



## Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

CSU Special Council Meeting – Agenda  
Thursday, February 27, 2019  
CSU Conference Room, 11h30, S.G.W. Campus

### Updated Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Establishing Rules for Impeachment Trial
4. Anti-Discrimination Definition and Strategy
5. Exam Conflict Recommendation to Administration
6. Elections Rules
7. UPass (Universal Transit Pass)
8. Adjournment

*Adjournment Meeting officially called by CSU Councillors James Hanna, Mathew Kaminski and Peter Zhuang as per By-Law 6.6.3.*

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Eduardo calls meeting to order at **11h58** .

**James Hanna** appoints **Eduardo Malorni** as interim Chair. Seconded.

---

**We would like to begin by acknowledging that Concordia University is located on unceded Indigenous lands. The Kanien'kehá:ka Nation is recognized as the custodians of the lands and waters on which we gather today. TiohEá:ke/Montreal is historically known as a gathering place for many First Nations. Today, it is home to a diverse population of Indigenous and other peoples. We respect the continued connections with the past, present, and future in our ongoing relationships with Indigenous and other peoples within the Montreal community.**

---

## 2. ROLL CALL

Council Chairperson: Caitlin Robinson

Council Minute Keeper: S Shivaane

**Executives present for the meeting were:** Eduardo Malorni (Student Life Coordinator), Patrick Quinn (Academic & Advocacy Coordinator)

**Councilors present for the meeting were:** Mitchell Schecter (John Molson School of Business), Peter Zhuang (Fine Arts), Hannah Jamet-Lange (Arts & Science), Christiane Sakr (Arts & Science), Lauren Perozek (John Molson School of Business), Sean Howard (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science), Tzvi Hersh Filler (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science), Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski (John Molson School of Business), James Hanna (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science), Jeremy Deneault (John Molson School of Business), Salman Fahim Syed (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science).

**Executives absent for the meeting were:** Isaiah Joyner (External & Mobilization Coordinator), Désirée Blizzard (Finance Coordinator), Chris Kalafatidis (General Coordinator), Celeste-Melize Ferrus (Loyola Coordinator), Marin Algattus (Internal Affairs Coordinator).

**Sean Howard** moves to excuse all CSU executives who are not currently present. Seconded.

### 3. ESTABLISHING RULES FOR IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

**James Hanna** presents the following motion. Seconded by **Sean Howard**.

**WHEREAS** “articles of impeachment” have been laid against Christopher Kalafatidis, the General coordinator of the CSU;

**WHEREAS** the impeachment trial is to take place on March 1<sup>st</sup>;

**WHEREAS** the charges laid before council against the General Coordinator are serious;

**WHEREAS** The Canadian Bill of Rights (1960), Part 1. 2(d) and (e) state:

2. [...] no law of Canada shall be construed or applied so as to

(d) authorize a court, tribunal, commission, board or other authority to compel a person to give evidence if he is denied counsel, protection against self-crimination or other constitutional safeguards

(e) deprive a person of the right to a fair hearing in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice for the determination of his rights and obligations;

**WHEREAS** principles of fundamental justice demand a fair trial;

**WHEREAS** the CSU has a moral if not legal obligation to conduct a fair trial in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice;

**WHEREAS** the Concordia Student Union nor Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised specify adequate rules and procedures to be used to ensure compliance with principles of fundamental justice during proceedings to remove officers from their positions within the context of the Concordia Student Union;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Roberts Rules section 63 be augmented by the following rules and procedures be established for the March 1<sup>st</sup> Special Council Meeting and any meeting concerning the removal from office of CSU officers:

#### **PART I - DEFINITIONS**

**Charged Officer** – Officer of the CSU against whom charges have been laid and against whom removal from office is being contemplated.

**Board/Board of Directors** – CSU Council of Representatives or any successor body holding the role of the Board of Directors of the Concordia Student Union or its successor body.

**Directors** – members of the Board of Directors.

Plaintiffs – Directors who signed their names on the charges against the Charged Officer, managers in the context of section 63 of Robert’s Rules.

Defence – the Charged Officer and their advocate.

The Charges – Specific allegations of impeachable offences levied by the plaintiffs against the Charged Officer.

The Chair – The Chairperson elected by the board of directors to preside over its regular and special meetings.

