Board of Directors Regular Meeting

Regular Session:

Territorial Acknowledgement

Pursuant to Federation Policy 50, Indigenous Engagement and Inclusivity, the Federation's Board of Directors acknowledge:

The University of Waterloo is on the traditional territory of the Neutral, Anishnaabeg, and Haudenosaunee peoples. The University of Waterloo is situated on the Haldimand Tract, land promised to the Six Nations, which includes six miles on each side of the Grand River.

Approval of Meetings

MOTION: Be it resolved that the Board approves the minutes of the special meeting held on July 27th, 2018 (SpecialMeeting_July_27th_2018.pdf) and the regular meeting on July 18th, 2018 (Public_July_18th_2018.pdf).

Executive Updates

FOR INFORMATION: Be it resolved that the Board receives the following verbal reports:

- Vice President Education (Gerrits)
- Vice President Student Life (Richardson)
- Vice President Operations & Finance (MacMillan)
- President (Wu)

Business Arising from the Minutes

MOTION: Be it resolved that the Board approves the Executive Action Plans. — Seneca Velling

- Education Action Plan (VP Education Action Plan.docx)

FOR INFORMATION: Communication for Fee Changes — Connor Plante & Kurt MacMillan

General Orders


DISCUSSION: Proposed Board procedure to comply with Policy 51, Value-for-Money. — Seneca Velling & Connor Plante

MOTION: Be it resolved that the Board adopts the Board Annual Plan and tasks the Chair and President to seek Council consultation on the same. — Richard Wu & Seneca Velling

Other Business
Federation of Students’ Board of Directors’ Minutes

SLC 1106, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

Chair: President Wu  Secretary: Chairperson Velling

ATTENDANCE

The following members were present:

- Wu, Richard
- MacMillan, Kurt
- Richardson, Savannah
- Gerrits, Matthew
- Beauchemin, Michael†
- Sesink, Hannah
- Burdett, Suzanne
- Velling, Seneca*
- Plante, Connor*
- Siemons, Jacob*
- Patricia, Duong*†

* remote
† late

The following members were absent:

- Tran, Tomson*

* regrets

PRELIMINARIES

CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, President Wu called the meeting to order at 17:04.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Be it resolved that the Board approves the minutes of the meeting held on May 31st, 2018 and June 21st, 2018.

Vice President, Richardson and Director Sesink.

Vice President, Richardson expressed concern that she may not have heard people’s names correctly while she was recording minutes at the prior meeting on behalf of Secretary Tran.
Director Plante noted he read the minutes and to his recollection had no inconsistencies with what was said by those members over the phone.

Michael arrived.

*Secretary’s Note:* Video conferencing connection was lost; the President switched to teleconferencing instead.

Connection being re-established, Director Plante re-iterated that where his name occurred, the minutes were an accurate reflection of debate. Other Directors who had teleconferenced in the prior meetings agreed and spoke to the accuracy of the minutes.

Director Beauchemin noted some minor technical and editorial changes were required, but that if made he would support the approval of minutes. These changes were the following:

- May minutes: on page two (2), was 'undergoing our membership review' correct? Chairperson Velling noted this was correct and that we were undergoing review of membership in Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance.
- May Minutes: on page five (5), typos 'Younghad' should be replaced with 'Duong had' to correct the proper legal name of the Director and the formatting.
- June minutes: page seven (7), 'Elected by their consistencies', the spelling of constituency is incorrect.

Chairperson Velling notified the Board these changes would be made with Secretary Tran. Vice President, Gerrits requested use of the term “Speaker” in the header to be changed going forward to “Chair” to reflect the appropriate position. Vice President, Gerrits additionally requested clarification that the minutes note the GRT Memorandum was intended for the Chair of the Board, not for Board at large, but that Chairperson Velling said he would send it to Directors.

Motion carries unanimously.

**Regular Session**

**EXECUTIVE REPORTS**

**Vice President of Education (Gerrits)**

Vice President, Gerrits informed the Board there was little of significance to report to Board. He explained that Vice President, Operations and Finance would likely address any GRT updates, as he has now taken over in this regard. The Vice President, Education is still assisting the Vice President, Operations and Finance with the GRT UPASS renegotiation as needd.

Vice President, Gerrits has also begun discussions with Registrar’s Office for greater clarity and agreement between the Office and the Federation as to sending out information
and emails to our membership. He noted that as an independent organization Feds wants dependable access to contact our membership. Director Plante inquired if currently the Registrar has to approve any communications Feds wishes to have sent out and whether the hope is greater autonomy over our own communications in the long run. The Vice President, Education indicated that yes this was the case with respect to mass communications to undergraduate students via the Registrar’s Office. He also noted that the hope is to have an agreement and common understanding about what the organization’s relationship with the Registrar will look like. Vice President, Gerrits highlighted the Registrar’s concerns regarding undue over-messaging of students, as this is a matter their office has been attempting to reduce for some time now. He also stated the process is moving slowly for now as the University has many staff on vacation this time of year.

