



CSU Regular Council Meeting – Agenda

Wednesday, May 9th, 2018

MB 3.265, 18h30, S.G.W. Campus

We would like to begin by acknowledging that Concordia University is located on unceded Indigenous lands.

The Kanien'kehá:ka(Ga-niyen-gé-haa-ga) Nation is recognized as the custodians of the lands and waters on which we gather today. Tiohtiá:ke(jo-jya-gé)/Montreal is historically known as a gathering place for many First Nations.

Today, it is home to a diverse population of Indigenous and other peoples. We respect the continued connections with the past, present, and future in our ongoing relationships with Indigenous and other peoples within the Montreal community."

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of the Agenda

4. Consent Agenda

- a) Executive Reports
- b) Reports from Committees
- c) Approval of minutes – April 11th (RCM)
- d) Chairperson's Report
- e) Position's Book

5. Presentations & Guest Speakers

- a) Dish Project
- b) Judicial Board
- c) Refugee sponsorship program

d) 7th Floor equipment

e) Our Turn Funding

6. Appointments

7. New Business – Substantive

a) Systemic Racism

b) Executive Salaries

c) Executive Bonuses

d) Chair and Minute-Keeper Pay

e) CSU Lounge Equipment

f) CSU StudentCare Letter

g) Executive Salaries

h) CEO

i) Fund Committee Report

8. New Business – Informational

a) Sustainability Coordinator Report

b) Academic and Advocacy Report

d) General Coordinator Report

9. Question Period & Business Arising

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 18h46.

2. Roll Call

No excusals are required for the final meeting of the year.

3. Approval of the Agenda

4. Consent Agenda

C. Thompson-Marchand moves to approve the agenda and items under Consent.

P. Magallanes seconds the motion.

In Favor: 15

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The agenda and all items under Consent have been approved.

5. Presentations & Guest Speakers

A) Dish Project

V. Macri: Hi, I am Vanessa Macri. I am the coordinator for the Dish Project. We lend out reusable table wear to faculty, students and staff for free. We provide a sustainable alternative for disposable dishes to enable people to reconnect with their waste. We engage our on-and-off campus communities to help them engage with their sustainability.

In April we signed a contract that came into effect in June in the amount of 24,400\$ for a five year contract. There are four years remaining. We have some metrics to go through during this presentation. We worked on growth and engagement, our outreach and engagement coordinator was amazing. We were able to use workshops, increase engagement with volunteers and the Concordia community. We had two events, the Zero Waste Week and the Waste Not Want Not composting events, screenings, workshops and successful events. We learned a lot and had a great turnout, and had the opportunity to have two internships one each semester thanks to CSU funding. Currently the whole web development team is revamping our website, and we want distribution services partner with us to help transport our dishes on-campus. That way students can book table ware for their events and distribution services can move that forward for them. I want to present some metrics, I know numbers can be a game changer with things like this. This is the amount of waste we've diverted since 2013, an upward trend from landfills every year through the use of our projects. This last year was our greatest, a 45% increase which coincides with a 45% increase in people using our services. We were able to keep track of this growth, and thanks to the funding given for my position and my own salary I was able to provide knowledge and training for more volunteers. We are confident next year we will hit 200 users. We have a 26% up in new users using the Dish Project, and roughly 80% are Concordia Users. 20% are non-Concordian users, and we charge outside communities small fees so we can put that back into the project for students.

This was the original budget we drafted for 2017-2018, and I worked with the previous Loyola Coordinator Marcus Peters on this. Most items are 1,000\$ or under, the biggest costs are coordinator salaries which are needed. We needed to hire a coordinator to keep things from falling into the cracks, and it has been uphill from there. The coordinator funding is collectively 20,000\$. The rest is for honorariums, workshops, our phone bills, website hosting, volunteer amenities, marketing and meetings, and so on. They're small amounts for running an organization. We have a breakdown here, can anyone see?

On the right hand side we have the dish lending services which the coordinator takes care of, and on the left we have the funding budget. That was what we did this year, and if you look at our expenses (which is what we base our budget on), we budgeted for a total of 197\$ as a surplus. We were right on there, and that was us being frugal. We probably should have budgeted more for certain things, that's kind of what I'm here for today.

Our fees for websites and marketing and honorariums would benefit from increased assistance. As you can see by the numbers and the things we have done that we have been unable to do before, we have had a lot of growth. We had to turn down opportunities because we were unable to meet greater demands. In addition to item replacements, telephone, contingency fund, amenities, are in the amounts of a couple hundred dollars. I want to be transparent with this request and its breakdown. The things that have changed are red, the things that haven't are in green. The biggest changes are the coordinator funding. Although we receive 15\$/hour, as an organization we need more. I did an estimate of 19\$/hr times 20\$/wk, increasing our hours from 15 to 20 to increase our annual workload. We might not use all 20 hours, but we'd like to ensure they're available in case we need them. This is the new funding request and if we put them side by side you can see the changes. The final amount I'm proposing for in our request is an increase of \$15,080. It's my proposal and my justification for the additional funding and Kamden has a motion prepared, unless there are questions?

D. Applebaum: How many hours do you have budgeted originally?

V. Macri: Fifteen for me and 10 for our General Coordinator, she would go over about 2-5 each week by trying to meet demands. We had to say no to a lot of tabling and collaboration because we created her position last year, and that position didn't exist before. We didn't anticipate the growth we'd experience and the interest in the events, we thought budgeting to increase those hours would be helpful.

M. Rossi: You increased your budget by 65%, what kind of growth are you anticipating?

V. Macri: Sustainable Concordia would fund is between 15-20 thousand dollars per year. We anticipate an even greater jump for the following year, up to 200 orders. We need to get out there even more and with additional resources we could do that.

M. Rossi: How many orders were you required to reject?

V. Macri: I don't have the exact numbers but insufficient inventory and just my hours. If my hours were up, I could go overtime as well but it's not always feasible. I want to say anywhere between 10-20% of orders could not be fulfilled.

M. Rossi: 78% comes from Concordia specifically? Do you have a breakdown of the faculties? Any faculties not being met right now?

V. Macri: I have all the different groups, and I can pull up my order list. I know JMSB and Arts and Science are very strong, Engineering a little less but recently Women in Engineering used us for the first time, and will use us for their next student association meetings. They invited us to speak over the summer.

K. Biggart presents the following motion:

“Whereas the Dish Project is a service on the SGW campus that aims “ to make events more sustainable by providing reusable dishes as a free and accessible alternative to disposable products” while “promoting the adoption of zero waste practices by providing practical resources to the greater community, encouraging people to rethink consumer culture in solidarity with those most impacted”;

Whereas the Dish Project has shown considerable growth in both their number of orders and number of new users from 2016-2018.

Whereas in order to accommodate they require additional funding to coordinate the increased demand for Dishware lending services as well as the need for increased education and outreach activities.

Be it resolved that the CSU grant an additional \$15,080 in funding to the Dish Project to be used as stipulated in their 2018-19 budget proposal.

Be it further resolved that the contract between the CSU and the Dish Project be amended to reflect the changes in funding.”

O. Riaz seconds the motion.

K. Biggart: I met with Vanessa earlier this year and it's a great project. Sometimes you don't even know they're involved with events, they have nice dishware. It's a useful service.

O. Riaz: I would also like to motivate in favor, CASA told them this year they'd cover the costs, I'd suggest you'd perhaps associate it to ASFA to use it.

D. Abrams: Are you only on SGW?

V. Macri: We're on Loyola as well, we also want to create a Loyola Coordinator internship and will be expanded in the coming year.

M. Rossi: I'd like to Dylan's point. If the other supporting governing bodies could also support it.

D. Applebaum moves to call the question.

In Favor: 16

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The motion carries.

V. Macri: Thank you for your time and voting yes!

b) Judicial Board

M. Braems: Hello I'm Mathilde Braems,

S. Mazhero: I was the former chairperson of the Judicial Board and current member; We're here today on behalf of the Judicial Board to make a request.

M. Braems: The Judicial board has the final say and their decisions affect the union profoundly. The Judicial Board requests compensation for the hard work they did during the 2017-2018 academic year. The board asks for an honorarium of 1,000\$ per member per year. And three credits per semester per member. The board asks in addition an hourly pay of 14.25\$/hour worked on election cases only. And finally the board wants to keep its former budget.

Here are the following reasons they should be compensated:

During ballot recount for example, Ballot clerks, CEO and DEO get paid for their work. The Judicial Board are required to be there but are not compensated for their work or their time. During the December 2017 recount, 3 members were required to supervise for a total of 4 hours, this semester it was 6.5 hours, and as each recount took place during the end of each semester it had negative effects on their academic performance. If it were indeed academic work it should not neglect their academic positions. They have also turned down executive positions in student clubs and so on, and we advocate for our positions not to be considered volunteer anymore.

Another reason is the special conditions of these elections. During the first semester of its mandate the board received many complaints with difficult circumstances. We received 212 emails and had to hold many last-minute meetings on request. The board has also had special meetings weekly to solve issues raised by students, clubs and elections and have been acknowledged as being professional, timely and dedicated .We have dedicated 350 hours on election cases.