Minute Keeper – person hired by the board of directors to take the minutes of the meetings.

The Meeting – The meeting of the board of directors at which the removal of the Charged Officer is being deliberated.

Censorship – Removal of Speaking Privileges.

Expulsion – Enforceable order to leave the room and be excluded from proceedings.

Brief Motivation – Motivations not exceeding 30 seconds. The persons making these motivations are not considered regular speakers and as such are not entitled to a 15 second warning.

## **PART II - RULES AND PROCEDURES**

1. No meeting held for the removal from office of a Charged Officer may contain the motion to remove from office more than one Charged Officer.
2. The role of The Chair shall be to preside over the proceedings, keep order, ensure the rules and procedures are followed, impose disciplinary sanctions and ensure fairness.
3. Both the Plaintiffs and Defence have the Right to Opening and Closing Statements, to call forth witnesses and to cross-examine witnesses.
4. Prior to the reading of the charges, the board must select, from amongst the plaintiffs, a representative who will act as a General Prosecutor. The General Prosecutor shall make opening and closing statements as well as call forth, question and cross-examine witnesses and raise objections on behalf of the plaintiffs. The Trial shall begin immediately following the appointment of the General Prosecutor.
5. The Charged Officer has the right to appoint, with consent of the appointee, an advocate empowered to make opening and closing statements as well as call forth, question and cross-examine empowered to make opening and closing statements as well as call forth, question and cross-examine witnesses on behalf of the defence.
  - a. The appointment of an advocate shall not be construed as the abrogation of the Charged Officer’s right to make opening and closing statements as well as call forth, question and cross-examine witnesses, on their own behalf.

- b. The nomination of the Advocate shall be considered delivered upon transmission, in writing or electronically, of the identity of the same, to the Chair. The Chair shall then, at the earliest opportunity, ask the nominated person their consent.
  - c. Upon receiving the consent, the Chair shall direct the Minute Keeper to record the identity of the Advocate.
  - d. The appointee shall immediately take on their role with minimal disruption to the proceedings.
6. In accordance with principles of fundamental justice, the defence shall make opening and closing statements as well as call forth witnesses after the plaintiffs have done so.
7. In accordance with principles of fundamental justice, the Charged Officer cannot be compelled to give testimony by the board.
8. both the Plaintiffs and Defence have the right to know the identities of witnesses being called by the opposing side prior to the beginning of the meeting.
9. In accordance with principles of fundamental justice, the Charged Officer has the right to submit, in a timely manner, evidence, to the Chair, that they wish to use for their defence.
  - a. Such evidence must be provided the latest 48 hours prior to the meeting and must be disseminated at the earliest convenience to all directors and those entitled to documents at board meetings.
10. The Trial shall begin, after a formal declaration of the beginning of the trial by the chair and the selection of the Prosecutor General, with the formal reading of the charges laid by the plaintiffs against the Charged Officer by the Minute Keeper or Chair, as decided amongst themselves. The Chair shall hear and the Minute Keeper shall record the plea of the Charged Officer.
  - a. Notwithstanding these entire rules, should the Charged Officer enter a plea of guilty, the trial shall conclude and enter into voting procedure immediately.
11. Both the Plaintiffs and Defence have the right to 10 minutes of Opening Statements
12. Both the Plaintiffs and Defence have the right to present up to 3 witnesses following the completion of Opening Statements.
  - a. A list of Witnesses must be provided to the Chair, confirmed by either simple majority of the plaintiffs or by the Charged Officer, no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting, from both the Plaintiffs and Defence.
  - b. Should a person not be on the list of witnesses, they shall not have the right to be called forth.
  - c. The list of witnesses for both the Plaintiffs and Defence shall be disseminated at the earliest convenience together with the evidence package provided by the defence.
13. Witnesses for both the Plaintiffs and Defence, during both their questioning and cross-examination, have the right to speak for 5 minutes.
  - a. Notwithstanding the above, both the Plaintiffs and the Defence have the right to ask a minimum of 3 questions to each witness during both the questioning and the cross-examination.