Vice President of Student Life (Richardson)

Vice President, Richardson has been working on increasing and assessing successes in campus engagement—this has been spearheaded by initial meetings with departments in Feds for provision of services and events support to on campus and satellite campus partners. She has also met with campus stakeholders to understand what they need in the way of support.

The Vice President, Student Life indicated she had visited the Pharmacy School at the Kitchener Campus to see how Feds could expand our student-run services and campus life support there. Vice President, Richardson also noted that the President would perform a similar visit on her behalf at the Architecture campus shortly.

Last but not least, the Vice President, Student Life informed the Board that she is conducting research on other student unions volunteer appreciation best practices. This research gathering has so far included but has not been limited to: what other student unions are doing event wise, recognition of volunteers, and how honoraria is awarded and administered.

Vice President of Operations and Finance (MacMillan)

The Vice President, Operations and Finance notified the Board he has taken the lead on the GRT negotiations and is steadily working toward amendments on the current agreement which he believes will rectify concerns of students ineligible to use the buses. Vice President, MacMillan believes the implementation of the amended agreement is unlikely for Fall, but that he hoped it may be prepared in time.

He further spoke to a planned promotional event "Faculty 101 day" which was a huge hit for services and engaged/informed first year students about the Feds services.

Another program he is initiating, known as 'Fifth Quarter', will be started to help achieve long range goals in promoting school spirit and Warrior pride through support of the football team. A director inquired if the program and its events would be subsidized by student fees or whether it was independently paid for. The Vice President, Operations and Finance noted that on the contrary the events were expected to be a large revenue-generator. Vice President, MacMillan emphasized that each planned event is expected
to bring in substantial revenue with over 200 patrons per event.

**President (Wu)**

The President reported that quite a bit has occurred in the last month. He is advancing his goals for the year. In an effort to understand bystander engagement better for his action plan, he participated in the Upstander program at Western University to learn about bystander intervention. The summit at Western was to share best practices so other student unions could learn what is successful. He is now working with the Stakeholder relations manager to do outreach to Dons and Rez to do better outreach on this topic for first years as well.

President Wu updated the Board that the General Meeting and Council Task Force has met twice thus far and had broken into working groups to address their tasks.

With respect to his action plan, the President apologized to the Board and requested extra time for his plan preparation. He informed the body that producing the plan is a lot of work and he is trying to ensure it is fleshed out well with measurable items before submission.

President Wu emphasized his recent efforts with the Committee for Student Mental Health (implementation committee for PAC-SMH). The committee has established subcommittees; one of which is looking to adopt the Okanagan Charter, a public health charter, which was discussed at length with the prior Council. The Committee is advocating to the University to adopt this Charter and to thereby establish a toolkit to address mental health, thus demonstrating their continued commitment to health and wellness concerns on campus.

**Business Arising from the Minutes**

**Bylaw Amendment pertaining to Council Directors**

*Be it resolved that* the Board approves for General Meeting ratification the bylaw amendment for 7.1(1b).

*Director Plante and Chairperson Velling.*

Director Plante explained this is a continuation of discussion on his presented technical amendment to provide by-law clarity in respect to Council Directors beginning in the 2019-2020 fiscal year. The amendment was for Article 7. Board of Directors, Section 2. Membership, Article 1, line b:

**Old Text:** 'Two (2) members of Students’ Council;'

**Proposed New Text:** 'Two (2) members elected as Councillors of Students’ Council;'

Chairperson Velling provided the Board with Council’s opinion on the change as requested. He noted in full disclosure that in his role as the Secretary to the Students’ Council he had prepared this statement. The prepared Council statement read as followed:
"The opinion and recommendation of the Students’ Council is that those members of Council that ought to be eligible to hold Council Director positions should be those elected\textsuperscript{1} Councillors.

"The assembly discussed this question in detail and expressed concern over the current potential for unelected and ex officio members to potentially serve on Board. Therefore, Council believes that no ex officio member of the body, voting or non-voting, should be eligible for the position of Council Director; including but not limited to commissioners, at-large committee chairs, or society presidents or their designee.

"It is noteworthy that representatives of AHSUM (Applied Health Science Faculty), EngSoc (Engineering Faculty), SciSoc (Science Faculty), ESS (Environment Faculty), and MathSoc (Mathematics Faculty) were present and supported the recommendation."