S. Mazhero: I will move on to point three, the Judicial Board has received a lot of emotional pressure that has affected board members. We are aware the position demands dedication, but it has taken a higher toll on members. Two members suffer from anxiety disorders, and being scrutinized on social media for working late nights has made it difficult to function with deadlines. We had been harassed for information and people on Facebook calling us privately. We were attacked during the public hearing April 6th. We recognize we are an entity of the CSU, we are recognized as one. The Judiciary Branch of the CSU holds a crucial role and should not be undermined or discarded. Point number five, the Judicial Board was given no guidance once our mandate began. We had to find our own legal advisor and gain access to our mailbox, we had no contacts. We recognize that though it is volunteer work, with the hard nights and hearing it is no longer volunteerism. The Judicial Branch has huge impacts on the Union. Although it's stated as being important, it is not getting any recognition monetarily. Thank you for listening to us and considering our request.

M. Hafiz: Can we have it in writing? Thank you.

A. Zebiri: Was the Judicial Board notified they can send their documents beforehand? Thank you.

Chair: Before we open discussion we will wait for the documents.

M. Clark-Gardner: I would like to say I think this is a very important thing to consider, something needs to be done. You're right in that there are many pressures, especially this year. It's hard because right now we're getting a lot of things without reading them. I think we should have a discussion, but I don't want this to be a trend. You don't necessarily know the procedure, we need to have time to review things. This needs to be dealt with, it's a lot in one thing. It's a big thing to consider and we want to make sure it is done properly.

M. Hafiz: I agree. There is a lot of content here and it's important but as mentioned, you guys were notified and we need it in advance. I do want this to be tabled to next Council Meeting. We need to be well-prepared to have a good discussion with you guys.

M. Hafiz moves to table the motion to the June meeting.

J. Haas seconds the motion.

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 2

Abstained: 5

The motion to table the discussion to the June meeting carries.

Chair: Anything to add for now?

L. Sutherland: You mentioned three credits, is it written in this proposal?

M. Braems: We will update it to include that.

R. Gaudet: The next council meeting will be a new council so expect to really present this.

O. Riaz: You mean monetary credits, worth three credits? Because we can't give credits.

M. Braems: Yeah, I guess so. We thought it was a possibility.

L. Sutherland: I would suggest for things like that, to meet with the following Executive. It's important and needs to be developed as a proposal. Talk with councilors or executives, we'd be happy to help.

S. Hough-Martin: I would add that we'd love to discuss how you feel your workload could be ameliorated.

Chair: Thank you for coming. To clarify for the Judicial Board, if ever you have anything like an issue with someone using your number or anything like that, please come to us. It's not okay that Judicial Board is being harassed.

C) Refugee Sponsorship Program

Guest Speaker: I'd like to thank everyone, I'm Antoine the director of the refugee initiative.

I'm here to talk to you about the refugee sponsorship program. Before we started we studied what services are offered to refugees. What we found out is refugee services are lacking for incoming refugees in Montreal and Quebec. The English examination for admittance into university, job training and academic programs. Within our first year, we've helped over 150 refugees get admitted to Concordia. We're on our second year now and we're almost at 100 again. That's just from our English proficiency examination program alone. I'm not sure if anyone knows how refugee partnership works. The government presents two options besides asylum. One is refugees selected by the government, capped at 20,000 per year. This past year it was 40,000. Then there's the private sponsorship program where people pool resources to sponsor refugees that the PSR deems in need of assistance. That amount varies depending on age and family status. To give you an idea of how many there are in the world, there are 65.6 million. Only 0.8% have been resettled. If you can imagine, there is an abundant amount. The program was started by the Canadian government.

People have been discriminated against either because of their identity or status. Who can be sponsored includes anyone identified as a conventional refugee. We'd like a collective partnership with the CSU to sponsor refugees to come to Canada. What does that mean? One part is financial responsibility. If you were to sponsor one refugee over the age of 18, it would be around the 12,000\$ mark.

While we could apply for this independently, the amount would be small. If we entered collectively with the CSU, ambitiously we'd be able to sponsor up to 200. The CSU's part in it would be as a partner in name and offering support. All the resources we'd need to sponsor refugees would be raising funds externally and from the CSU. We'd like to ensure those we do sponsor become Concordia Students. We've been doing this for the past two years and we feel we can continue with our success.

Guest Speaker#2 (Jean Francois): In the news you hear a lot come from the US. Right now we help them with their legal processes. Inside Canada it's different. We help them find work. At the moment they wait forever for a hearing. The needs for them to find employment and get work permits, the refugee center does that at the moment. With this program what we'll be doing is to prepare for their arrival. In this program they are outside a country of origin, living where there is no war. If I'm a refugee and I have a sponsor in Montreal, for example, CSU, it takes years for them to arrive. Sometimes they need internet and so on, and we can help facilitate their integration. War is booming these days so we're not missing applicants, it's the unfortunate truth.

Guest Speaker 1: The key factor is the two-year period. It takes two years for those applications to come through. We can communicate with them with online systems, and we built partnerships with banks to help create them bank accounts. We build networks with housing organizations so they can find a place to live to attend University. Those things need time. We'd be grateful to have it to be more efficient to ensure they get their due justice. This is something the CSU has already taken a position on; it's in the positions book. This is a subject the CSU has vocalized support for, and it's something we want to do with the CSU because it would increase the quota for who we can help and two, it would increase student involvement. The amount of hours needed to ensure this goes through swiftly and smoothly especially for such a culturally diverse University would be easier with public support from the CSU.

Guest Speaker 2: A couple of weeks ago we had a family from Columbia, five people, we don't speak Spanish. We got a translator from the student population, we can show them around. They arrive with a suitcase; they don't know how to take the metro, and so on. The students help, it starts like that. At Concordia we have associations for the sponsorship programs, people from Pakistan and so on, they can raise a levy fund. It's how it can reach the student community.

Guest Speaker 1: Not to go into how it would look like, the refugee center would take on all liability. What the government expects: That you are financially liable for the refugee for the first year. There's a set amount of money given to them in stipends throughout the year on a monthly basis. To make sure no one takes advantage of them, there's a lot of that in housing. This is a safety measure for them. The refugee center would hold the whole responsibility for that, we're a continuous body, whereas the CSU changes each year. In order for a sponsorship to be approved, it would have to be approved by the CSU. A signing officer could deal with it, we can discuss that in detail if we do agree to this. We can't say we're sponsoring 200 and the CSU doesn't know about it. So it's something that would go on between the CSU and the refugee center throughout the entire process. Pierre Luc is our legal representative and has done over 400 of these cases, he is very experienced.

Guest Speaker 2: At this moment the Quebec program is suspended. There's no liability there. It might reopen in August. All in all, this program will change, there will be more regulations and it will be harder for refugees than it was before. IT will be my personal fight.

Guest Speaker 1: So right now it's closed but it will be reopening in August and that's when we hope to make our application. This is dependent on the Government approving our collective agreement. Even if we enter this agreement, it's not set in stone the government will approve it. While the Canadian refugee Initiative helps Refugees before they come to Canada, this would help them once they're here. We feel it is a more efficient way. We pinpointed placed not offered direct Visas because the government did drop the ball. A lot of people who arrived had no idea what to do, or how to apply to university. If it was not for the options presented to them through our outreach, we wouldn't have been able to change their mind. Any questions?

K. Khánh Trân: Every time you'd raise enough to bring in one refugee, you'd speak with a CSU executive and then they'd see if it'd get approved?

Guest Speaker 1: The Government wants to ensure the funding is there. The funds would go into a trust.

Guest Speaker 2: All the liability is on us and I'm the first person who's got to be over the person's file. We have to ensure for one year. To apply, you have to ensure you have those funds or what'll happen in two years someone will arrive and need welfare. We'd have a penalty of paying back the welfare. Usually it's the family who will talk to me, and say "I have a brother in Lebanon, we have 12,000\$". We put that in the trust. And for the year they arrive, they will be fine. That's usually how it works. Rarely, the problem is people question whether the person is a refugee. I don't send a demand if I am not sure. You send it to those programs to see their stances.

A. Zebiri: You get profiles from where?

Guest Speaker 1: We've been working with a bunch of organizations who have profiles and given to us based on resettlement needs. Some have been displaced from their family members and want to sponsor their families. There are many different scenarios but the government does its own background checks as well, that's why it takes two years. They do vet people extensively to ensure they are indeed refugees.

Guest Speaker 2: We don't do the security check, but when it comes to finding the refugees they generally come to us for help. When it works with one you have a domino effect of people asking how to apply.

A. Zebiri: Since you have a restricted capacity, how do you screen or discern who gets to be served first?

Guest Speaker 1: By priority? For example it's tough when you have limited spots. If we were to go into this alone we would have maybe five spots, ten if we're lucky. And then that problem would arise. If we were to go in with the CSU because of its history as a corporation, it would open up to 200 spots. We're not going to have 200 people knocking on our door, but it would help us not have the problem of prioritization.

Guest Speaker 2: If someone is disabled, their needs are through the roof so we try to accelerate it. The way it works I receive demands, and usually they're very simple. A family of four to five. Sometimes some cases are a bit more extreme, usually Lebanon, Turkey and Jordan. I also get flagged for them. But wealthier countries we vet a little, it's the most we can do for "life distress".

D. Applebaum: There's possibility for collaboration, but I'm unsure of cosigning is the position the CSU should be taking. As of right now there is no indication you'll get the funding to get the additional people. If there were a better cosigner, it might help. For people to use our resources and services as the CSU, maybe focus on the resources we can offer and seeing as new executives are coming in working closely with them. In time when you have that foundation, then maybe cosigning would come back to the table.

C. Thompson-Marchand: I'm confused what you're asking, a line to be open..?

Guest Speaker 1: the government has a private sponsorship program. You can do it independently or with other organizations cosigning allowing a set amount of spots. If we were to do it together between us, it would be a lot smaller. But collectively with the CSU, we'd get more spots. We're not asking the CSU for any financial support. We're asking for cosigning. All the financial organizing would be done by the refugee center, we ensure the funds are there before the refugee is sponsored. We'd showcase the funds have been reached and who we'd like to sponsor.