- b. Should the witness surpass 5 minutes of speaking while the plaintiffs or defence have not asked the minimum of 3 questions, the witness shall receive a maximum of 30 seconds to answer the current question and 1 minute to answer each of the remaining questions.
  - c. No witness may be in the trial room during the testimony of other witnesses, nor in any place where they might overhear the testimony of other witnesses, nor in any place where they may overhear the opening statements.
14. Both the Plaintiffs and Defence have the right to 5 minutes of Closing Statements following the testimonies of all witnesses.
  15. Witnesses, the General Prosecutor and the Defence must constrain their testimony and opening statements to relevant matters and may not speak to evidence not presented before the board. Closing statements may not introduce new information.
  16. Directors shall have up to one minute to enter or leave the room following the closing statements of the Defence, after which the doors shall be considered barred.
    - a. Directors temporarily expelled may re-enter the room at this time.
  17. A vote on the motion to remove from office the charged officer shall occur by roll call immediately following the barring of the doors.
  18. Each director shall be entitled to a 30 second motivation should they desire to explain their vote.
  19. Abstentions are not permitted once the doors are barred.
  20. Should quorum not exist following the barring of the doors, the motion to remove from office shall be considered defeated.
  21. No person may speak unless expressly permitted by these rules and procedures.
  22. All speakers are entitled to a 15 second warning, prior to the end of their speaking time, given by the chair. Speaking time shall be considered elapsed once the 15 second warning elapses, even if it occurs past the nominal speaking limit.
    - a. When applied to witness testimony, the warning shall be given 15 seconds prior to the nominal speaking limit. For extended speaking times, the chair shall then inform the speaker when the 30 second extension has begun and when the time to speak on that particular question is elapsed. This rule shall apply as normal for the 1 minute speaking time allotted to remaining questions beyond the nominal speaking limit.
  23. Audio from the meeting must be live streamed as to ensure that temporarily expelled directors, if any, may hear testimony.
  24. All Directors have the right to a copy of these rules and procedures during the meeting.

### **PART III - TEMPORARY CHANGES TO THE RULES AND DISCIPLINE**

25. The General Prosecutor or the Defence may raise objections if they believe the rules are being disobeyed. The objection shall be sustained or overruled by the Chair.

26. Similarly to a judge at a trial, the Chair shall direct the proceedings and rule on all questions of evidence and any objections or requests by the plaintiffs or the defense, the merits of which may first be argued by the plaintiffs and the defense.
27. Only the Chair may impose disciplinary sanctions, with or without prior objections being raised from the General Prosecutor or the Defence, should the Chair need to enforce the rules.
28. Disciplinary sanctions include but are not limited to verbal warnings, censorship and expulsion.
29. Disciplinary sanctions of censorship or expulsion are appealable by any Director, to be confirmed by a vote of the board, immediately after a brief motivation, by simple majority for the sanction of a director or by 3/5 majority for the sanction of any other person.
30. Disciplinary sanctions may be permanent or temporary.
31. Directors Cannot be permanently expelled from the room.
32. Notwithstanding Rule 13, should any witness begin to make clearly inappropriate or obscene statements, any Director may raise an objection to the witness.
  - a. The Chair may apply disciplinary sanctions congruent with the severity of the violation, if any.
33. Notwithstanding Rules 11 and 14, should any speaker begin to make clearly inappropriate or obscene statements, the General Prosecutor or the Defence may raise an objection.
  - a. The Chair may apply disciplinary sanctions congruent with the severity of the violation, if any.
34. Any speaking times may be extended at the request of the General Prosecutor or the Defence, to be confirmed by 4/5 of the board present.
  - a. Such requests may not be done prior to a speaker elapsing their speaking time, must specify the extension requested and must specify for which person the extension applies
  - b. The request may be followed by a brief motivation by the requesting person. A vote shall follow immediately after.
35. The Rules may be temporarily changed at the request of the General Prosecutor or the Defence, to be confirmed by 4/5 of the board present.
  - a. Notwithstanding the above, expressly enumerated rights cannot be abridged by temporary rule changes without the consent of the persons whose rights are being abridged.
  - b. Such requests must specify the rule for which the change is requested or if a new temporary rule should be added, the scope of the change and the change itself.
36. Should a General Prosecutor no longer be able to fulfil their duties, the board shall elect a new General Prosecutor from amongst the remaining plaintiffs.
37. Should the Charged Officer be expelled or censored, the Charged Officer shall attempt to appoint an advocate if necessary.