Motion carries unanimously, the bylaw is approved for General Meeting ratification\textsuperscript{2}.

**Bylaw Amendment Pertaining to Future Bylaw Amendments**

Be it resolved that the Board approves for General Meeting ratification the bylaw amendment for Article 14: Amendments.

Chairperson Velling and Director Plante.

Secretary’s Note: the approved Article 14 as amended is attached to these minutes.

Chairperson Velling spoke to the motion and emphasized discussion with former Board members on the \textit{ad hoc} Bylaw Rewrite committee from 2016/17 which had re-drafted the Bylaws to comply with the Ontario \textit{Corporations} Act, \textit{R.S.O} 1990. As context, the Chairperson explained that while the \textit{Not-for-Profit Corporations Act} was passed by provincial legislature and given royal assent had not been put into force, therefore the organization would continue to be regulated by the \textit{Corporations Act, R.S.O} 1990 and the Bylaws needed to be re-drafted to be legally compliant. In the development of these bylaws in 2016/17, former Board and Council members negotiated a series of changes to how bylaws should be amended, the conditions for approved amendments to go into force, and ensuring the ratification process complied with the \textit{Corporations Act, R.S.O} 1990. Chairperson Velling explained that this article pertaining to such amendment procedure was omitted in the final version for ratification at the Fall 2017 Annual General Meeting due to the inclusion of a motion on the GM and Council Reform Task Force. The omission was designed to be temporary and allow for implementation of changes recommended by the Task Force coming into affect this Fall 2018. At the recommendation of the former Chair, AJ Wray, Director Velling brought this item forward for approval.

After the floor opened for questions or commentary, President noted one inconsistency in the amendment proceedings. The statement “and ratified at a General Meeting of

\textsuperscript{1}Elected Councillors in Council deliberation of this matter referred to any Councillors elected or acclaimed to their position pursuant Article 11: Elections and Referenda of the bylaws and Elections and Referenda Procedure of Council for Feds’ Council Elections.

\textsuperscript{2}Bylaw amendments must be approved by a 2/3\textsuperscript{rd} super-majority at the Board of Directors.
the Corporation” in clause one item one, 1(1), was missing. This was added by friendly amendment.

Be it resolved that section 1, clause 1, item 1 of the bylaw amendment "Article 14: Amendments" include “and ratified at a General Meeting of the Corporation”.

President Wu and Chairperson Velling.

Adopted by friendly amendment.

Chairperson Velling made it clear this mistake was a transcription error on his part and that since the Act is clear on the responsibilities of the General Meeting (or a Meeting of Delegates imbued with GM powers) to approve Bylaw amendments had this not been caught no harm would have come.

Vice President, Gerrits commented that he would like an additional clause included in section one (1) which would add an amendment for a notwithstanding clause for the regular conduct of amendments as a potential option in the event of gridlock in Council or Board:

Be it resolved that the following be added to section 1 of the bylaw amendment "Article 14: Amendments":

“(4) Notwithstanding clause one (1), nothing shall prevent a Board from placing a bylaw amendment on the agenda for a General Meeting, not to take effect until after approval at a General Meeting.”

The Vice President, Education highlighted that while this is redundant and not necessarily important he was concerned that giving Council total veto powers over any the bylaws pertaining to Council presents risk. At times a General Meeting must be able to make changes to Council, especially as a democratic mechanism to appeal unpopular Councils. Chairperson Velling reminded the body that clause 1(3) of proposed amendment already allows appeal with a requirement to remove the amendment giving Council veto capability if need be. Vice President, Gerrits noted that clause 1(3) is a nuclear option, and should not be employed unless Board must substantially reorganize the organization; he emphasized he would prefer another method to provide some bylaws through a notwithstanding clause as nearly last resort for an intransigent Council, but without reducing Council’s bylaw authority. Chairperson Velling said he respectfully disagreed and that the representative body of students should have power to prevent immediate changes to that body from the General Meeting which could be hijacked by members bringing out a group of friends to sway debate.

Vice President, Richardson offered an alternative option whereby instead of Council’s effective veto power, this could be changed to standard consultation as with changes to bylaws pertaining to Student Fees and Officers.

Director Siemons spoke in opposition to the motion to reduce Council’s powers over bylaw amendments and understood this as a risk. He also expressed strong disapproval of the Vice President, Student Life’s suggestion for only requiring recommendation from the Council. Chairperson Velling said he would support Vice President, Gerrits’s notwithstanding clause proposal before entertaining reducing Council’s veto capacity for bylaws.
changes unpopular with the student body. Vice President, Richardson withdrew her suggestion after deliberation.

