



Concordia Student Union – Council of Representatives

CSU Special Council Meeting – Agenda
Sunday, March 1, 2020
CSU Conference Room, 17h00, S.G.W. Campus

Updated Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Impeachment of General Coordinator
4. Adjournment

Meeting officially called by CSU Councillors Elizabeth Tasong, Hannah Jamet-Lange, Christiane Sakr, Naomi Barney Purdie, Esther Morand, Jarrad Haas, Maha Siddiqui, Leigh Kusaj, Victoria Pesce, Lauren Perozek, as per By-Law 6.6.3 .

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting is called to order at **17h18**.

Chairperson: We have adopted different rules than usual.

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: Chris Kalafatidis (General Coordinator), Isaiah Joyner (External & Mobilization Coordinator), Marin Algattus (Internal Affairs Coordinator), Celeste-Melize Ferrus (Loyola Coordinator), Eduardo Malorni (Student Life Coordinator), Patrick Quinn (Academic & Advocacy Coordinator)

Councilors present for the meeting were: Hannah Jamet-Lange (Arts & Science), Maha Siddiqui (Arts & Science), Elizabeth Tasong (Arts & Science), Leigh Kusaj (Arts & Science), Jarrad Haas (Fine Arts), Menachem Israili (Independent), Peter Zhuang (Fine Arts), Jeremy Deneault (John Molson School of Business), Arad Andrew Banis (John Molson School of Business), Tzvi Hersh Filler (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science), Victoria Pesce (John Molson School of Business), Esther Morand (Arts & Science), Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski (John Molson School of Business), Lauren Perozek (John Molson School of Business), Mitchell Schechter (John Molson School of Business), James Hanna (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science), Salman Fahim Syed (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science), Sean Howard (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science), Naomi Barney Purdie (Arts & Science), Christiane Sakr (Arts & Science), Selena Mezher (Gina Cody School of Engineering & Computer Science), Howard Issley (John Molson School of Business).

Executives absent for the meeting were: Désirée Blizzard (Finance Coordinator).

Salman Fahim Syed moves to excuse **Désirée Blizzard** and **Isaiah Joyner**. Seconded by **Arad Andrew Banis**.

Chairperson: There is someone in the room who is both councilor and witness.

Hannah Jamet-Lange moves to allow Hannah Jamet-Lange be the first witness so she can be in the room after her testament. Seconded by **Esther Morand**. Opposed by **Mitchell Schecter**.

VOTE

For: 15

Opposed: 1

Abstentions: 3

Carries.

Maha Siddiqui presents the following motion. Seconded by **Naomi Barney Purdie**.

WHEREAS many councilors were not present at the SCM last Thursday,

WHEREAS many councilors are not comfortable with the following aspect of the motion that passed,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the motion passed be amended to allow councilors to abstain from the process.

Chairperson: Please refrain from talking or whispering amongst each other.

James Hanna: After closing statements, councilors have 1 minute to leave the room. Because everyone has 30 seconds to voice their motivation, if you abstain, there's no real reason to motivate. You can leave the room.

Lauren Perozek: The room is crowded. It'll be hard to leave the room. That's inefficient use of time.

Chairperson: It's already accounted for in the timeline.

Jeremy: Where is this being livestreamed?

Melvin: CSU Facebook Page.

VOTE

For: 14

Opposed: 7

Abstentions: 0

Carries.

Maha Siddiqui presents the following to motion. Seconded by **Elizabeth Tasong**.

WHEREAS this impeachment is specifically based on the breaching of CSU by-laws and the CSU Code of Conduct done by the General Coordinator,

WHEREAS this motion is not to negate any of the other work that the GC has done,
BE IT RESOLVED THAT no witnesses that aren't members of the CSU or any character witnesses be called, and that only witnesses that specifically related to the charges at hand be called.

Maha Siddiqui: It makes no sense for there to be character witnesses. All witnesses need to be related to the specific charges.