## MISCELANEOUS

38. Directors may make points of personal privilege to the chair directly in writing. They may not interrupt speakers unless they are the General Prosecutor or the Defence.
39. Directors may call for recess between speakers, to be confirmed by 2/3 majority vote. The Request must be made in writing to the chair and specify the length of the recess
40. The chair may appoint a page to assist in delivering motions to the chair.
41. Any votes of the Directors as a whole require a second to the motion being voted on.
42. Trials shall be held in open session. Should the evidence in the trial include documents that are normally reserved for closed session, the Board may move to enter closed session by 2/3 majority for the purpose of hearing witnesses testifying to those closed session documents. The Board must move to open session once the witness has finished testimony and been cross-examined.
43. Trial procedures shall be considered automatically entered once the agenda point on the motion for removal of office has been reached.
44. Wherever appropriate, these rules supersede Robert's Rules of Order.

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*** rules be incorporated into the CSU standing regulations as *Appendix D: Rules and Procedures for the Removal from office of Executive Officers and Other Officers of the Concordia Student Union.*

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*** this be referred to Policy Committee.

**James Hanna:** This is for clarity's sake. Directors are entitled to the rules and this makes sure that the rules are explicit. We know what our rights and obligations are during the trial.

**Lauren Perozek:** Why did you choose three questions?

**James Hanna:** It's fair to ask at least three questions. It could be either five minutes or three questions. This is to prevent witnesses from talking for 20 minutes.

**Christiane Sakr:** It is good to have structure, especially because no one knows how this works. I want to know if the chair was consulted prior, because this is a lot of work for the chair.

**Chairperson:** While the Standing Regulations don't specify a procedure, Robert's Rules has a procedure very similar to this. Robert's Rules' method for impeachment is a lot more difficult to follow and has a lot of detail that doesn't apply to CSU. James did speak to me beforehand. This is much less complicated than Robert's Rules.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** There is a contradiction. This says evidence must be provided 48 hours in advance, but there is also confidential evidence.



**James Hanna:** Closed Sessions documents is available to council and not the public. I believe that was my intention. “And those entitled to it”

**Peter Zhuang:** I’m not in favour of this. I don’t understand why we’re doing this in a trial way. We should limit it to council only. And now it’s going to become a public event, which I don’t understand.

**James Hanna:** I’m not a lawyer but the Canadian Bill of Rights gives people rights to a fair hearing. This is the fairest situation where Chris can speak to anything. We’re morally obligated to do something along these lines.

**Salman Fahim Syed:** Is this just for 1 March?

**James Hanna:** This is going to policy as well.

**Salman Fahim Syed:** I say not to mention Chris’ name.

**James Hanna:** Understood.

**Lauren Perozek:** What are the documents available to the public and how do we protect Chris’ reputation?

**James Hanna:** Impeachment documents are available to the public. The Charged Officer is the one responsible for defending themselves and so it’s to present evidence to chair and then chair sends it to everyone.

**Chairperson:** Anytime anyone tells me a document is in closed session, it’s automatically in Closed Session. It’s what we always do.

**James Hanna:** Rules shouldn’t force them to present confidential information.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** It’s good to have a structure. I think it would be better to have maybe 2 general prosecutors. Since the defense is also two people.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange** motions. Seconded by **Lauren Perozek**.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** This is to make it clear that it’s not just one person leading this. And that its 2 vs 2.

**James Hanna:** I’m not necessarily against it. I put it in for uniformity. The charged officer doesn’t necessarily have to appoint an advocate and charged officer doesn’t have to speak.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** Chris doesn’t get to choose 2 people. There are 10 people who signed off. I would assume all 10 read the documents.

**Lauren Perozek:** The purpose of 2 is not to give an advantage. It's to share the workload. To your point, the charged officer doesn't talk so I don't see why they can't have 2 people as well. If he chooses not to speak, I don't see why it can't be fair.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** This doesn't mean both can speak. It presents the opportunity in case one doesn't want to or isn't able to.

**Sean Howard:** As this is modelled on legal type procedure, in these situations, there's usually only one main person. To deviate would hurt the whole set-up.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** My main issue with a lot of this is that a lot of the charges are ambiguous. There is flexibility in interpretations. I don't think you should be given the ability to exploit that flexibility.