C. Thompson-Marchand: Would it be like the Guarantor? Kind of?

Guest Speaker 2: It would be us taking the responsibility. C'est "sponsor". We wouldn't show up today to bother you if we did not have the strong belief we could not handle the demands of more than five refugees, trust me. If I say we have five spots, tomorrow morning it would be full. Demand is very high for these. As a sponsor the CSU would be the name because how the government works, they need an organization with enough financial capacity and experience, existence. We're too young. If I have no basis and I take on 200 people, in the box on the refugee center, what do we got? No building, not much assets but guaranteed income. But the CSU has been there forever, in the 'worst extreme case' the CSU will have 600 bucks a month for welfare times 200 and that amount is their closing amount. The point is, it's on paper for public servants to say "I approve" for the people to be sponsored on the basis of the most extreme circumstances. We're sure we'd be fine, but we're not going to send a demand with an attorney

being checked by the syndicat, I'm not going to just sign everybody up "no problem". There's a vetting process. We wouldn't be here if we didn't think we could.

G3: We wouldn't have come if we had the services to help that many individuals on our own.

K. Khánh Trân: The CSU has no financial liability, you're just using our name in order to expand your number of applicants.

Guest Speaker 2: Not the nicest word, using, but

K. Khánh Trân: But it would allow you to make 200 applications, you're raising that money on your own. Okay.

Guest Speaker 1: No sponsorship claim would be made without CSU approval.

Guest Speaker 2: If the CSU wakes up one morning and says "I don't like that guy" and you remove that person, it's the end of it.

A. Zebiri: Dylan's not here but it's toward their point, I don't think it would trouble the refugee center to find other sponsors. There are fee levies, and they're part of the Concordia community. We have a friendly relationship we can build with them to work on this initiative to help decrease the trouble they can go through. If they want to see other sponsors again and again, it would waste the time of people in war zones.

M. Hafiz: Because it's cosigned on the sponsorship application, in terms of the individuals, what they do after the fact, are you responsible for the actions of anyone?

Guest Speaker 1: The government only requires the financials for one year.

Chair: We don't have a motion on the table right now.

A. Zebiri: The motion was sent to you.

Chair: Good!

Guest Speaker 1: We can't sponsor anyone without the CSU's approval. We'd have an automatic update each time.

Guest Speaker 2: How it works in reality it's the first time we open it, we'd have a rush. A lot of people will want to apply. Then we'd fill up to our capacity which will be depending on a lot of variables, it

rushes then we wait, and wait until the Government sends us a letter that says "accepted", it takes another year, and then they arrive. It's like they arrive one at a time. A family a month, and we have to report and so on. You'll get the full disclosure. One family takes a lot of energy and resources, family doctor, kids at school, job, rent, and so on.

O. Riaz presents the following motion:

“Whereas the refugee center has supported refugees and immigrants since its established to resettle in the Montreal community through its various services and initiatives

Whereas the Concordia Student Union passed the following positions:

** That the CSU call on the international community to work collaboratively to accommodate refugees from all parts of the world seeking asylum. [Adopted September 16, 2015]*

** That the CSU supports the efforts to institutionally address the issue of refugees and the adoption of policies at the provincial and federal level that would increase the openness of our borders in times of crisis. [Adopted September 16, 2015]*

Be it resolved that the Concordia Student Union enters in the collective sponsorship program under the Quebec government with the Canadian refugee initiative as presented on May 9th

Be it further resolved that the Concordia Student Union supports other initiatives aiming to help refugees in Canada or outside of Canada when possible

Be it further resolved that the CSU and the Refugee Center sign a contract where the Refugee center agrees to take on any legal and financial liabilities associated with this program.

Be it further resolved that the CSU is only a partner in name and will not provide any financial support.

Be it further resolved that the Refugee Center provide a copy of an account which holds sufficient amount to sponsor refugees, for the total amount, before they arrive, which cannot be used for any other purpose.”

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the motion.

O. Riaz: I think the presentation covers a lot of it; it's within our positions book to take part in initiatives such as the one presented today. There are no financial liabilities, and it's worth the CSU's support.

R. Blaisdell: If we can foresee ourselves deliberating over five minutes then we excuse the presenters and discuss before we vote, limit discussion, there's an empty classroom we can move to. We could deliberate there, it's my proposal.

Chair: A motion just came on the table so it might speed up the process. Who wants to speak to the motion?

M. Hafiz: To clarify it would be the CSU cosigning, it wouldn't be Council?

C2: You take whoever you want.

M. Hafiz: If it's Council who has to approve it, it would slow things down a lot.

Guest Speaker 2: Anybody you want, as long as you have somebody permanent.

Guest Speaker 1: To clarify, there is a general manager of the CSU who is permanent? We understood they would be responsible.

R. Gaudet: Question for Omar, was the motion they presented the same posted on Facebook?

O. Riaz: It's in the comments, the clarifications.

Chair: There is no more speakers' list; there is a vote on the motion.

In Favor: 15

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 1

The motion carries.

Chair: Any more discussion on this point? A few were on the speaker's list.

O. Riaz: It's important for us maybe, that you be notified who the signing authority would be. Do you need to know now?

Guest Speaker 2: It's not an emergency now; the second part of the process is if you want a written agreement. We checked with our lawyers, and they were fine with it. But you might want to find out. I did it with my great Aunt who is a nun in Quebec City, it takes a long time. If they're unsure of someone, they bump the undertaking. In the day to day, if they don't like a candidate they reject it.

A. Jemma: Depending if there is an agreement or not, maybe something to suggest is to get a partnership with students regarding tutoring, people good in math.

Guest Speaker 1: We already have a lot of that, it's been very helpful.

O. Riaz: The contract is not for us to say "we don't approve" of given refugees, I think it's understood but it's important that it be formalized.

Guest Speaker 1: One of the next steps is to speak with the CSU's legal counsel and ours, moving forward to ensure everything we discussed is in place.

Chair: Thank you for coming.

(At this point, Council changed rooms, to MB 3.430, and returned to session at 8:28 pm)

E) Our Turn

(Presented prior to point D)

Caitlin Salvino: I'll go through what we do, I'll probably defer more to Asma for the motion. If you have questions, feel free to ask. I'm chair of Our Turn, one of the co-founders and I am nearing the end of my mandate. The rest of the national committee will be continuing, and Asma is one of our members. Our turn is an independent survivor organization independent from other student organizations. We partner with others, but we are independent. We support anti-sexual violence efforts and take a holistic approach; prevention, support, and advocacy on the campus, provincial and federal level. At the provincial and federal level we advocate better standards, such as in BC, Ontario, Quebec, NS and PEI. I'll get into the Federal later.

We have an anti-oppressive, intersectional approach to anti-sexual violence work. We do not have a one-size fits all prevention campaign. We try to work with individual student groups, we helped the CSU and Carlton to create prevention programs. We worked in BC to present a communique to the government. I spoke about it briefly but when we talk about survivor-centrism, we try to centralize the rights and needs of survivors. We try to provide practical examples for policies, we use the term survivor based on how

people chose to self-identify. We respect that do not identify as such. Something central to our work is intersectionality, acknowledging the voices of marginalized groups and that they experience violence in higher rates and in different ways. In our policy committee on the national team, it is incredibly diverse and we are always trying to see how it could be better. If you've already heard this, I can skip ahead. But Our Turn originated similarly with what happened in Quebec, Bill 132 required all Universities to have sexual violence policies. But they did not create any minimum standards, every campus in Ontario has its own sexual violence policy, and some of them are terrible. In Quebec we're trying with Bill 151 to ensure this does not happen again. Prior to Our Turn I was involved in writing an open letter signed by student groups and hundreds of students and we were locked out and they passed the policy anyways. The language used in administrative meetings, was that there was no "appetite" for reform of bad policies. People are harmed, such as this person who was harmed in spite of these policies and left the perpetrator with the survivor for ten days. When we tried to develop policies we felt unsupported and alone, and that's where Our Turn came from. We tried to organize the student groups at Carlton, and we recognized that other groups across the country had these needs. The CSU was the first group to help and sign on, and then we toured and got other student groups as signatories. We have a nice bilingual action plan for student groups to implement prevention, support and advocacy programs. We work one on one with 29 student groups to get what they need. It can all be found online in our Action Plan. One of the models we work with, and some student unions work is Tasks Force .We created a sexual violence prevention and support hour and a half training and linked it to club funding. In order for Clubs to receive the second half of their funding, they'd need five members to complete this training. We are working on a handbook to bring to the national level, and in terms of advocacy one of the things we're most well-known for are the gradient policies. We have many partners, representing over 500,000 partners. In Quebec we work with the CSU, SSMU, AVEQ., SRC, PGSS, and we will be expanding undoubtedly in Quebec with the upcoming implementation of bill 151. The thing we're more well-known for is the Policy Score Card, measuring 45 different criteria for campus sexual violence policies. We worked with the CSU policies, grading Concordia with the worst sexual violence policy with our grading. The administration was very unhappy with this scoring. It is a point of contention at Concordia, Concordia has a policy regarding sexual violence but it also refers to the student code of conduct. For the students we work with, we need it all to be in one policy. The ability to report to police without being suspended, to have a review period less than three years, policies that define consent, that concern faculty...