Vice President, Gerrits sought to clarify the intent of the exemptions to standard amendment pathways. He inquired if the intention of these clauses were to prevent the Board making rash decisions in key areas or just to ensure an effective consultation process. Chairperson Velling responded that from his understanding from the former Chair, AJ Wray, and the principal writer of the changes, Director Emeritus Sacha Forstner, that this was primarily consultation but also the result of negotiations from a Council that feared reactionary/rash Boards which attempted to limit the scope of Council powers.

Chairperson Velling reminded the Board this was the product of substantial negotiations and there should be general trust for the process. Based on the fact that these bylaws as written had been vetted by legal counsel and were the result of negotiation process between prior Board and Council, Chairperson Velling refused to accept the amendment to the principle motion as friendly.

**Motion to Call the Question** on the amendment to the main motion.

*Vice President, Gerrits and Chairperson Velling.*

**Motion carries.**

**Adopted by unfriendly amendment.**

Discussion resumes on the principle motion, as amended.

Director Siemons inquires about waiting periods to allow for consideration of amendments made to presented bylaw amendments on the floor and whether this should trigger another "waiting period" as outlined in section one (1) clause two (2). Director Siemons noted this would allow Directors the opportunity to consider the implications of the amendment, prior to actually voting on the finalized bylaw change.

Vice President, Gerrits emphasized this change would require then that a motion to amend would require the now amended version of the change to go to another future General Meeting prior to being accepted. The Chair explained that the General Meeting has the absolute right to “accept, reject, or further amend” any bylaw amendments, provided such amendments to the principle motion are within the scope of that motion. Chairperson Velling further identified that such actions to amend the principle motion would be fully within the power of the General Meeting to make. He did not believe Board had the power to restrict the powers of the General Meeting under the Act and that if this bylaw were to be implemented it would be of no effect because it would contravene the *Corporations Act, R.S.O 1990* which takes precedence. Following this discussion, Vice President, Gerrits inquired if the GM has the right to constrain its own powers in the bylaws. Chairperson Velling replied that the Board cannot pass bylaws which it expects to enforce that would unreasonably restrict the GM’s powers under the Act.

Chairperson Velling sought to clarify the intention of Director Siemons’s suggestion as to whether this waiting period was for approval by the Board or ratification by the GM. Director Siemons clarified that while intended for both, as it was made clear Board could
not enforce the bylaw on the GM, discussion should be constrained to this waiting period for Board approval. Director Siemons notes he would like to add a requirement that amending the proposed bylaw amendment itself would require an additional waiting period to adoption by the Board and ratification at the GM. Vice President, Richardson expressed concerns that this might stall necessary bylaw amendments via amendment *ad infinitum*, that is continuous amendments to prevent any adoption. Director Siemons clarified that this would not occur unless Board was voting on the finalized amendment. This motion was only that if an amendment were to be accepted by the Board on the proposed bylaw amendment, the principle motion would need to have another "waiting period" for consideration. Director Duong expressed that discussion surrounding continuous amendment to kill proposals for bylaw amendments was moot because if that many changes needed to go into effect on the principle motion then likely the amendment needed substantial re-working. Director Duong emphasized support for the idea to ensure due diligence.

Chairperson Velling expressed concern that such a waiting period mandated in the bylaws would slow Board substantially and perhaps this could be solved in Board procedure, which itself can be suspended if necessary (unlike bylaws), instead of complicating bylaws. Chairperson Velling reminded the Board that some procedures can be prevented from being suspended outright. He offered to work with Jacob to develop such a procedure.

President Wu suggested a five (5) business day waiting period for amendments. President Wu then withdrew this comment given that it presented similar problems just on a shorter timescale.

Vice President, Richardson spoke in support of Chairperson Velling’s suggestion to implement this change in procedure rather than putting it into the bylaws.

Director Plante proposed a compromise in an attempt to satisfy both Director Siemons’ request of the waiting period and other director’s concerns over this waiting period being a burden on the Board’s ability to conduct business in a timely manner. He offered that another notwithstanding clause could be added in that would override the waiting period if there was unanimous consent from all directors to do so.

Director Siemons, recognizing Board concerns, failed to advance a motion for amendment and agreed to work with Chairperson Velling to implement this in procedure.

**Be it resolved that** the Board approves for General Meeting ratification the bylaw amendment for Article 14: Amendments, as amended.