**James Hanna:** I am sympathetic to the split workload. I would suggest one person has opening statements with no switching in between witnesses so the process is streamlined. Maybe changing it to up to 2 to act as GP(s)?

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** To clarify, to change the amendment so one person can speak to each point at once.

Seconded by **James Hanna**.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** One point like. There are 6 charges. One person per charge?

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** One person.

#### **VOTE on amendment to amendment**

For: 9  
Opposed: 0  
Abstentions: 1

**James Hanna:** Where is this included? In the addendum?

**Chairperson:** Anytime it says one GP, it will be changed to 2.

**James Hanna:** At the end of point 4.

#### **VOTE on amendment**

For: 4  
Opposed: 4  
Abstentions: 1  
*Fails.*

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski** calls to question. There are oppositions.

**VOTE**

For: 6  
Opposed: 3  
Abstentions: 0

**VOTE**

For: 5  
Opposed: 4  
Abstentions: 1  
*Carries.*

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** Not giving us to chance to raise out other objections doesn't go with the idea of establishing a fair trial. We had more general questions.

**Lauren Perozek:** Why only 3 witness when we have more?

**James Hanna:** it's possible to have more, but each witness takes half an hour of time. With 3 witnesses we only have a buffet time of an hour an da half. I don't think anyone can afford to be in the room forever. 3 is a good compromise for witnesses.

**Lauren Perozek:** Can it be an option? Time or witnesses?

**James Hanna:** In theory, yes.

**Lauren Perozek:** But if we ran out of time, we wouldn't be able to do that?

**James Hanna:** I would think you would.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** I wanted to ask about this. There might be witnesses who would like to remain anonymous like the RAWWC. Councilors and executives would know but there should be public anonymity.

**James Hanna:** This would apply to Closed Session witnesses.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** Why are abstentions not permitted?

**James Hanna:** If you are in the room, you can vote.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** Rule 20, about quorum not existing. Shouldn't this just moved to another meeting?

**Chairperson:** The promoters of the motion are more than quorum. Promoting something doesn't mean you agree with everything in it. You just think it merits a discussion.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** If it is the belief, if the documents have fraud. Who can they hold accountable?

**Chairperson:** Fraud is a strong word. When you sign something, you're signing on to having the meeting.

**James Hanna:** It is the defense's job.

**Chairperson:** If someone believes there's something libel in the documents, you can bring it up.

#### **4. ANTI-DISCRIMINATION DEFINITION AND STRATEGY**

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski** presents the following. Seconded by **Mitchel**.

*WHEREAS*, the current standing regulations chapter 2 items: 212 and 213, chapter 2 – section 1 item: 215, chapter 2 – section 3 item: 221 use the word, 'Discrimination'.

*WHEREAS*, the Ethics and Sustainability Policy of the Standing Regulations use the word discrimination,

*WHEREAS*, the Appendix A of the Standing Regulations (items 3 and 10) use the word discrimination,

*BE IT RESOLVED THAT*, CSU amend the "Initial Provisions – Definitions" section to include the following definition for discrimination: "Discrimination means, in alignment with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the unjust or prejudicial treatment of individuals or organizations or marginalized groups on the basis of race, language, nationality, ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, marital status, family status, disability, genetic characteristics and convictions for which a pardon has been granted or a record suspended."

BIFRT the budgetary impact of this motion is nil

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** In a time where council may be in total agreement, this might bring council a bit closer together. This will have long-term protection of the student body. In a time of divisiveness, we can show that we agree on something.

**Peter Zhuang:** With what's happening, I don't think this is reasonable

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** By defining anything, we're not taking any action. We refer to the Standing Regulations a lot, and it would be good to have a concrete definition. They can refer to this, they can be protected.

**Lauren Perozek:** Do you have language in there?

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** Yes.

**Sean Howard:** Is there a reason the Quebec Charter isn't mentioned?

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** We can propose that amendment.

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski** proposes amendment to include Canadian and Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedom. Seconded by **Sean Howard**.

**VOTE**

For: 10

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

*Carries.*

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski** proposes the following motion. Seconded.

**WHEREAS**, the Federal Government has introduced Building a Foundation for Change: Canada's Anti-Racism Strategy 2019-2022.