S. Hough-Martin: I've been reading a lot of the policies the last weeks, the Concordia policy refers to itself as their own standalone policies.

Guest Speaker 1: And McGill does, too! It has a policy against sexual violence, but when you read it there will be six different policies to go to. It's unbelievable for someone vulnerable navigate these spaces is bad. To have it centralized and coordinated is needed. When you have a coalition of 29 student groups, it's much more powerful when we say we need a real policy. There is no policy in Canada against "stealththing" (the removal of condoms without consent), and other similar issues. We have scores on whether the people involved are trained, if they'll appoint external investigators instead of untrained Deans, I can go through everything but it is comprehensive and that's how we grade these policies and those are some key concerns. Concordia was very unhappy to say the least, it is at least not the case across the country. When we published the action plan many schools did not comment publicly but silently revised their policies. The University of Winnipeg and Manitoba went under huge upgrades. To have 45 points where a University can improve on is incredibly helpful. I don't want to take too much of your

time, but I want to validate some of the CSU has done and their efforts to make the campus a safer place. We presented at the Bill 151 community and tried to get student interests in the bill before it was passed. We were present and spoke at the press conference the CSU picked representatives for the committee for successfully. We called on the Minister of Education to come up with a plan, and called them out for purposefully excluding students for four months. We worked with McGill and Concordia's walkout. In Quebec we've been one of the few groups critical of the government in their approach to bill 151. They pass legislation without considering the nuances, so we need to continuously call them out and advocate for the best practices. This impacts Quebec but we are also pushing the federal government to budget for dealing with campus sexual violence. To fall back to the motion, it's about funding. All this work we've been doing is unpaid. All my work this summer has been unpaid. I am leaving so this would not be for me, but for the new time. Many people ask us why we're asking the CSU for this. Every student union asks "why not someone else". That's something we've struggled with. Another thing we're dealing with outside of the context of Quebec is we don't feel comfortable creating a fee for what we do. Some student groups, like those in PEI don't have the means to do that. Those trying to leave the CFS are terrified by fees, and that's understandable. The funding is to compensate some of the labour of the national committee next year. The work we do is by and large that of individuals, our committee is comprised with people who are traditionally unpaid. We have people who are marginalized, people of colour, people who are struggling to cover their other bills while doing this labour. If we could begin to compensate them it would be huge. We'd never be able to fully compensate the, but it would be a great start. I'll defer to Asma, thank you.

A. Mushtaq: Thank you for your presentation.

A. Mushtaq presents the following motion:

Whereas the CSU acknowledges the existence of rape culture on campus and commits to taking action to prevent sexual violence, support survivors and advocate for needed reforms.

Whereas the CSU holds positions to end sexual violence and has signed on to the Our Turn action plan, committing to sharing resources and accessibilizing best practices.

Whereas the Our Turn National Committee has been operating without payment for their labour in the last year.

Be it resolved that Council approve the allocation of \$13,825 to the Our Turn's national committee to ensure the continuity of its work and in recognition for the living wage.

Be it further resolved the CSU create a Student Taskforce on Sexual Violence to coordinate student efforts to create an environment free from harassment, discrimination and violence, with the following mandate:

- To speak out against behavior and practice which perpetuates rape culture such as racism and sexism, the perpetuation of rape myths

- To contribute to the prevention of, intervention in, and effective response to any form of sexual violence.

- To work collaboratively with community members towards the building of just, social and educational environments

- To engage students at large to ensure their views are reflected in the policies and processes that affect them.”

L. Sutherland seconds the motion.

A. Mushtaq: A lot was covered by Caitlin's presentation. Many people end up taking on the labour while being economically disadvantaged. It's beyond their ability to secure grants and funding in that context, looking at their personal costs in the documentation, it would be incredibly useful to assist them. Developing this work is critical, and it would cover their work. If we look at how this work has benefitted the campus, it's worth it.

R. Blaisdell: Thank you for your presentation. Your request for 13,000\$, I'm going to assume keeping in mind we're one student union. There are others who can fund as well, if you weren't asking for that funding with that in mind, how much would you actually need to cover Our Turn's expenses in total? You're only asking for us for a small piece of a pie. What is the whole thing? 13 is nothing for us. When Leyla introduced it to me, I thought it was 30,000, and I thought it needed more. Could you give us your total needs?

A. Mushtaq: Did everyone get a chance to see the budget? The last documents the Chair sent out includes its operational budget.

O. Riaz: The motion's for the 13,000\$, and 45,000\$ for the CSU, CSU BIPOC is 5,000\$, CAF fund comes out to 13,500\$, the motion read out does it cover those?

A. Mushtaq: That would be for a different component, not for what was brought to council.

O. Riaz: Because the total budget is 35,000\$, then 13,000\$ and another 13 through other channels?

A. Mushtaq: BIPOC has been approached, I'm not sure if CAF had applied to, these are not amounts that have been secured. This is the total cost at this stage, if Council could consider that it would benefit it.

O. Riaz: I understand the total cost, and that 13,000\$ is being requested, but if we did approve it would you continue to ask for 5,000\$ from BIPOC and CAF?

Guest Speaker 1: It would cover the living wage of the chair and the honorariums for the vice chairs. The rest would be for the other members of the Our Turn team and the rest would be worked on.

R. Blaisdell moves to amend to increase the amount to 25,000\$

R. Gaudet seconds the motion

R. Blaisdell: Looking at their budget, they've already explained this is a shoestring budget. This is their start-up. In order for them to feel any sort of financial security to take on new initiatives they need that cushion. Giving them 25,000\$ is very reasonable for the CSU to do. The benefits we see on this campus from supporting initiatives comes back tangible for students.

Chair: Can the amendment be considered friendly? Thank you.

The amendment is considered friendly.

A. Jemma: Not an opposition, but it went from 13,000 to 25,000, I'd like to know why.

R. Blaisdell: I'd known the budget beforehand, they explained the 13,000 covers just their personnel, Chair and Vice Chairs, nobody else included. This is three people's work and if you have 10-15-20 people working nationally that amount is nothing. I think 25,000 is minimal. Their entire budget is 35,000, and they should be growing.

D. Applebaum: The only thing I'm confused about, is it just for Quebec, Concordia Initiatives, what's the scope of this budget?

Guest Speaker 1: The labour Canada-Wide, but we work closely with Quebec. We have 2 Quebec representatives and one of our vice-chairs is based in Quebec. This work can't only just be Quebec Based. What's powerful about our work is our research and best practices from across the country. We can use different policies and provinces to make the best outcomes.

L. Sutherland: I want to speak strongly in favor of this. I brought the original motion to co-sign Our Turn. They've been a huge resource, we wouldn't have been able to do a lot of what we needed to do with tackling sexual violence without them. If we had to use other nonprofits or external sources we could have easily spent this amount of money or more, and we get the insights of people all over the country for free this whole year. We'd hope to see their work distributed across more communities and universities. We were the first to greatly benefit from Our Turn, it would be fitting to help them.

Chair: We are speaking to the amendment to increase to 25,000\$.

S. Hough-Martin: I'm in favor of what Rory is suggesting, they are asking for a very small amount. In terms of why we should do this, the CSU adopted a position on feminism 12.3: That the CSU add power to the voices of women and gender-nonconforming persons.

As already mentioned, this would go toward paying who are traditionally unpaid for these efforts.

D. Applebaum: I believe they do amazing work, but they are coming back to the CSU for additional funds and revenue sinks through BIPOC and other committees. Giving them the 13,000\$ would give them the

additional funding they need. At the base level, getting the additional funding from other universities and then coming back for additional funds to scale up. If they would receive those funds right now, they'd have their pay for the chair and two additional people. They'd already be coming back for at least 7,000\$ and you will likely get it.

A. Jemma: I believe the program is very good, I am wondering, I would like a breakdown of how much they need.

L. Sutherland: There's a document.

A. Jemma: I'm a bit confused, it says CSU 6,000\$, maybe one that is more precise?

C. Thompson-Marchand: I think the CSU should lead by example and what I'm hearing is that "oh it's a start up project; we should wait for other universities". If all universities do this, they will never get the funding they need. The work they've done only by volunteers really impresses me. I can only dream of what would happen if they got the funding they deserve.

A. Zebiri: I want to comment on what Dylan has said, I don't know if they've been on any committee that gives funding. BIPOC would consider the money we'd give them today and analyze whether the additional funding makes sense for them. It's not a problem at all. They've been working for free, if we do not support them financially their work to get other universities on board will be a big struggle.

D. Applebaum: I was speaking to the motion on increasing the amount to 25,000 not the original 13,000.

D. Abrams: How many volunteers do you have?

Guest Speaker 1: 12. We work with different student groups on the ground and we don't impose on them, a lot of this labour fell on about six people. We are trying to expand to bring more people in to make it more sustainable.

D. Applebaum: If you got the increased amount, would you reach out...how would your operations change from the original 13,000?

Guest Speaker 1: Receiving 25,000\$ would help us breathe. It's really hard, this work is really hard. Even coming here speaking to you today, every single student union is my free time. To be able to have all the labour and compensation covered would take off this burden from us so we can focus on making it sustainable moving forward and work with our student unions to figure out more. This year we wouldn't come back to the CSU, as we transition.

M. Bokesmati: We saw the example of the university whose grades improved, something I'd like to see in my grades! As a student union we are representatives of the students as we analyze their needs. It's unquestionable, the need for the upgrade for the points in Concordia University. I'd like to see this as an investment, to comment on the increase of funding. I'd like to see that as an investment with the interest of the CSU to increase our grade and have a more staunch policy in terms of affecting sexual violence on campus.