**Motion carries** with 2/3rd super-majority, the bylaw is approved for General Meeting ratification.

**Metrics Used to Measure Member Engagement.**

Vice President, Gerrits looked into how the Federation tracks engagement and on-campus awareness. He noted that he will share the report summarizing the conclusions from this research with Directors electronically after the meeting.
The Vice President, Education noted that tracking metrics is typically done not for the purposes of knowing the data or having the data, rather by virtue of another operation or departmental action that resulted in the collection of data. He emphasized this was not a positive or negative statement, just a matter of fact. The Vice President, Education highlighted the three major veins of tracking within the Federation — advocacy, campus life, and governance. He noted that regrettably he had failed to discuss separately with the Communications Department.

In Advocacy, Vice President, Gerrits explained that the engagement is tracked by link clicks and material pick-up, staff student interactions, and student actions (e.g. signing a petition). That is, advocacy typically relies on metrics pertaining to how many students pick up a call to action. These are set within Marketing Action Plans. The analysis of these metrics after the fact then informs future advocacy working plans and allows reform of the process for the future regularly. The Vice President, Education expressed awareness there is more to do to engage and inform the community. He noted in his action plan he intends to develop a membership survey to further explore this.

In the Campus Life Department, the biggest engagement metric comes from ticket purchases and sales, but link clicks and social media does sometimes provide uptick in awareness or engagement. Additionally, surveys can generally provide some measurable engagement/awareness data for the Federation. For instance, cultural caravan is hosting a survey on what they enjoyed and how they became aware of it.

With respect to the Governance side of the organization, the primary metric is participation in the number of votes cast in referenda and elections, as well as the number of students who run for elected positions, though Vice President, Gerrits acknowledged clicks on links and surveys do factor in a bit. Similarly GM turn out, online viewership, and member submitted agenda items offer an window into the engagement, interest, and general awareness of our students. This data is typically useful in influencing the post-mortem discussion of successes and failures. This year Governance is performing more in person engagement with one-on-one talks with staff and personnel for elections.

Thus there are generally multiple modes of assessing engagement; while this was exploration was built around Board concerns about awareness of Council, this has emerged as a larger conversation worth having.

Chairperson Velling mentioned work by President Wu and himself on Council marketing with the marketing department that factored into use of this data going forward and improving awareness generally.

Director Duong asked how staff and the Executives use the data to inform and improve our processes and engagement/awareness. Vice President, Gerrits emphasized that data is collected for a purpose; in the advocacy, this data is used for debriefs, where metrics indicated success and where the organization should dedicate greater resources in the future. The Vice President, Student Life seconded this point and emphasized that the purpose is iterative self-improvement. President Wu also spoke in support of using data for future iterations in Governance metrics too.

Director Siemons asked about data collection of one-on-one interactions as was referenced with this year’s elections and when Board can expect it such data. Vice President, Gerrits indicated that was for the Feds Elections, so it can be expected to come in around that time.
GOVERNANCE ITEMS

Be it resolved that the Board approves amendments to Procedure 2 Board Meetings, as presented.

Chairperson Velling and Vice President, Gerrits.

Secretary’s Note: the approved amended procedure is attached to these minutes.

Chairperson Velling explains these changes were the result of discussions from himself and Director Plante. The changes were entirely bylaw compliance and editorial (spelling and grammar) in nature. Nothing substantive was changed. The motivation was to ensure our procedures were in compliance with the bylaws, which supersede them and whence they derive their authority.

Director Duong inquired about the holding of Special Meetings within exam periods with respect to ten (10) business days notice. Director Plante explained that this ten (10) day notice is a bylaw compliance issue as the bylaws specify this time. It was clarified by Vice President, Gerrits and Director Plante that the “day(s)” in procedure and bylaws referred to regular days and not business days unless indicated as "business days".

With no further debate the motion proceeded to a vote.

Motion carries unanimously.

GENERAL ORDERS

STATUS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION REVIEW AND PUBLIC REPORT

Seneca informed the body that he reached out to the prior Chair, AJ Wray, because of the misunderstanding on publication of a written report. Some prior Directors and Executive were under the impression he was drafting a formal report on Executive Compensation (a written report accompanied by an analysis). Chairperson Velling explained that Mr. Wray was under the impression he was to provide a verbal report at the General Meeting, with the numerical analysis as a physical piece. He understood that a Feds News & Updates presser was to go out indicating the results of the review and next steps in executive compensation analysis. The Chair emphasized that clearly this miscommunication presents a dilemma because no report is written and Chairperson Velling would not feel comfortable picking up Mr. Wray’s report for publication.

Vice President, Gerrits provided some clarity that Mr. Wray did not feel comfortable conducting an in-depth analysis of this sort, but only did the basic review to see if executive compensation matched similar not-for-profit organizational standards across the field.