**WHEREAS**, this proposal is used to help promote a Canada where every person is able to fully and equally participate in our country's economic, cultural, social and political life – free from discrimination and hate.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, CSU utilize this plan in order to combat all forms of racism, hate and discrimination on campus.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT**, CSU amend standing regulation 212 to the following: "The CSU commits to creating a campus environment free of discrimination, harassment and violence. It aligns itself with the strategies and terminologies listed in Building a Foundation for Change: Canada's Anti-Racism Strategy 2019-2022."

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the budgetary impact of this motion is nil.

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski** proposes the following amendment to include "Notwithstanding Book Xiii 13 Provision e." Seconded.

**Lauren Perozek**: What's the actual action?

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski**: I supported the Positions Book motion that might disadvantage marginalized communities who should be committed to. If the positions are removed, there's something that supersedes that.

**Lauren Perozek**: How does someone use that position?

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski**: The Canadian Charter is 25-page document that says how governments and citizens protect. There is a 3-year short-term plan to help the overall landscape. We'll not be doing anything concrete, because we can't do anything more than our government can.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange**: I'm not sure what this will do. The Charter includes the Indigenous approach and that's not what the government is doing now. This needs more clarification. External Committee decides on funding and this is not clarified in that.

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski**: That's something I want to look into further on what concrete steps council can do better that's better than our government.

**Sean Howard:** These Standing Regulations supersede Positions Book. CSU is held directly reliable and accountable because of the Standing Regulations. Students have that tool to combat that racism.

**James Hanna:** One thing on policy, I'd that it is in Standing Regulations and not in by-laws. This is a good idea.

**Lauren Perozek** calls the question.

#### **VOTE**

For: 10

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

## **6. EXAM CONFLICT RECOMMENDATION TO ADMINISTRATION**

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski** proposes the following the motion. Seconded by **Lauren Perozek**.

**WHEREAS** students perform worse academically during midterms and finals due to cluttered examination schedules,

**WHEREAS**, students can have up to four final exams in the span of 2 days.

**WHEREAS** Concordia professors and course coordinators do not have comprehensive communication

channels or active statistical software to optimize exam scheduling,

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the CSU recommend that the administration of Concordia University work to

implement a statistical software that optimizes exams by creating prioritization criteria – in the attempt to

improve academic performance and reputation.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the CSU recommend that these prioritizations be based on:

1) Making sure classes that are commonly taken in the same semester do not have exams placed close together.

2) Being more lenient regarding letting students write alternate exams.

3) Scheduling alternate exams strategically based on original exam dates to minimize schedule conflicts.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the budgetary impact of this motion is nil.

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** As a JMSB student, the way exam schedules are set is that some professors talk to each other. We need something more concrete. The current exam schedule does not allow for the full academic capability of students and tarnishes the reputation of school, especially considering our proximity to McGill.

**Lauren Perozek:** There's a clause that you can change your schedule if you have three exams in 24 hours. Does that include that?

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** My alternate date was differed to 12 hours later.

**Sean Howard:** There are many of these instances in engineering. Where there are not more than 2 in a day, but someone might have an exam at night and then one immediately the next day. This is hard especially since not everyone lives on island.

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** Administration can read this and say they don't want to do this. If we get a unanimous vote on council, at least we can say that we tried. There are layers of bureaucracy.

**Hannah Jamet-Lange:** This is really good. One extra thing is that we do have international students. If they have their last exam on the last day of finals season, their flights. become more expensive. Can this be incorporated as well? I just wanted to mention that. This is a good first step.

**Mitchell Schechter:** We all agree. The exam period is 2.5 weeks. It doesn't make sense for the session to be so long if exams are not spread.

**Jeremy Deneault:** Students can get better grades if they have more time to study.

#### **VOTE on calling question**

For: 7

Opposed: 3

*Carries.*

#### **VOTE**

For: 10

Opposed: 1

Abstentions: 0

*Carries.*

**Salman Fahim Syed:** Did you go with this to Senate? This is nothing in front of Senate or Administration. You can ask for alternatives and that it can be done without explanation.

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** You can't have three exams consecutively after each other in the time reserved.

**Salman Fahim Syed:** You can't have 4 exams in 48 hours.

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** That's the worst-case, and I had to do that.

