 associate member.

11.1.3 - elections of councillors for student union.

Patrice: I think I pretty much said it before. The difference between council and exec is that councillors run independently. This is healthy governance that the board of directors run independently to supervise the executive.

Anthony: I feel that this piece of the bylaws isn't clarified enough. If I want to run as council, I have to run independently. Am I allowed to endorse a team?

Patrice: You're just not allowed to say this on a poster.

Emran: I'm concerned that this could be confusing.

Lex: Students will get confused, have all the names on the process. People will be allowed a short bio. Campaign period has changed. Students only campaign in their own faculty. Given that the whole process has changed, I'm fairly confident it won't be a big issue.

Chad: All the names are already on the ballot anyway. So now you can't vote for a person just because they're affiliated.

Morgan: I hope this will encourage more students to get involved. And to get councillors to learn more about being a councillor

Anthony: At this point, does this mean that every time somebody runs they'll have a different slogan, own marketing, or is there anything that would allow them to identify together?

Lina: A lot of the time people were complaining about being bombarded. This is a solution to that problem.

Lex: This changes a culture of animosity. Now they don't see each other as a voting block. Elections will be less awful for everyone, because in the end everyone may have to work together.



Chad: What about posters?

Lex: Not really a bylaw issue. Policy committee...

Call question Melanie
seconded by Kyle

1.1.3 all in favour unanimously.

11.1.2

Patrice - The item that resulted in the most discussion during consultation. This slate system started pretty well, but then created a division. It created a lot of hostility. And resource wise it created a problem with election funding. In the last 5 or 6 years, because everyone was pooling their resources, everyone has likely spent more than the campaign budget. Because everyone is one team, and one executive. It attracted a lot of outside actors into Concordia politics. I think this was one of the most unhealthy things for the CSU. This has to be by Concordia students for the students.

Emran: I understand that this will work for council, but if for example this wouldn't bring into the fact that different (everyone from ASFA will get elected).

Lex: The fact is, that can still happen right now. You can still run a team of all ASFA people. there's an incentive to put together a team that is diverse by faculty. There's really no way to correct that without enforcing rules that are undemocratic. Instead of doing that we hope that teams who win will be diverse.

Shubert: How would postering work?

It's item number 9 - 181 in standing regs.

Antony: Right now with this bylaw, it states that you're allowed to run as a team, but when it comes down to voting it'll be voted individually. So in that case, that'll allow for students to say, "It's in my best interest to vote for a team."

Stephanie: It's a much healthier environment to be in. If you have slates that are put together it allows people to bring in students to bring in people who are most qualified. My only concern would be, should something happen where only one individual being put onto the slate with another team. A team really does end up working collaboratively.



Nadine: I agree that we have to make sure that different members of opposing teams will be able work together. I think there's less of an incentive to run with different faculties. Whether you like it or not, you can literally run as ASFA only, much easier than if you create a slate. There's not really any protection against this. It's mathematically possible that all VPs could be from ASFA.

Patrice: All the part-time profs are elected without faculty being an issue. I'm really not convinced. When you have such a system the reality adapts to it. I don't think there's as much danger as it seems.

AJ: I said stuff.

Emran: With engineers, it's hard to get them involved with student politics. It would be harder for an engineering student to get the support as an ASFA student.

Jordan: I think that with this system. You're going to be less likely to get into those types of situations where you're in conflict with other teams. There will be less animosity. This has been recently adopted at ASFA and McGill. They've found that there's some animosity at the beginning, but it quickly dissipates.

Chad: Having directly dealt with the affiliation system. This allows teams to still form. The only difference to elaborate, strategically if you want to win, you're going to have to run students from every faculty. You really have to run on your own merit. Teams will try to be representatives of every faculty, or else they won't win. At ASFA, there was tension, but we were polite and respectful. It provides a better sense of acceptance. If we have to work with you at the end of the day, my conduct follows me.

Nadine: POI - Did they have representation from all the different faculties at McGill?

Jordan: They are not specific to

Morgan: Executives can't hide behind the team anymore. Even in office you have to prove yourself in the office. Executives will call each other out on stuff and not hide behind executive solidarity.

Kyle: we're all trying to work together.

Lex: I think Kyle is awesome.



Stephanie: There's a fear that because there's more ASFA students, there will be more ASFA execs. But if they don't look at all faculties on an equal level, they're not doing their job.

Irmack: Can they be unaffiliated?