O. Riaz moves to call the question.

A. Sherra seconds the motion.

In Favor: 15

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The question has been called on the amendment.

CR: So the motion is now regarding the funding of 25,000\$.

In Favor: 12

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 4

The amendment carries.

C. Thompson-Marchand: I had a question concerning the point on the Task Force, how it would relate to the current Task Force and the Gender Advocacy Committee?

A. Mushtaq: I had mentioned it, regarding consistent representation concerning sexual violence in an intersectional manner. These are issues that are critical for students to look at, and need to be centered in an organized way. This would be different than University Task Forces, we have no control over those. We only have feedback and we have a certain timeline to address them. We need a mechanism for gathering support from students at large. Having more students sitting on a Task Force would provide direct feedback.

K. Khánh Trân: Is there a way for the CSU to have a joint task force to work with Concordia? It might be confusing for students to have two things named the same.

A. Mushtaq: If renaming it is useful for preventing the comparison, but the Concordia Task Force will end its mandate in June. They have a small scope, and a planned review to continue until the fall. For ourselves when it comes to when the University listens to the federal recommendations. An appointment we tried to have in October was rescheduled so many times is only going through this week. If we wait for the University, nothing will happen in due time. If we do it through the CSU it's securing the base and not replicating the efforts of the university.

D. Applebaum calls the question

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the call to question.

In Favor: 15

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The question has been called.

Chair: The motion on the table is the one Asma read out, regarding 25,000\$.

In Favor: 11

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 1

The motion carries.

Chair: Any more discussion for funding?

C. Thompson-Marchand: Concerning sending this motion late, I received this email at five today. It's an hour and a half before council. since it's money, it should be sent beforehand. thank you.

Chair: Thank you for coming and presenting.

Guest Speaker 1: Thank you so much. This is huge and I am excited to tell everyone.

Chair: Ahmed agreed to move their point down.

7. A) Systemic Racism

A. Zebiri presents the following motion:

Whereas the Concordia Student Union has adopted the following positions:

Adopted by Members

- *15.1 That the CSU opposes racism in all forms and rejects all values, structures and behaviors that perpetuate systemic racism;*
- *15.2 That the CSU actively works to dismantle racist systems, policies, and practices, locally and globally, including within the Union;*
- *15.3 That the CSU support anti-racist work on campus and in the broader community by actively identifying and challenging racism, and changing systems, organizational structures, policies, practices and attitudes with the goal of establishing greater equity;*

●

● 15.4 That the CSU recognizes that systemic racism differs from individual acts of racism by the presence of systemic policies, practices and economic and political structures which place minority racial and ethnic groups at a relative disadvantage.

[Adopted during the November By-Elections, 2017]

●

Adopted by the Council of Representatives

● 15.5 That the CSU oppose the rise of fascism and its current manifestation as the alt-right both locally and internationally and that the CSU support local groups which

carry a similar mandate. *[Adopted by Council of Representative on September 20th 2017]*

Whereas the Centre for Research-Action on Race Relations and other racialized individuals filed a petition to the City of Montreal to hold a public consultation on systemic racism and discrimination with the goal to adopt a comprehensive strategy to ensure diversity, equity, inclusion and to eliminate and prevent discrimination, inequality and hate in all areas of municipal life;

Whereas CRARR and the petition promoters call for concrete actions against systemic racism and discrimination that is based on intersecting grounds such as gender, disability, religion, social condition, citizenship status, sexual orientation, age and gender identity, which will have wide and positive effects on large numbers of city residents and students at all levels;

Whereas the petition has been approved by the City clerk and that the petition has gone to its second phase of the petition process;

Whereas the City Council has the discretionary authority to require the collection of 15,000 signatures in order for it to hold this consultation;

Whereas the Concordia Student Union has shown its public support to the petition on both press conferences held on February 11th and April 4th;

Be it resolved that the Concordia Student Union make a public statement of support and solidarity with CRARR, individuals and other groups advocating for the consultation;

Be it further resolved that the Concordia Student Union call on the City Council and the Executive Committee of Montreal to hold the consultation in the public statement;

Be it further resolved that the Concordia Student Union supports CRARR and the petition promoters in actively collecting the 15,000 signatures required to move this consultation forward;

Be it further resolved that the Concordia Student Union provide financial assistance and support where needed to support CRARR and petition promoters in carrying out this grassroots undertaking;

Be it further resolved that the Concordia Student Union call upon other student unions of cegeps and universities on the Island of Montreal to support this petition, to help collect signatures.”

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the motion.

A. Zebiri: At the beginning of the year the Center for Action on Race Relations and other groups filed a petition to the City of Montreal to hold a public consultation on Systemic Racism and Discrimination. Some of the key issues it would address are an accountability framework for employment equity for French and English speaking people and minorities, housing discrimination, religious discrimination for municipal zoning, and so on.

The council of the city of Montreal tried to create a committee to maneuver these issues, but it does not discuss hate crimes, zoning, targeting religious minorities, and so on. The executives of the CSU have supported the petition in press conferences, one in February and one in April. And now the city council has given the petition an official notice that they can start campaigning and forcing the campaign promoters to get 15,000 signatures from the residents of Montreal for this consultation to move forward. To disclose, I do work with the center for research on race relations. I will not be voting on this motion I am presenting. We are trying to get student unions and community groups to collect those signatures. We got support from the Dawson College Student Union and Vanier Student Union and others, officializing their support of the petition.

Chair: The speaker's list is open.

In Favor: 13

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 1

The motion carries.

Chair: We can move on.

5. D) Seventh Floor Equipment

A. Badr: I tried to report all the items to ensure what equipment we need. We concept is for the CSU lounge to be turned into a cinema type of room, so we'd have visual and audio equipment. I have posted the presentation on the council group, so I will start with the first item, the visual equipment. A laser projector, it's approximately 11,000\$. The reason why, it's laser is so we can project during daytime and make use of the CSU lounge during the opening from 10-6. We can have presentations, workshops or even movie screening. Why a laser projector, the space is large and I believe the large lounge is about 108m squared, and the smaller lounge is 16m². It's similar to the ones in classrooms here at Concordia. Different sized rooms need different projectors. The second item is a switcher, it has inputs, and 4K and HDMI inputs. You have the same in outputs and analogue. We can use anything, memory sticks, laptops, and project with it. The third item is the CD and DVD player. We can use it for wireless presentations, there is an input for internet connections and the last one is the screen itself. It's similar to what we have.

The second item is the control system for media presentation. I met someone from IITS and they told me this equipment is kind of old, they have newer versions. They made this estimate back in last year. I'm not sure about some parts, but they said it was to have more connection. On slide #12, we'd need to secure the equipment. Moving to the sound system, we have a mixer with 8 inputs. And an amplifier, speakers, we need four for the large lounge and then we have the ceiling speakers needed for the smaller lounge. Then a multi-line input for the sound system and here we have a remote control. Moving to slide #16, it's client input for Microphones. And finally the microphones themselves, six wireless ones are recommended with a receiver. Slide #18, the second receiver and slide #19 for four mics. Again, the reason why I was thinking about this project, it's a reflection on this year. The CSU had many events and booking venues was one of the biggest challenges. Most classrooms are used at peak times. Concordia turned the exclusive event rooms into classrooms. I take classrooms in rooms that fit 600 people, booked during weekdays and most of the time between 9 and 8 and in weekends they are in high demands. I have to move events or cancel them when I can't find venues. The VA cinema as well is in high demand, they are used as classrooms. The cost for them in slide #24, it's expensive especially for small groups like CSU

clubs with small budgets. Organizing events and renting the H rooms will raise their costs. H11-10 costs around 750\$. Finally, the lounge: The benefit of this equipment in the CSU is that it's accessible for everyone. We provide food and drink, we're allowed to have it there unlike classrooms. The CSU lounge is flexible, it can hold different formats of events without rental fees, available year-round. Any questions?

D. Applebaum: How did the selection process for that type of equipment? A conversation with the university or external references?

A. Badr: I had a discussion with a CSU employee, last year they said they had this project in mind and asked someone from IITS to take the measurements and work on this project. They gave us all these estimations based on the equipment they're using.

Chair: Thank you. There was no motion, correct?

A. Badr: I believe I have it on page 20, but I can read it now.

Chair: Yes, please.

A. Badr: I would like to add also, to add to this project we figured out we have 12 windows we were working on adding 12 blinds. And since the CSU lounge is an open space, we'd like curtains similar to theater curtains for privacy for workshops or whatever they would reduce the noise...going to the motion...

A. Badr presents the following motion:

“Whereas the CSU lounges is the only space that CSU has control over

Whereas the two lounges are available for booking at no cost for clubs, fee-levy, university departments, and affiliated non-Profit organization during the University's opening hours.

Whereas the recommend changes will increase the use of the Large and Small Lounges. These changes revolve around installing a permanent audio-visual system, retractable curtains to close off the area, and roller blinds to block off light.

Be it resolved that the CSU will allocate \$47,000 for the A/V system, \$10,000 for the curtains, and \$2,200 from the SSAELC fund as per as the 7th-floor renovation.”

D. Applebaum seconds the motion.

A. Badr: I believe I've said everything, if anyone has any questions?

R. Gaudet: Was this motion sent out in advance?

Chair: Do you have a written copy?

A. Badr: I posted it on the council page.

R. Blaisdell: It's just the motion not sent in advance but all the other documents are in the package, with all diagrams and equipment?