**Peter Zhuang:** Some students in Fine Arts only have projects and no exams. I don't think this is fair to them. They wouldn't be in favour in doing this.

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski:** Projects can always have a late penalty. You know about projects in the beginning of the semester, while final exams are announced late. There are a lot of little things we can think about.

## 7. ELECTIONS RULES

**James Hanna:** There should be a few changes allowing full reimbursements. Not having that is barrier to entry.

**Chairperson:** This should be discussed in Policy.

**Patrick Quinn:** That's been discussed.

**James Hanna:** Would that be applicable for these elections?

**Patrick Quinn:** That would require a budget revision so no.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** I don't think this is a barrier for entry. Printing costs very little. You could print stuff for less than a dollar. It would be nice to have online method. My reimbursement form had only one cost for printing.

**James Hanna:** Executives might spend the whole \$800. Referendum Committee might be \$300. It is a barrier to entry. You're asking students to shovel out money to be able to represent students

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** I understand.

## 8. UPASS (Universal Transit Pass)

**Patrick Quinn** presents the following motion. Seconded.

**WHEREAS** the Concordia Student Union ("CSU") has done a research project about the use of the Universal Transit Pass ("U-Pass") across Canada;

**WHEREAS** the U-Pass is a transit pass that gives unlimited access to public transportation (STM, Exo, STL, etc) on a semesterly basis;

**WHEREAS** several universities across Canada, such as the University of British Columbia, University of Ottawa, University of Manitoba, Simon Fraser University, and Universite Laval have adopted this model;

**WHEREAS** the CSU U-Pass Report, set to be released on March 3, demonstrates that a UPass program saves students between \$36.75 and \$60.85 per month, depending on the postsecondary institution.

**WHEREAS** the goal of a U-Pass program is to encourage sustainable transportation and discourage the use of single-use vehicles

**WHEREAS** another goal of a U-Pass program is to improve public transportation around the campus(es) of a university;

**WHEREAS** apartment vacancy rates in Montreal are at an all-time low and this lack of supply is causing a housing crisis;



**WHEREAS** this housing crisis is causing students to live farther away and causing students to pay more for rent;

**WHEREAS** the CSU believes keeping Montreal affordable for students to be important;

**WHEREAS** a U-Pass program can help make Montreal affordable for Concordia students;

----

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Council of Representatives, under their power vested in section 9.6.1 of the By-laws, send the following referendum question to the 2020 Annual General Elections:

*“The Universal Transit Pass (U-Pass) is a transit pass that gives unlimited access to public transportation (STM, Exo, STL, etc) on a semesterly basis rather than on a monthly basis. The U-Pass program has the objective to: lower public transportation costs for students, reduce the use of single rider vehicles, and improve public transportation around our campuses. The CSU would like to explore the possibility of implementing this program at Concordia University.*

*Do you, as a student, agree with the Concordia Student Union negotiating with the various stakeholders (such as the STM or Exo) with the understanding that a U-Pass program proposal will come back to referendum for a vote in the future?”*

**Patrick Quinn:** I have been working with Sustainable Concordia, a professor of Urban Planning. Having transport fees come out of tuition is common across Concordia. This reduces pollution, discourages use of vehicles, and stabilizes costs. Things are getting pricier in Montreal. This expands the scope of fees paid. We will ask students if they want or not. It is not worth bugging the city they don't want this.

**James Hanna:** I am cautious of this, unless opt out mechanism. I understand this is a consultive process and the kinks will be worked out. We should start the process.

**Sean Howard:** I'm not opposed to starting negotiations. We should be able to opt out. Would this reduce costs for those who use the STM?

**Patrick Quinn:** Opt outs are a thing across Canada. Whether students opt out depends on each agreement. We should be reducing costs for students. Another goal is sustainability. That's something a lot of people believe in. This is the first step.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** Are we looking to tram 3 or 8.

**Patrick Quinn:** The fee structure in terms of Montreal set by ARTM. They're restructuring their whole fee thing right now because of REM. it's a huge transportation initiative.

**Lauren Perozek** calls the question. Seconded by **James Hanna**.

**VOTE**

For: 10

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

*Carries unanimously.*

## 8. ADJOURNMENT

**Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski** calls to adjourn. Seconded.

Meeting adjourned.