Tzvi Hersh Filler: The charges are based on incompetence. As such, if you have someone who said he did his duty, that is an appropriate witness.

Peter Zhuang: You need to have all perspectives.

Chris Kalafatidis: They are not character witnesses. Evan is a first-hand witness of work that I've done. Keroles is here to speak on my collaborations on sustainability.

Maha Siddiqui: The motion never stated incompetence. This is not to remove any witnesses; this is to ensure that this goes in a cordial and efficient way.

Lauren Perozek: The motion is to stick to facts and eliminate emotions.

James Hanna: It's already in the rules. We can raise objections.

Elizabeth Tasong: I don't think it's redundant. This motion specifically calls for things to be relevant. This meeting was called for the specific reasons sent to chair.

Sean Howard: This amendment is redundant. This feels done in bad faith.

Victoria Pesce calls the question.

VOTE

For: 6

Opposed: 10

Abstentions: 3

Fails.

3. IMPEACHMENT OF GENERAL COORDINATOR

Lauren Perozek nominates **Maha Siddiqui** as General Prosecutor. Seconded by **Victoria Pesce**.

VOTE

For: 15
Opposed: 2
Abstentions: 1
Carries.

Chairperson: The trial has begun.

Minute Keeper presents the following motion. Seconded by **Hannah Jamet-Lange**.

WHEREAS Section 2.1.b of the Bylaws states as the object of the Student Union: “ b. To provide for student representation on various boards, councils, and committees of Concordia University”

WHEREAS section 6.3.c of the Bylaws gives the Council of Representatives the power to “Act as the final authority on appointments of the Student Union.”

WHEREAS Section 10.3 of the bylaws states “The General Coordinator and Coordinators may be removed from office by a two-thirds majority vote of the Council of Representatives for misappropriation of funds, dereliction of duties, violation of these bylaws or of the Regulations adopted thereunder.”

WHEREAS Sections 1.1-1.5 of the Code of Conduct state: “Generally, Student Union representatives are expected to: 1.1 Adopt a professional and respectful standard of language when engaging with other Student Union Representatives, members of the Concordia staff and student body, as well as third parties, while in performance of their union duties. 1.2 Act reasonably and with due care so as not to disrupt, interfere with or unduly delay Union Activities or union-related activities. 1.3 Act in good faith towards the Union and the Student Union Representatives. 1.4 Understand the scope of the mandate they are responsible for and not infringe on other Representatives’ roles. 1.5 Maintain professional and respectful relationships with other Student Union Representatives and Student Union Members.”

WHEREAS Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 of the Code of Conduct state: “Student Union Representatives shall not: 2.3.2 Provide false information to other Student Union Representatives or the Media. 2.3.4 Make false representations in the exercise of their authority, or knowingly allow others to make false representations to the Union.”

WHEREAS the General Coordinator has not fulfilled his duties as General Coordinator;
WHEREAS the General Coordinator has actively prevented student representation on the Standing Committee on Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Violence, thus violating Bylaw 2.1.b;

WHEREAS the General Coordinator has failed to fulfill his duties as part of the appointments committee, especially in regards to:

- appointments to the Judicial Board
- appointments to the Sexual Violence Accountability Committee
- appointments to the University Senate

thus violating Bylaw 2.1.b;

WHEREAS this has led to a lack of accountability measures within the Student Union;

WHEREAS the General Coordinator has appointed positions without informing council or having it ratified by council, thus violating Bylaw 6.3.c;

WHEREAS the General Coordinator has misrepresented past council decisions and actively ignored mandates given to him by the Council of Representatives, thus violating Code of Conduct Sections 1.2 and 1.3;

WHEREAS this has led to an executive position being vacant for 8 months, thus violating Code of Conduct Sections 1.2, 1.3, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4;

WHEREAS it has also led to the halt of the development of the RAWCC;

WHEREAS the General Coordinator has broken the code of conduct by using offensive, inappropriate, disrespectful and unprofessional language while dealing with a Councillor, thus violating Code of Conduct section 1.1 and 1.5;

WHEREAS the General Coordinator made false claims to Appointments Committee about reaching out to a student at large, thus violating Code of Conduct Section 2.3.2 and 2.3.4;

WHEREAS all of these offenses go against either the Bylaws or the Code of Conduct;

Whereas this is grounds to impeachment on the basis of dereliction of duty and violation of the Bylaws and the Regulations adopted thereunder;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the General Coordinator be removed from his office;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Council of Representatives appoint a General Coordinator from among the remaining Coordinators for the remainder of the term of office in accordance with Bylaw 7.4.