R. Gaudet: My concern was the actual number we're meant to approve.

A. Badr: If you check the Excel sheet, the total is an estimation. We'd normally get three quotes. This is only the best quote in terms of quality. 40,000\$ is our maximum, similar to what we did in the Agenda. We had 60,000 but went for 42,000.

Chair: Any other concerns?

In Favor: 10

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 5

The motion carries.

R. Blaisdell: I didn't catch this in time but I just googled a few things on the list, there's an 11,000\$ projector I found for 3,900\$ directly from the manufacturer. Can we double-check to make sure we're not being gouged? I can buy this stuff on Amazon.

A. Badr: I give the quote because the prices take into consideration the area we'd project into. There are a lot of specifics. It will be similar but different in quality.

R. Blaisdell: But this exact model, the PTEZ 590 online is a lot less. Can we double check some of this stuff so whoever we're paying isn't giving us "their" price. We could go to Panasonic and ask for their corporate rate.

A. Badr: Whenever we purchase anything above 1,000\$ we have to have 3 quotes. Having these quotes to present to finance, these were the best.

R. Blaisdell: We're not just 47,000\$ boom. Okay, thank you.

O. Riaz: I wanted to say that the University doesn't often go to the cheapest supplier. For example expensive items like the projector the four first through things we can probably order ourselves and ask them to install it.

Chair: If there's no further discussion, we can move on to Executive Salaries.

7. D) Executive Salaries

L. Sutherland: I am going to present an updated motion, so I'll share it to the Council Group.

L. Sutherland presents the following motion:

“Whereas CSU executives are currently paid a yearly salary of \$27,063.66 before taxes;

Whereas this amount to a biweekly salary of \$1,040.91 or 13.01/hour for a 40 hour week (before taxes);

Whereas the CSU took a position for a living wage which specifically excluded executives from being payed a living wage (currently \$15.44);

Whereas executives' pay should reflect the same standard of pay held by the union;

Whereas the current pay does not reflect the positions of the CSU or the demanding nature of the role of an executive;

Be it resolved that the executive salary be raised to \$34 074, which would reflect the IRIS recommendation for living salary for a person with 1 dependent, which would amount to the equivalent of \$1310.54 biweekly or \$16.38/hour for a 40 hour week (before taxes);

Be it further resolved that this increase be retroactive for the 6 months previous to the passing of the motion.

Be it further resolved that the Policy Committee be mandated to re-evaluate the bonus system as it currently stands.

Be it further resolved that the Policy Committee be mandated to assess other potential costs-of-living not reflected in the current salary structure.

Be it further resolved that the executive salary be re-evaluated on a yearly basis.”

D. Ellis-Darity seconds the motion.

L. Sutherland: I have spoken about this several times over the year, that the CSU positions on living wages do not extend to Executives. We'd need to amend the time the retroactive payment accounts for, and the total amounts.

K. Khánh Trân: Why is it only retroactive for six months but not your whole mandate?

L. Sutherland: We spoke about it. There were some concerns about what that amounted to overall. That's something that can be discussed as a Council.

D. Applebaum: My concern with this is that this motion has been changed to get votes on Council. You changed it to make it more acceptable. If we're not accepting of the whole course of the mandate, I don't think we can change the details. If we believe a living wage is what we deserve, we shouldn't finagle* to alter it to make it more acceptable.

Chair: Finagle isn't the bad word, "you" is!

R. Blaisdell: I know it's been brought up before about the number of hours every executive works and recording hour sheets, you have used the 40 hours a week for full-time, is that what is being reflective across the executive? Do you have the average? Some people work 80 and some people 10? The living wage based on a 40 hour work week. Someone mentioned that you did have that data.

L. Sutherland: That project did not continue throughout the whole year due to a lack of participating on certain executives parts. I broke it down by hourly wage, not by salary. All the positions are understood to be full time positions, so a living wage salary would need to be reflected.

D. Applebaum moves to amend the '6 months' to '12 months', or the whole mandate.

J. Haas seconds the motion.

D. Applebaum: If we take the stance the living wage should apply to the work of executives, it should apply throughout.

L. Sutherland: It changes no figures on the sheet, but it would change the total amounts retroactively. It changes no numbers.

D. Applebaum: It doesn't change the 34,000\$?

L. Sutherland: The retroactive amount is not in the motion so it wouldn't need to be changed.

R. Blaisdell: What do we do for executives who are no longer in office, are we prorating or adjudicating based on the number of hours they put into the job? Open question.

V. Rydzewski: This would include the ex-finance coordinator who still worked and deserves their pay.

O. Riaz: It should be, the Finance coordinator was not dismissed and it would apply to the incoming finance coordinator for the time they've worked.

D. Applebaum: You're considering that you're paid a salary but you're paid on a contract basis, your salary is not dependent on the number of hours worked?

Chair: It's the executive as a whole, please.

O. Riaz: I think your assumption is correct, but it is not that anyone worked less than the 30 hour minimal. The things we can see add to a substantial amount of hours, plus committees and office hours and so on.

Chair: The amendment on the floor is to change from six months to twelve.

R. Blaisdell: I don't disagree with the living wage intention behind this, my only sticking point here is that if we're moving to a system that expects or that is based on a 40 hour work week, maybe not for the previous mandate giving them the benefit of the doubt, moving forward, I know that some people work different schedules it's fine. But we know there are executives who are in their offices more than others, and some who are not. Paying them a salary, I get that, what do we do if one executive is not chipping in but grazing by with another picking up the slack? That happens. That's my concern, I don't know how to amend or fix this right now but I do have a concern paying people 40 hours a week.

S. Hough-Martin: I'm in a weird situation where I am in incoming executive and current councilor. Regarding being held accountable, I think that's super important. Something that's really important to consider with salaried work, it's important to have accountability. It's council-elect's job going forward. Executive reports might be key moving forward, I don't know if this is the motion to find a way to hold people accountable but we should consider it moving forward.

Mikaela: I greatly agree there needs to be something in place where people are held accountable, it's very tricky. I also feel the same way, certain executives work harder than others and something needs to be in place. The timing of this motion is a little bit bizarre, it's last minute and I know it's been worked on for the entire year. The fact that I know certain executives work more than others, and we didn't have a lot of time to think about this. This is the last Council, I am in agreement with six months about I hesitate on twelve.

V. Rydzewski: For accountability for future executives to log their hours to Council is a good idea to consider.

A. Mushtaq: To address the point about accountability, there are HR practices and firms that specialize with these things. There's a fine line between micromanaging and accountability. It needs to be thought through. There needs to be proper policies and documentations, not on the back of another proposal. There are conversations with the General Manager and an impending meeting with a firm to get them to

work on that. It might be one way of doing it, just as good to explore. This is a point that needs addressing on more than a salary basis and needs weight in an equitable manner, having spoken to previous CSU members.

Chair: We are on the amendment.

D. Applebaum: I want to make sure that when we vote on it, we think about the practicality. We are saying we want to increase the salary because we want them to be paid a living wage for what they've done. In the same context, why would we only pay them for half the year? We're saying they should be paid that, we shouldn't say "Oh sorry, we're only paying you half the year we think you deserve a living wage".

R. Blaisdell: First, let's be clear. This living wage is based on the hours estimate of the work week. If you made an assumption that an assumption is working 20 hours a week due to their course load and working part time, this is no longer "not a living wage". I agree with the intention, but it has to be commensurate with hours worked. If someone has worked 60 hours a week, they should be compensated with a Living Hourly Wage for those hours worked. The one thing we need to keep in mind here is we also give executive bonuses. I don't like 12 months all in one go, it does not sit well with me. But we can consider we've given very low bonuses, and we can use that bonus buffer for executives who have worked that extra time to pay for those other six months. I don't like that blanket 12 months for everybody and then bonuses on top of that. I think we should use the bonuses as middle ground of compensation.

L. Sutherland: It's important we're all on the same page that the executive role is supposedly a full time job. If we're going to talk about hours, that is not about living wages. It doesn't make sense to talk about whether or not to consider this job full time, they're important but separate and different conversations. I mentioned the bonuses structure in the motion specifically because I think it's, even though it boils down to potentially the same amount of money. It doesn't make sense that a job is only a living wage based on a bonus. If someone were to leave, their bonus would be in question. A bonus is a bonus, it's not part of a living wage. Nobody is paid a bonus to reach a living wage. Perhaps this year is an exception depending on how Council wants to go ahead, but it's a problem.

R. Gaudet moves to call the question.

J. Haas seconds the motion.

In Favor: 14

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The question has been called.

Chair: We are voting on the amendment.

In Favor: 10

Opposed: 1

Abstained: 3

The amendment has been adopted.

O. Riaz: Something Veronika mentioned for hours to be logged and presented, AVEQ does that and from experience I would advocate to be used next year in addition to executive reports.

D. Abrams: I wanna respond to something Sophie said. Even if the people have no bias at all, there's some conscious bias in the sense that there are people who are going to become executives in the room that I don't think should be able to vote on this.

Chair: Council is council now. Nobody can force anyone morally to vote. It's up to you whether you should or shouldn't.

D. Abrams: Then I rescind.

D. Applebaum: Now we have to have the conversation of whether it's a true salary or a contract. When they're voted in, they're voted in on a contract. They're not getting paid by the hour. There are people here who probably did work 60 hours a week. They should be compensated. But we're trying to put a "salary per hour" in a contract environment. When we looked at the individuals who ran in different slates, last year, not this year, people ran on the assumption that wages would decrease for executives and certain people were voted in for that reason. And now we have the argument that the salary would increase? Our students voted for a platform of not increasing salaries.