Director Plante inquired as to whether the work from Mr. Wray is professional enough to represent an executive compensation review for the membership. Vice President, Gerrits thought this review was meant to be an internal guide post, for Board use not
public consumption. Board expressed consensus that no publication would be made without more formal investigation.

**NOTICE: APPROPRIATION OF FUNDING FOR STRENGTHENING TELECOMMUNICATION**

Chairperson Velling explained that the Students’ Council has passed the following motion recommending action by the Board and requesting the Board appropriate funding for improved telecommunication hardware (AV equipment) and software pending an executive cost assessment of options by the Vice President, Operations and Finance. Council spoke about the desire for microphones for those meeting in rooms, and better telecommunication software for calling into meetings of council, board, and committees…

**Motion referred from Students’ Council:**

*Whereas* the current council teleconferencing setup is cumbersome and creates difficulty for off-site councilors to speak and be heard in the meeting room by other councilors;

*Whereas* this problem especially poses an issue for council members that are currently on a co-op term away from the University;

*Be it resolved that* Council tasks the Vice President, Operations and Finance to perform a cost-assessment for new and alternative software and hardware options for means of telecom meetings for those calling in;

*Be it further resolved that* Council recommends that the Board review financial opportunities related to teleconferencing;

*Be it further resolved that* the Board of Directors appropriate funding in the 2018 FY Budget for capital investment for teleconferencing and will approve the use such funding pending executive/staff cost assessment of hardware and software options.

**Motion carries unanimously.**

Chairperson Velling noted that Vice President, MacMillan is working on the cost assessment and that Vice President, MacMillan and President Wu have had initial conversations with Pratik Patel, the Feds IT Manager, about addressing the telecommunication concerns from Directors and Councillors. President Wu indicated he had updated Mr. Patel and was discussing the matter in advance of the Board Meeting.

**Ratification of Executive Action Plans**

*Be it resolved that* the Board ratifies Executive Board approval of the Executive Action Plans:

- Presidential Action Plan
- Education Action Plan
- Student Life Action Plan
- Operations & Finance Action Plan
President Wu and Chairperson Velling.

Director Plante notifies the Board he would like the question divided into parts due to his conflict of interest in the Education portfolio as one of the Commissioners for the Vice President, Education.

Motion to divide the question

Director Plante and Vice President, Gerrits.

Motion carries unanimously; the question is now divided into parts. Voting shall occur on each item independently.

Discussion proceeded to the first item, Presidential Action Plan; Chairperson Velling notified the Board no such plan was submitted for the agenda.

President Wu spoke to the fact that his plan was not finished. He indicated he is working on finishing it, however requires more time to develop his thoughts. Director Plante brought up that the Action Plans, per procedure, must be brought forth to Board after approval by the Executive Board, which is to occur by the 30th of June each year. He noted he was disappointed that Board was not informed of the failure to approve the plan and of the general failure to produce a plan. Director Plante emphasized that in the future, on other items, that Executive need to be more proactive on communicating to Directors that they are too busy or too new to their role and require more time to produce what is being demanded by procedure or asked of them by Board. Director Plante added that at the previous two meetings, he had heard plan development was going fine, but that now the Board learns things are not going well. He emphasized that Board procedures are serious matters, and require a 2/3rd super-majority vote to suspend; if procedures were failing in the future Board needed to be proactive to address these failings. Director Plante continued that if executives or directors think the procedure is unreasonable then that ought to be a discussion but that keeping Board blind to these problems was not conducive.

President Wu agreed and noted this critique was fair. The President said that when he first started putting thoughts on paper he could not write down what he intended, that his points were too general. He has since re-drafted the plan. President Wu asked Chairperson Velling to take over for this discussion.

Chairperson Velling expressed his thoughts on Richard’s draft plan and noted he understood director’s concerns but that when procedure breaks down we need to be less focused on being punitive to the executive and more focused on aiding them in accomplishing their functions and supporting them. Chairperson Velling explained that the President Wu’s draft plan was thorough with details and measurable outcomes. He noted that the plan included a letter to students explaining the intention of all the Executive plans. The Chair encouraged the Board to empathize with the President, that jumping into a new role without the prior experience of Board, Council, or part-time service to the student union was a difficult task. He noted that the Board need to be flexible enough to recognize strategic shortcomings as an organization and compassionate enough to foster improvement of executives rather than be penalty/compliance focused. That being said, the Chair made it clear that procedures must be complied with and communication...
going forward is paramount; Chairperson Velling was explicit in noting that if procedure continued to be ignored after repeated attempts to support individuals violating it then the conversation would change from "how to support" to "what is the appropriate ramification of failure to comply".