Maha Siddiqui: We are here to address charges against the GC for neglecting his duties. A third of council has lost faith in the GC and has called for this meeting. He is paid \$41k of students money including benefits to advocate for students' rights. The GC must uphold all code of conduct and values of the CSU. He is expected to carry out his mandate. These charges show multiple instances of him violating the Code of Conduct and Standing Regulations. This impeachment is called not to negate any good work done but for the breaching of specific by-laws. This is to look at what is not done. We are here because councilors have a fiscal responsibility to hold him accountable to what he has not done and are legally accountable for this. In February, we received a 15-page complaint from a former councilor with regards to SARC saying that the GC neglected the core mandates of positions. The first grievance is regarding appointments. CSU is required to appoint individuals to sit on bodies, and not doing so has legal repercussions. This shows a purposeful dereliction of duties. The slate GC ran on was the only one that didn't run on sexual violence and then he neglected to have SARC be fully functional. Sexual assault is notoriously overlooked by administration and this failure to ensure representatives on SARC shows a glaring disregard for this issue, especially since we received many complaints on the GC related to harassment. If council mandates GC to come out with three options by a certain deadline, if multiple councilors reach out personally to address certain behaviors that affects councilors that are not addressed, it's a problem. Most of these have been ignored during council and when any councilor has tried to address it, GC has simply negated and deflected them as a personal attack.

Chairperson: There is an objection to not campaigning on sexual violence. The GC can address that himself.

Chris Kalafatidis calls 5-minute recess to set up PowerPoint slide.

VOTE

For: 12

Opposed: 6

Abstentions: 4

Carries.

Council resumes at **17h55**.

Chris Kalafatidis: On unprofessional language, complaints on conduct need to be reported. This is an overstepping of authority by Council. Council cannot rule on these things, they have to go to JB. Hence, every instance citing breaching of Code of Conduct is irrelevant. On delaying to appoint a Sustainability Coordinator, I have been accused of actively ignoring mandates. The Judicial Board ruled in July that the motion passed by council was illegal and I informed the council of this. Council cannot appropriate that responsibility. This is an overstepping of roles. My right not to appoint Sustainability Coordinator saved the CSU \$30k in salaries. Council cannot impeach me on a decision that is my right to make. It is the responsibility of council to appoint JB. When JB became dysfunctional, I stepped in to make Appointments Committee to do the job and now JB is 8 members strong. On SARC, three people who signed off on this meeting were there. This is not exclusively my fault. We decided together to prioritize other committees. Margot did not do an interview and her appointment was never ratified. Council was told to do an interview and by October 1, she was interviewed. To say I actively refused representation is a stretch. For senate, I did not fail because on 23 August we appointed 5 people. One issue is that a student was blocked by an executive and then blocked by the university after council reversed that decision. The Academic and Advocacy Coordinator used his power to overrule that because an important meeting was being had on divestment. I admit I should have informed council on this earlier. I included it in my next report, and I agreed that we needed better communication. Last year, appointments were way slower. Last year, executives didn't call meetings in the summer, which is normal. On RAWWC, council ratified the report that explained the decision we were making. We wanted a professional to be part of this center. Council signed off on this. Here are the meetings, including Nov and all the admin meetings. I was exercising due diligence.

Chairperson: There is no mechanism to object things that are untrue. All witnesses need to leave the room. We will start with Hannah, Evan, Alexis, Alex and then Margot. Witnesses aren't allowed to watch the livestream.