V. Rydzewski, L. Sutherland: Whose platform?

Chair: This isn't a point of information.

R. Gaudet: I want to bring up something I take big issues with how it was brought to Council. It should have been sent Friday and the Executive has had all year to put this forward. It should come at any point, the night before the last council meeting; suddenly asking for a 10,000 retroactive pay increase...it looks bad. It hasn't been filtered through committee discussions. It has been discussed between CSU members; it will look like something to the student body. It looks like we're handing cash off to the executive, it looks non-transparent. I agree we should pay the living wage and increasing the bonuses. The 10% is small, all good ideas. Retroactively decreasing in a last-minute motion a year-long salary. It looks unprofessional and it looks sketchy. I am not comfortable with the CSU doing this.

K. Khánh Trân: We're discussing salaries? Thank you.

L. Sutherland: I want to acknowledge that the timing optically is bad and I understand that. What is being requested is a living wage. If it is being done in a way that is transparent, I have spoken about this all year. It shouldn't come as a surprise that this is being discussed. I understand the motion was sent out late, and that it can look sketchy during the last meeting, but if the CSU's position to pay a living wage, the

decision not to because of timing wouldn't change the principle. Either you agree with the intention or you don't, and if you do you should be able to defend that as a councilor to your peers.

A. Badr: I believe it's a matter of my memory, it's not the first time we discussed this. We discussed it as an informed point. I can't remember, either January or February and we mentioned we were working on this process. We wanted to review executive salaries, and the timing just for everyone, we just finished our finals and some of us are finishing degrees. I had many projects I was taking care of, and I didn't postpone them. I can't postpone my classes or projects or finals. It was the least important project for us, although it's important to recognize we get paid less than staff. We're demanding a living wage, not a luxury.

D. Applebaum: I have to agree it will look bad in timing, there isn't a lot of time between when we got the original motion, and I don't think we can adequately defend this. They'll ask "how many hours do they work", how do we answer that? They'll ask a lot about bonuses, twelve months, they'll bring up those things to make it difficult. When the Judicial Board came to us asking for their needs, we said as a board "whoa this is very last minute", it didn't run through our channels and it's almost the same situation here.

R. Blaisdell: Maybe this is a point of order, who was the first mover on the amendment to increase to twelve months?

Chair: Dylan was.

R. Blaisdell: So Dylan was. So Dylan can you explain what you just said, I really don't understand what position you're voicing on this.

D. Applebaum: The original position on increasing to twelve months based on the Living Wage without changing the motion to make it more acceptable, the original one had twelve months. My stance on that was we should not change the number, if we should do a living wage it should be fully retroactive as a separate point. It was my argument.

R. Gaudet: I want to move into the discussion of the difference between salary and bonus. First off, to be clear the salary of next year's executive will be decided in June when they do the budget. Whether or not this is passed, whether next council follows this is at their whim. I get the idea of wanting to put this forward, but it doesn't stand for anything. I agree with a lot of these points about Policy Committee be demanded to re-evaluate this, it makes sense. There are fair concerns about living wage, it doesn't force anything for next year. If changing the salary now doesn't make much of a difference for this year versus a bigger bonus instead of a retroactive salary. If the executives want to demand a living wage while deciding bonuses, retroactively increasing salaries is a weird way around it, to me.

A. Jemma: I believe it is never too late, as a matter of principle. Everyone must be paid a living wage, maybe in terms of bonuses; maybe it would be more transparent.

L. Sutherland: I think there is a very large difference between a bonus and a living wage. A living wage indicates you would be paid that amount because you worked that amount; a bonus is an evaluation on the quality of your work. There are many choices that we make in the budget over this year that help incoming teams decide their budget lines. That is how finance coordinators help each other. As things are increased and decreased during budget presentations I don't see a situation in which it would not make sense, that it wouldn't be able to be carried over to other councils as it is in conjunction with the CSU's living wage mandate. It's a strange way to operate; it sets a bad dynamic if an executive's work is only a living wage based on Council's determination. No member of council sits and watches us work, if we have a position on a living wage that is only supported by the whim of Council it questions whether they should receive a living wage.

C. Thompson-Marchand: I'd like to point out the weird or sketchy practice of strongly advocating for a living wage and then pulling the rug under their feet. I will agree with Leyla concerning the difference between a living wage and bonuses. From my point of view it is a much better to give a retroactive living wage than bonuses. It's just clearer. It's not a living wage what we have right now and we have positions on this. What we don't have is that in bonuses.

A. Sherra: I find it troubling that a lot of people agree with living wage but are afraid to go to the student body okay; we gave these people a living wage. You should be proud of that. I don't understand. That we have principles we do not abide by is troubling.

K. Khánh Trân: I don't know who tried to compare an executive from the CSU from the Judicial Board. An Executive from the CSU to work part time on top of that, to compare the Judicial Board to CSU work. It's been brought up before. This is the last meeting, but when else could it have been brought up? Leyla has talked about this consistently throughout all the meetings. This is tying up loose ends, there is nothing sketchy about it. We're supposed to end the year and we took a stand on living wages. For anyone else working under the CSU roof, the Executive team is part of that and it's only fair.

A. Mushtaq: I would reiterate many of the points made, so many of the conversations on the Living wage are about forms and complaints about work efforts. If we brought up the context of salaries and the original contexts of living wages, those conversations should be kept apart to keep those intentions intact. We should understand what a living wage is, our stances on unpaid internships. We started our mandate and we have positions. If we focus on the issue of pay, then other issues like bonuses can be dealt with practice and mechanisms like tracking hours. Putting this all back in a pot and stirring it is cyclical. We can move ahead.

M. Hafiz: I know there were some points about optics, I'd really like to clarify something that in terms of justification to the students: This is a very reasonable justification. Students can be informed this is for

living wage. "Bonuses" are time and time again are the worst ways to do this. Bombardier was scrutinized for this. Bonuses for executives isn't good, why did we increase a living wage if we were going to give bonuses? They should be completely separate. This is retroactive pay, that's it that's all, it's fine. If you increase bonuses, THAT creates precedence. This is consistent, it stands, it stays years and years as a salary increase. That's it.

D. Applebaum moves to call the question.

J. Haas seconds the motion.

In Favor: 13

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 1

The question has been called.

Chair: With the six months changed to twelve, we can vote on the main motion.

In Favor: 8

Opposed: 3

Abstained: 5

The motion passes.

S. Hough Martin, M. Clark-Gardner, C. Thompson Marchand's votes of Abstention have been noted.

A. Jemma: Maybe instead of 12 months we can say until the end of their mandate.

Chair: It's already been passed.

A. Jemma: Maybe they won't stay the whole time.

Chair: There's only two more weeks. So with that, we can move on.

7. C) Executive Bonuses

V. Ryzewski moves to move into closed session.

O. Riaz seconds the motion.

In Favor: 14

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The meeting is now in closed session, as of 10:12pm.

The Executive has voluntarily exited for the duration of Closed Session.

M. Clark-Gardner moves that Leyla Sutherland, Veronika Rydzewski and Kamden Biggart receive a bonus of 10% of their pay.

R. Blaisdell seconds the motion.

In Favor: 13

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 3

The motion carries.

R. Blaisdell presents the following motion:

"Given that Leyla, Kamden and Veronika performed double the role of an expected CSU executive, Given that Omar and Soulaymane El Alaoui fulfilled none of their projects during their mandates and underperformed their duties as expected, with no exceptional work,

Be it resolved the CSU give Omar Riaz and Soulaymane a 0% bonus."

A. Sherra seconds the motion.

In Favor: 10

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 6

The motion carries.

M. Clark-Gardner moves to give A. Mushtaq, D. Ellis-Darity and G. Polanco a 5% bonus.

J. Haas seconds the motion.

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 3

Abstained: 3

The motion carries.

The meeting returns to open session.

7. D) Chair and Minute-Keeper Pay

K. Biggart presents the following motion:

“Whereas the Finance Committee reviewed the honorarium for the Chairperson and Minute Keeper based on the standing regulations and requisitions submitted by the chair.

Whereas the committee recommends adopting a fixed amount of honorarium for regular and special council meetings.

Be it resolved that the honorarium for the minute keeper be \$100 for both regular and special council meetings.

Be it further resolved that the honorarium for the chairperson be \$250 for regular and \$200 special council meetings.

Be it further resolved that Chapter 3 Section 2 #13 and Chapter 3 Section 3 #15 in the standing regulations be amended to reflect these changes.”

A. Sherra seconds the motion

K. Biggart: This was something on the Agenda month after month, Finance Committee met and discussed it and this is what we came up with. It's in the finance committee report.

In Favor: 11

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The motion carries.

7. F) CSU Student Care Letter

V. Rydzewski presents the following motion:

In order to clarify the situation, Be It Resolved we issue the following letter:

“Dear StudentCare,

The motions passed at the CSU Council of Representatives on September 20th 2017 regarding the SUDS Conference and the BC trip is a matter of internal disclosure policy that was not followed by Omar Riaz and Soulaymane El Alaoui as officers of the corporation.


The policy states that officers of the union must disclose and describe any and all gifts or sponsorship received courtesy of their position at the Union and that the Council of Representatives has the final approval on whether they can be accepted or not, all the while taking into consideration the Positions Book.

Additionally, the two officers of the Union had a legal duty to disclose all such information under the Civil Code of Quebec, Canadian Business Corporation Act, and the Quebec Business Corporation Act.

Omar Riaz and Soulaymane El Alaoui did not follow the disclosure policy, and as a result, were reprimanded by the CSU Council of Representatives.