After further discussion beyond the scope of the President’s Action Plan progress, it became clear that multiple executives had struggled to submit items by procedural deadlines and were missing aspects of their plans required by procedure. Director Duong asked about multiple executives struggling to meet deadlines, especially members at large without prior experience. She wished to know what Board can do to fix this for the future? The Chair spoke to this and offered thoughts on flex deadlines and how Action Plans should be treated as the final step of the transition process.

**Motion to suspend the rules** to allow the President to deliver his plan at the next regular Board meeting.

*Chairperson Velling and Director Beauchemin.*

Some debate regarding other procedural violations came up, but was considered out of scope and deferred until after this motion.

**Motion carries** unanimously.

The Chair adopted a privileged motion:

**Motion to lay on the table** to discuss general Action Plan procedural compliance.

**ACTION PLAN PROCEDURES**

The question was asked if these Action Plans should be received or ratified by the Board. Vice President, Gerrits expressed that in the procedures it says clearly the plans are to be approved by Executive Board and that this action could set a precedent. Chairperson Velling said that prior minutes had used ratification of approved plans or reception depending on the year. The Chair further emphasized that in light of this being a procedural matter, the power to ratify or approve is truly a Board power, but one which was deferred to Executive Board via the procedure. Chairperson Velling said that since Executive Board had approved the plans, he recommended ratification from a governance and precedence standpoint.

Vice President, Gerrits notified Chairperson Velling that he was incorrect in assuming the plans had been approved by Executive Board. Vice President, Richardson indicated that for her plan she had sought to get Board input prior to having Executive Board approve the plan and hence it had not been approved. Other executives indicated the same.

Chairperson Velling asked why procedure went out the window here for all of Executive Board. Director Plante noted that every report was in noncompliance and that is unacceptable. Directors emphasized that the Act provides for mandatory compliance with the bylaws, and the bylaws in turn require compliance with Board resolutions and procedure. Compliance is not optional. Chairperson Velling again noted the conversation needs to be focused on how to facilitate improvement, not how to force ownership/responsibility for mistakes. The Chair encouraged the Board to recognize that this
procedure was clearly failing for all executives, and thus reflected equally poorly on the procedural requirements set by Board. Chairperson Velling suggested this be revisited and the procedure be re-drafted but that in the interim Board suspend the procedure entirely for all Executives and have the Board of Directors approve the Plans at the next regular meeting in lieu of the Executive Board.

**Motion to suspend the rules** and allow the Board to approve Executive Action Plans at the next regular meeting and delay publication of the plans until ten (10) days following the next regular meeting.

Chairperson Velling and Director Sesink.

Director Plante motions to divide the question to allow his abstention on the Vice President, Education item.

**Motion to divide the question**

Director Plante and Vice President, Gerrits.

Motion carries

**Motion to suspend the rules** and allow the Board to approve the Vice President, Education Action Plan at the next regular meeting and delay publication of the plans until ten (10) days following the next regular meeting.

Motion carries with Director Plante abstaining.

**Motion to suspend the rules** and allow the Board to approve the Vice President, Student Life Action Plan at the next regular meeting and delay publication of the plans until ten (10) days following the next regular meeting.

Motion carries unanimously.

**Motion to suspend the rules** and allow the Board to approve the Vice President, Operations and Finance Action Plan at the next regular meeting and delay publication of the plans until ten (10) days following the next regular meeting.

Motion carries with Chairperson Velling abstaining.

Secretary’s Note: the President’s Action plan was already motioned to be sent to Board for approval at the subsequent regular meeting.

**EXECUTIVE ACTION PLAN FEEDBACK**

Discussion resumed for feedback on the Executive Action Plans.

- Vice President, Education — Vice President, Gerrits walked the Board through his plan. He spoke in support of *Courier New* font choice. The Vice President, Education joked that he enjoys planning and making things measurable, so this new format was an idea to give a better overview on the deliverables of the entire department. The preparation of the plan was intense and required substantial amounts of

---

3 Secretary’s Note: Director Plante is the Co-operative Education Affairs Commissioner for the Vice President, Education portfolio.

4 Secretary’s Note: Chairperson Velling is a director-member of the Budget & Appropriations Committee which is featured in Vice President, MacMillan’s Action Plan.
time, Vice President, Gerrits stated. He emphasized part of the ease with his plan development was that the goals were relatively document heavy.