Salman Fahim Syed: But they are able to see the video?

Chairperson: The spirit of it is that they not watch it. We'll have someone to take care of that.

Victoria Pesce: I'll ask Marin.

Chairperson: Thank you. There will be 5 minutes for each witness to answer 3 questions from each side. If witnesses exceed 5 minutes, each subsequent answer will be limited to 30 seconds.

Witness: Hannah Jamet-Lange

Maha Siddiqui: As a council member of appointments, can you describe role of the committee?

Hannah Jamet-Lange: I have been on this committee for the whole mandate. The chair is supposed to call meetings, make sure everything is working, submit reports to council and inform committee members of things going in. We only met officially four times which includes times where councilors had to reach out multiple times to confirm meetings. The first time Margot was brought up was in June. We wanted it to be done correctly. It was then brought up again in August when we asked him to reach out, which did not happen and I had to reach out to Margot. After which, she reached out to him on October 1. We finally interviewed her. She was only confirmed mid-October. In that time, there was no student representation on the committee, which is very problematic with the culture of campus surrounding sexual violence. The duty of chair to convene meetings and I, as an unpaid councilor, only found out about the issue after reading the by-laws. There are also some issues with senate appointments. By-law 6.3.c states that all appointments ratified by council. Bakry was not appointed until January.

Maha Siddiqui: As councilors, what prompted you to file the complaint?

Hannah Jamet-Lange: As councilors, we are mandated to hold executives accountable. We can be held liable for not doing so. We believe that student money should be used appropriately. The main reason we called this meeting is that we got complaints from students-at-large. We have to take those seriously. We got many more complaints on more things that didn't happen and also some on harassment. It is incredibly important to do our jobs as councilors.

Maha Siddiqui: The fact that we can't bring up the other complaints doesn't make them any less valid. Has the code of conduct been breached more than once?

Hannah Jamet-Lange: Multiple times. After the impeachment meeting was called, I was yelled at by multiple executives. There is a pattern of not responding to messages and neglecting duties.

Chris Kalafatidis: When did you realize that the SVAC wasn't appointed on time?

Hannah Jamet-Lange: December 9.

Chris Kalafatidis: It is your responsibility as a councilor to make sure things go well. Do you hold yourself responsible?

Hannah Jamet-Lange: Yes. But at the same time, this was not brought up by the paid chair of the committee. I had to bring it up. I regret I did not notice that sooner. But, it shouldn't have happened.

Chris Kalafatidis: Where does it say that it is the responsibility of chair?

Hannah Jamet-Lange: Book 1. Chapter IV Section 1, 28a. “Each committee Chair shall (a) Endeavour to set a regular meeting time for each semester, as possible; (b) Notify the members of the committee of the dates, times, and places of the meeting of the committee; Prepare the Agenda and any relevant documents for each meeting and send them to the members of the committee within a reasonable delay to be considered before each meeting; (c) Submit a written report to each regular Council meeting containing all matters that have been considered and decided by the committee, including a closed session report for anything considered in a closed session of that meeting-”

Chairperson: There are time for closing statements to consider objections.

Witness: Evan Lee

Chris Kalafatidis: As the GC of ASFA, can you explain your interactions with me? Have I been doing my job?

Maha Siddiqui: This is not relevant to the charges drawn.

Chairperson: We will discuss the merits of the question.

Chris Kalafatidis: I was accused of dereliction of duties. I have the right to ask if there was any dereliction of duties.

Maha Siddiqui: The GC is charged with the dereliction of specific duties. You can ask specific questions. This is what the first motion was for. We agreed that character witnesses should not be admissible.

Chairperson: The question is general enough. I’ll allow it.