The travel sponsorship provided by StudentCare was offered to the CSU as an organization, not to the individuals in their personal capacity; however, as noted above: They did not follow internal procedures in selecting themselves as the beneficiaries of this sponsorship. The motions are internal and do not suggest or imply wrongdoing on the part of StudentCare or Lev Bukhman, Founder and CEO.

Sincerely,



Veronika Rydzewski
Internal Affairs Coordinator
Concordia Student Union ”

A. Sherra seconds the motion

V. Rydzewski: This is a letter explaining the situation at Council, we didn't accuse Lev Bukhman of anything in the Suds Report. It was about the procedural problems.

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 3

The motion carries.

7. G) CEO

A. Sherra presents the following motion:

Whereas the CEO has failed at their duties.

Whereas the CEO has failed to give public access to information and reports relating to election regulations.

Whereas the CEO has refused to report in person at any public event including council.

Whereas the CEO has removed, and destroyed Art worth \$10,000 in the VA building.

Whereas the CEO has held very few office hours

Whereas the CEO has re-hired a DEO that was busy with another job.

Whereas the CEO has asked for pay over the original honorarium, when they were given an honorarium not a salary.

Be it resolved that the CEO is dismissed from their current position as the Chief Electoral Officer of the Concordia Student Union.”

R. Blaisdell seconds the motion.

R. Gaudet: Point of order, can you clarify where we get the regulations from? I think it's Article 2.77?
The Chair should check.

R. Blaisdell moves to amend to notwithstanding the standing regulations.

R. Gaudet seconds the amendment.

The amendment is considered friendly.

A. Sherra: We are not happy with the job done, and a lot of students are very upset with them. It was a mess during the whole elections. I think they should be removed from their position, if we don't they will continue their job next year.

K. Biggart: I think we should also put in a stipulation about when they should be notified and they have unsubmitted pays, if it's effective now we inform them immediately.

S. Hough-Martin: Can we mandate that they're terminated as soon as they submit the official election results, which haven't been released.

D. Applebaum: When we talked about their pay, there were two stipulations for additional amounts, did they?

Chair: It was a draft because there were issues with booking rooms for the recount. They submitted everything with the exception of the recount, I have not heard the results despite having emailed them after the sixth. The official results post-recount have not been release.

P. Magallanes: I don't think we'll be notified about the recount, if there was a recount that the ballots affected things, we'd know.

M. Clark-Gardner: There was one, we were not notified. It happened on May 6th.

R. Blaisdell: Him not performing his job correctly does not mean we should pay for the added time to fix those mistakes. I'm completely against that.

S. Hough-Martin: I have a question. If we terminate the CEO right now and they disappear with the official results, what do we do? Our mandate starts June first and we're not officially reelected, is my question.

Chair: The standing regulations offer some options. We could hire an interim CEO, Council could re-hire a CEO which would require a callout and so on. Judicial Board has to oversee the recount, that's why it took so long. If you let me confirm if Judicial Board minus the CEO we could do it, but I'd have to check.

M. Clark-Gardner: Someone else could write the report. The results are done, we can get somebody else, maybe the DEO to write the report.

R. Gaudet: Do we have...does someone other than the CEO have the results? Was Judicial board there?

M. Clark-Gardner: We haven't been notified, it's ridiculous.

R. Gaudet: Worst case scenario, we can update it. It's already drafted.

R. Blaisdell: Is there some way, we could have them do the work that's still required and then fire them?

Chair: This is all open session. There is no date for the termination, you could say "at the end of the mandate of the council". In past years it was "recommended" that the CEO resign themselves. At this point I, not since my six years being here have I seen a CEO be "terminated" per se. That's different. It depends what time frame Council wants to put on the motion.

R. Gaudet moves to amend the motion to say "at the end of this CSU mandate".

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the amendment

R. Gaudet: It allows the CEO to finish the job, but if people want to terminate them immediately that can work too.

R. Blaisdell: Can we let them try to finish their job, once they submit the results the reply back is...well. It's conditional. We tie the termination to the results. We don't need to put a date. We can just say "once this has been completed". It doesn't need to be rude, their job is over.

Chair: Can that be considered friendly; instead of May 31st it is "when they submit their report".

The amendment is considered friendly.

S. Hough-Martin: To motivate a little bit, as someone who has been disqualified twice and had Judicial Board overturn twice overturn the CEO for ridiculous reasons, due to a misunderstanding of the basic tenets of the standing regulations. When corrected or when the regulations were brought up as to why the CEO might be mistaken, they'd double down on these presumptions that were made. The fact that the CEO unilaterally decided they could censor the student press, that the CEO decided that they could decide who was in the room for ballot counting or not, just kind of baffled me entirely after elections the CEO had to be chased down literally, for anything. Not just by candidates, anyone. And never in person came to Council to account for any of the misunderstandings or mishaps is unacceptable for someone in that position. The condescension, derogatory nature of conversations with this individual, being talked down to, the fact that my entire slate was disqualified mid-way through ballot counting when we won with the most votes. For something we had nothing to do with, no evidence, with regulations stipulating evidence needs to be provided, this individual lacks competency befitting anyone in this role. They should have been fired long before this point in time.

D. Applebaum: The CEO sounds like a certain president, that is all.

A. Sherra: I want to connect what the CEO has been doing with the Judicial board with why Judicial Board came and complained. It's clearly because the person in the middle isn't doing their job. 212 emails is a lot of emails.

Chair: Council can move to a vote. There's a notwithstanding, we need a 2/3rds mark.

In Favor: 8

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 5

The motion carries.

7. I) Fund Committee Report

O. Riaz moves to approve the Fund Committee Report

D. Applebaum seconds the motion

O. Riaz: They have to make a report every year. About a million for the daycare, 200,000 for the HOJO renovation, appliances for the daycare, and more funding for SUCCR. We got feedback last night from them, we'll have a meeting at the end of this month to approve it, otherwise it would go to referendum.

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 1

The fund committee report has been approved.

8. New Business – Informational

a) Sustainability Coordinator Report

R. Gaudet: I realize these need to be approved, so I made a mistake pulling them.

R. Gaudet moves to approve the report.

C. Thompson-Marchand seconds the motion.

R. Gaudet: It was sent to Council an hour before Council started. So the Sustainability Coordinator, it's the same for everyone involved to briefly outline the report for good practice.

O. Riaz moves to omnibus to cover all the reports under the header.

O. Riaz: This is covering stuff from after the final report, after April 30th. There's an update on the Daycare, we've shortlisted manager candidates. There was a structural problem with the roof which the University will cover. The board has been presented with two layouts for the back yard. We've finalized the archival digital documents policy, during the RCM we'll need as motion to approve those policies. The fund committee met to ratify the SUCCR funding. We got the information needed for that yesterday, and we will start the training for General Coordinator Elect. That is all.

D. Ellis-Darity: I went over the projects I completed and which I am still finishing up. There are some ongoing, like the recycling station. In my mid-mandate report they wouldn't be designed, but they got funding so they will be ready for September. It's exciting, and going over things I've completed but that still need to be done, and an update on the boards I was sitting on.

R. Blaisdell: Maybe we should have gone over reports before talking about bonuses as a procedural comment.

R. Gaudet: Would Asma like to go over theirs?

A. Mushtaq: I have written reports on the committee and caucus meetings. I also covered the web conference we delivered for two hours about our action plan against sexual violence on campus and we are the only group who sit on the Minister of education's advisory committee for Bill 151, and I mentioned the AVEQ board, the daycare meeting, the equipment which the General Coordinator which has alluded to, the retreat at the end of the year between the 23rd and 25th which overlaps the date of the other committee's retreat. This involves a flight costs, I approached the board to see if it's an issue. It's the most sensible option given the route. For undergraduate bursaries, they were missing ten of the applications and caused caucus to go into closed session and caused them to approve some of them. We're over going the rate of distribution for 2017-2017, expected to take about 2 sessions. We have many more than we had last year. There's the breakdown of the last committee meeting of the year, the CSU's annual general meeting covered in the report. There are mentions of the advocacy center coordinator dealing with accusations of misconduct while we were left out of the process. And there is mention of consultation. At the moment this needs to be investigated, and our in-house IT person does not have the IT knowhow and outsourcing might cost us 300\$ an hour. There are other things not suited to a report but are worth discussing.

In Favor: 13

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

The motion carries.

9. Question Period & Business Arising

A. Sherra: I have a question for the general coordinator, about the website. I don't understand how the new website isn't ready. The back image, the word press theme, pages not working. Clubs not being able to access their pages to reapply, none of the updated stuff is available; none of the executives know the password for the website to update things. When will that be finalized?

O. Riaz: I also do not have the password.

A. Sherra: I'm asking you.

O. Riaz: We are meeting with the person who made the website, to get that information and update it. The employees who deal with the website have brought that to my attention. A lot of the issues are between the developer and IT being unable to work coherently. The front put there is by the lead graphic designer, it is not a stock photo. We can change it if you like. It is a stock photo but we left it there because it goes along with the school vibes.

A. Sherra: I've asked and they've said no.

10. Announcements

R. Blaisdell: It's summer time!

L. Sutherland: It's after midnight; you can take a cab home.

A. Sherra: Thank you so much!

R. Blaisdell: Next Friday during senate there was supposed to be an e-Concordia session that might be interesting to you. Message any of us senators.

A. Jenna: I would like to thank everyone in this room; it was a good experience to work with you.

Chair: I would like to thank you all as well. There's council elect next week.

C. Thompson-Marchand moves to adjourn at 12h31 am.