Chad: ASFA and CASA each have their individual poster.

Morgan: Posters are layout in standing regs.

Anthony
Kyle second

Favour of adopting 11.1.2

Opposed Nadine, Emran

Adopted.

Irmack - 12.5

Morgan: Motion to forward to policy committee.

Chad: second.

Referring 12.5 to policy committee. Unanimous.

The right to speak at council and be present at closed session. 6.2.3

Patrice: It's to add those.

Shubert: What about one representative of each faculty association ex-officio on council. 1. people from faculty associations don't necessarily feel the need to run on csu knowing that their voice will still be on council. 2. Brings up competition of ticket sales. Prevent from screwing over other

Morgan: the faculty associations aren't here to make decisions in closed session. We want faculty to be represented, but that doesn't mean they are privy to confidential information. They're not parts of the corporation.

Nadine: Why can't we have the faculty associations



Lex: Directly for reasons of hiring and firing and confidential info. BoG and Senate have to do stuff that we have to say. Closed session exists to protect... (Watch CUTV. This is a good little explanation).

Melanie: Faculty associations aren't members of this corporation. BoG members and Senators are mandated by council. We're not barring them from bringing issues to the table.

Lex call to question: second Renee

6.2.3

1 abstention Nadine, passed

end of bylaw section.

Standing regs

Standing reg 81.

Nadine: I don't think that council should have to approve everything trivial, but maybe if we set it to over \$20,000.

Lex: This is a functional thing. Two years ago, this increase was adopted by council but never got recorded. I sign cheques, Jordan makes them. To get a performer on a timely for example, we need to keep these numbers flexible. The process lies just in the Financial Committee.

Nadine: Isn't there a provision where the president can write cheques

Lex: You don't want the definition of exceptional circumstance to be for everyday things.

Nadine: Where did we get \$50,000 as a number?

Patrice: Sometimes it's a legal thing. If you have to pay a bill and it's a lot of money, it's a legal obligation that you have to write the cheque anyway. There's a reason that there's a financial committee.

Morgan: 10,000 dollars is a lot of money, but in the budget allows for this. We can't go past a budget line anyway. It allows the planning of Orientation while everyone's away for the summer.

Kyle: I hope we don't spend 30,000 dollars on one speaker. We've budgeted for these already. If there's every abuse we can always pick it up and impeach the executive.



Laura: If this number were any smaller, I think the quality of speaker seires and concerts wouldn't be as high of quality.

Nadine: I hear a lot about Orientation, but what about the bigger picture and the rest of the year?

Melanie Call question: Sabrina second.
Nadine opposed.

Article 81, approved, Nadine opposed.

Standing reg 265:

Patrice: The way was to grant honorary membership to passed presidents.

Nadine: One of the many recommendations for the BoG, was to cut down on size of board and to abolish honorary membership. We're a pretty big council, having more and more honorary members is not going to be efficient. Once you are no longer a president you are no longer a key role. If you'd like to have them for experience, you can create a council of old presidents.

Nadine: What privileges would they have as honorary member?

Chad: Motion to bring this to policy committee for review.
Seconded Nadine.

Chad: I think this should be considered as to whether or not to be added at all, is because I have serious concerns with granting this honorary membership to presidents, or just at all. This opens the door for potential non-students to come and lobby for their interests. In may open the door to people meddling.

Morgan call to question.
Nadine second.

Two abstentions to call question, Sabrina and April

1 abstention April to refer to policy committee for further examination. motion passed.

130 - 132

Lex: Just so that they have to bring it to us.



Irmac call to question
Nadine second call to question.

Unanimous approval. Motion approved.

181 - Posters and poster night.

Patrice: To get rid of poster night and the advantage that bigger people have when postering. How is the CEO going to divide poster space. I recommend that by approving 181, it is with the understanding that the policy committee would address this concern.

Lina: My question wasn't so much how, I realise that has to be narrowed down. My question was answered.

Morgan: As the chair of the Policy Committee I will make sure that the next step to this reflects the new bylaws.

Motion to refer to committee and approve.
Nadine seconded.

Article 181 CEO will work with policy committee.
Motion passed.

Chad: To announce that sustainable action fund, there will be an opening for a new staff coordinator. Your job would be to take care of the books and allocations of funds for the staff, and chair the meetings of the staff. I'll send out a description to everyone.

Bruno motion to adjourn
Sabrina seconded.

Unanimous.