Evan: The GC is hardworking. I will speak to the ASFA Senate appointment since it is on the list of evidence. Here’s a timeline. On June 1, at the start of the mandate, the GC reached out to me and asked for four candidates for Senate. I submitted Gigi and Bakry. Gigi was nominated as the official representative and was later rejected because she didn’t meet the academic requirements. The GC notified me of that in the beginning of October. I found other candidates including Bakry. Without representation for two months on Senate by ASFA, I sent an email to appointments on October 17 about appointing Bakry. I wanted to expedite the process and nominate him. The other candidate had applied for Senate in another capacity, so I decided to appoint Bakry. Chris was very helpful and answered any questions I had. As student as large, I hope councilors and executives can reach an impasse.

Chris Kalafatidis: Were you concerned about representation on Senate from ASFA?

Evan: I took it upon myself to make sure we got representation. I sent two candidates, and then asked Bakry again after complications arose. The other candidate was ruled out because she had already applied. So, yes.

Chris Kalafatidis: Do you think the appointment was completed in a timely manner?

Evan: Yes, it was done within October. I don't know what happened behind the scenes. Everything was done in a timely manner on my end. According to evidence, the ASFA candidate was chosen in August. Other candidates were reviewed later in October.

Maha Siddiqui: As the GC for ASFA, is it an impeachable offence if a GC violates bylaws and Code of Conduct?

Chris Kalafatidis: Objection, this is not CSU-related.

Chairperson: I'll allow it.

Maha Siddiqui: As you are a GC, on principle, yes or no, is it impeachable if an executive violates the Standing Regulations and Code of Conduct?

Evan: Yes.

Maha Siddiqui: True or False. Did anyone else reach out to you regarding appointments?

Evan: No, just Chris.

Maha Siddiqui: Were you aware of internal CSU bias against the first ASFA candidate Gigi?

Evan: No.

Witness 3: Alexis Searce

Chairperson: Alexis is the former CSU Loyola Coordinator.

Maha Siddiqui: As the previous chair of appointments, can you describe your previous duties?

Alexis: I was chair of appointments committee from end-November to the end of the mandate. In that time, we appointed JB, Tribunal, CEO, etc. I wrote call outs, set up meetings, collected candidates, ran their eligibility and then ran them past committee.

Maha Siddiqui: Is it standard practice to train the chair coming in?

Alexis: Yes. You get paid \$15-20/h for training the incoming chair. In April, I started preparing to train the new chair. I had prepared an 8-page manual and wanted to be thorough. In the first week, we sent out a list for the new executives to choose which committees they wanted to chair, with a message to go see the previous chair to arrange trainings. I didn't receive any emails from anyone. I sent a follow-up email asking the GC to send the schedules to me. I was in the office every day, and no one came by. I sent email to the executive, to ask them to pick up some CVs

and Cover Letters. No one talked to me. By my standard, that was unacceptable. There was no involvement from the GC.

Maha Siddiqui: As former chair, how important is it to appoint someone. Can someone who didn't undergo training do the mandate properly?

Alexis: Appointments are crucial. Most appointments happen in the summer. There is no time to learn the position once the mandate starts. There are a lot of deadlines and policy and ethics to consider. We want the fairest process we can and need good quality control. It's a sensitive job. It is very important to be accountable to the interviewee and to council. You have to document that everything was done properly. Being chair is different from being a councilor on the committee.

Chris Kalafatidis: What training did you receive?

Alexis: I came in the middle, but I sat down with outgoing chair and we talked about everything that needed to be done. I did have to learn on the fly quite a bit.

Witness 3: Margot Berner

Maha Siddiqui: Can you describe your experience being appointed to SARC?

Margot: Most of it is covered in the complaint. Originally I was appointed by the previous Academic & Advocacy Executive. I was also passed through academic caucus and was sent through council and the previous GC. I was appointed three different ways. I went to the Standing Committee and was told I was not confirmed by CSU which is reasonable. As I continued to go for meetings, I was recurrently unconfirmed. That would've been fine if someone else was appointed but that wasn't the case. SARC writes policy on sexual violence. This is very important and how the policies go and how it runs with QC legal code. Whoever was in charge on appointments decided to bow out. I was contacted by a member of appointments who asked if I had been contacted by GC. I sent the previous mandate's GC's report. She told me I'd be hearing from the GC. I waited the entire summer. I reached out to the GC, and was told he wasn't responding to emails. I reached out on Facebook. This was in September and after months of no student representation on a major university committee. GC said he was nervous about reaching out, I assume because I also ran during the CSU elections. I have nothing against him as a person. I just want him to do his job. I continued to reach out to appointments. Eventually, I was told I would be re-interviewed even though I had already been appointed. The committee didn't know what SARC was and Chris didn't know what the acronym stood for. It was a big mess. I was eventually appointed.

Maha Siddiqui: What prompted you as a student-at-large to file a 15-page complaint?

Margot: I like reading policy and am passionate about Sexual Violence. I realised that he hadn't appointed people to JB, or Campaigns.

Maha Siddiqui: Based on your previous experience on council, do you consider this to be an impeachable offence?

Margot: Yes, that's why I wrote the complaint. The GC has made it systemically impossible to file complaints by making JB not functional, undermining the accountability process. Council has power over JB.

Chris Kalafatidis: When were you appointed?

Margot: In October, half a year after I was supposed to be appointed, which is most of your mandate.

Witness 4: Keroles Riad

Chris Kalafatidis: As executive of Waste Not, Want Not, does it appear like I've been doing my job?

Keroles: I'm not here as WNWN. I depend on support from Sustainability Coordinator. I've felt like I've had the support. The GC invited me to speak with Selena and himself, who were very receptive. I was reached out by all executives on how to work with sustainability because the GC referred them to me.

Chris Kalafatidis: Since we have no Sustainability Coordinator, can you explain how I stepped in to fill that gap?

Keroles: The GC was instrumental in helping us get prepared. 34,000 people attended our meetings and events. We made connections with every CSU executive. Within their mandate, to answer the first question, we require negotiation with university and administration and often times I go to those meetings alone. GC came with me to the meetings. It helps to have the full CSU weight behind you.

Maha Siddiqui: Outside of personal interactions, do you think sustainability issues have been tackled well?

Keroles: I've gotten to work with Sustainability Coordinators over the past. This year has been exceptionally good.

Maha Siddiqui: Since you are here as Keroles, how are you relevant to the mishandling of work including Senate, SARC, RAWCC?

Keroles: I'm not.

Maha Siddiqui: Did you acknowledge on your Facebook that the CSU is understaffed?

Keroles: There's a position that is supposed to exist that is vacant but that was not referring to how the current existing team is incapable.

Victoria Pesce motions for recess. Seconded by **Christiane Sakr**.

Arad Andrew Banis motions for 10-minute recess.

VOTE

For: 16

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Carries.

Council resumes at **19h16**.

Chairperson: We will have closing statements and then the vote by roll call.

Maha Siddiqui: There are multiple objections that need to be called. There is a repeat history of unprofessional behavior, not just one. As he stated, usually it is supposed to go through JB. That was not possible because JB was not functional until very recently. These complaints will be filed. The JB ruling on the Sustainability Coordinator was incomplete. They still recommended to follow Council's decision. Council can overrule JB rulings. On appointments to Senate, the problem is that the GC overstepped his role. Appointments Committee is there to appoint people to Senate. Senate is highest authority of student representation. The PowerPoint showed that JB can fill a council vacancy. One of witnesses said that he was not consulted about Senate Candidate from anyone but GC, but another councilor did. It is irresponsible to pay someone who is not fulfilling mandate. This is not about anything personal. We have reached out 1-1 and in council. It took multiple students-at large complaints for us to finally take action and call for this meeting. The GC has demonstrated a behavioral pattern of inaction, taking powers of council upon himself, and blocking appointments.

Chris Kalafatidis: We started with a good statement to focus on BL and SR and facts. And then, through witnesses, they attacked my character. I have shown legal facts. I gave a long presentation on how I am innocent of all accusations of breaching BL. Instances of unprofessional language need to be brought to JB. Council has no right to overrule me on appointments. JB can recommend whatever it wants but I cannot be impeached for not following a recommendation. Council approved actions I took on the RAWCC. Hannah essentially said I was an incompetent Chair. It is also the responsibility of the committee. Hannah should've pointed this out to me. I am allowed to miss something. Margot stated that SMSV is important. Well, all other committees are also important. Alexis says I didn't have the appropriate training, but her training came down to a quick informal conversation. She is no more prepared than I am. All you need to run a committee is a good team. Witnesses did not focus on legality and attacked my character. I implore you to vote no.

Chairperson: Councilor has 1 minute to leave the room, should they choose to do so. We will begin roll call vote.

Hannah Jamet-Lange: I vote yes. I believe it is our job to hold executives accountable to their mandate. The GC's mandate has not been fulfilled. I do not believe that Sexual Violence is the same level as every other committee. Sexual Violence affects us personally. This council, of which some have asked for excusals from consent training, has showed that they don't care about sexual violence.

Salman Fahim Syed: I vote no. These complaints are valid but are more valid for JB. Our mandate is to make decisions. The lawyer in that committee that can make the decision.

Arad Andrew Banis: I vote no. I align myself more with the comments GC made.

Mitchell Schecter: I vote no. One of the witnesses was biased. The GC presented facts. Other side presented opinions. This should be taken to JB.

Lauren Perozek: I vote no. This should go to JB.

Victoria Pesce: I vote no. I was one councilor to call this meeting but from a business perspective, it doesn't make sense for the role to be vacant. These complaints needed to be addressed. Hopefully, the next GC doesn't overlook their mandate.

Mathew Levitsky-Kaminski: I vote no. After hearing both sides, this is an abuse of power. Having participated on many boards, this is very emotionally driven. I believe this is an attack of character.

Sean Howard: I vote no. This is built on falsehoods and is biased. To vote yes would be to ignore the things we represent.

Selena Mezher: I vote no. I weigh things out. The weight is on the facts displayed by the GC not opinions.

Naomi Barney Purdie: I abstain. I'm not sure anymore.

Maha Siddiqui: I vote yes. We brought these to council. According to the by-laws, the GC is mandated to follow motions in council. It is our fiscal responsibility to hold him accountable.

Elizabeth Tasong: I abstain. But I will say that it is belittling to say the prosecution's arguments is based on opinions. We cited the proper by-laws and complaints are valid. These will be brought to JB. It is concerning to have councilors completely dismiss them.

Jarrad Haas: I vote no, simply because there are other complaints that couldn't be brought to council. Every single complaint should be brought to JB, all at once, and JB should decide.

James Hanna: I vote no. Last year, appointments weren't done until November. It is a big task to do them over the summer. It is not the job of GC to blindly follow council.

Tzvi Hersh Filler: I vote no. I cannot take the point on Code of Conduct seriously because two of the councilors stand accused of bullying another councilor, and one tried to threaten him to keep quiet. If she believed in what she signed off on, she would have resigned.

Menachem Israily: I vote no. The prosecution laid out a draconian interpretation of the Code of Conduct.

Howard Issley: I vote no. There is insufficient evidence. Even if there were, JB is there to deal with them.

Jeremy Deneault: I vote no. GC has made mistakes and should've contacted certain people sooner. But he did not break any rules according to the CSU. He should face JB.

Peter Zhuang: I vote no. These evidences are not significant. GC has done nothing wrong. He is the first one in the past few years who has done his job right.

Christiane Sakr: I abstain. When impeachment was sent out, two executives sent me private messages saying I was contributing to council's toxicity. These executives are no stranger to toxicity themselves. Some executives cannot separate politics and personal.

VOTE

For: 2

Opposed: 15

Abstentions: 3

Fails.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Jarrad Haas moves to adjourn. Seconded by **Victoria Pesce**.

Council adjourns at **19h40**.