- Director Beauchemin expressed support for how well the plan was drafted, but had goal related questions. Director Beauchemin asked about the third Goal, noting that it seemed to be a moonshot. The Director asked what the Vice President, Education can do to ensure it carries over for Fall 19 implementation as the Vice President will be gone. Vice President, Gerrits responded that he was embedding these tasks with the stakeholder relations manager. There is a lot overlapped with an employee’s strategy plan and his view for the department. Hopefully it can be housed within Stakeholder relations to outlast the Executives, though Vice President, Gerrits acknowledged the year-to-year concern with the goal.

- Director Beauchemin followed up with questions on Goal 22; if Vice President, Gerrits had any idea of the format he wanted to take with the transition document. Director Beauchemin thought that this should be a regular goal instead of a stretch goal, given the importance of a good transition, and the benefit of having a document with so much information (present and historical) to draw on is immense. Vice President, Gerrits expressed that he was planning to do transition no matter what, though the question is whether such a document would be carried forward or not. The Vice President, Education hoped something like this would allow continuity instead of year by year changing these transition documents.

- With respect to Goal 25, Municipal Budget Submission, the goal generally is sparse on details noted Director Beauchemin, and asked the Vice President, Education if he could explain further. Vice President, Gerrits explained this goal came out of discussion with Vice President Emeritus, Andrew Clubine, as he was leaving. Mr. Clubine was a bit of a municipal affairs aficionado. The City of Waterloo’s municipal budget is not set annually; they have a 1-year temporary budget and a 3-year budget cycle, explained Vice President, Gerrits. We should be part of that and have Feds lobby the city to spend on or support. This is a prime time to consider that and it’s why it’s there. This is why it is a stretch goal, it may not be achievable with staffing and other demands on the time-line that exists.

- With respect to Goal 26, Directors expressed that there should be some kind of consultation with students (via Students’ Council) before implementing policies and ideas from other schools. Particularly, we must as an organization consider the differences in environment/atmosphere. The Vice President, Education stated the point was well noted, and thanked the Board.

- Regarding the Syllabus Repository Initiative, Director Beauchemin and Director Duong spoke of the Engineering Society Syllabus bank. The Vice President, Education explained we are looking into this and how to implement it.

- Chairperson Velling noted this format for Action Plans should be adopted going forward for future plan preparation, but should not be compared to other Executives as it was experimental and other plans followed standard format.
• Vice President, Student Life —said she looked forward to Board questions.
  
  - Director Beauchemin inquired about the second goal. Director Beauchemin expressed that the Vice President, Student Life should be careful that the Society Relations Commissioner does not step on the toes of the Faculty Societies when engaging more with the Societies. Director Beauchemin also notes he doesn’t see how the Vice President, Student Life intends to attain this plan and would like to see measurable goals pertaining to this item. Vice President, Richardson noted she came up with some measurables, including but not limited to: going to satellite campuses and engaging with students to learn about issues one-on-one; for extension of services to satellite campuses we measure success from discussion; anecdotal and collaborative metrics (like number of collaborations, events engagement and participation, joint event sponsorship by societies, feds, satellite campuses).
  
  - Director Sesink inquires about what these measurables really look like and what the end goal is and what that goal should look like. Vice President, Richardson notes that the Campus Life departmental will be looking at how students feel and do interviews and discussion with students about this.
  
  - Director Plante asked about the Vice President, Student Life’s exploring ideas about accessible coordinator and exec training. The Director expressed that this goal is great! He asked however if this meant currently we are failing to provide accessible coordinator and exec training. The Board asked for clarification that from a legal compliance perspective our training is in compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, S.O. 2005 (AODA). Vice President, Richardson explained that when she referred to accessibility with respect to documentation and information opportunities in training that was not referring to legal compliance with accessibility law, but rather that we have the opportunity to increase ease-of-access for co-op and training via telecommunication. She agreed that her language might be worth changing because AODA is the go to for accessibility. Director Plante suggested perhaps “Ease of Access” instead.
  
  - Director Siemons noted that most goals link back to long range plan, save for the first goal. He inquired if this was because of the lack of a link or rather if it was just not noted. Vice President, Richardson noted the link existed, but that she will add a portion explaining the services relevancy piece of this in the context of the long range plan.

• Vice President, Operations and Finance —Vice President, MacMillan noted he had accidentally failed to include his rationale and would be adding this to his plan shortly. The Vice President, Operations and Finance intended to increase the relevancy of products for students and has other goals as listed. He explained his offerings in the access to Bombshelter pub would allow more events engagement with student groups. He also noted he intends to reform the GRT UPASS agreement to expand to a broader student base because it is currently limited to full time students and some other cases, as discussed in the GRT UPASS Memo sent out by Vice President, Education. Finally, Vice President, MacMillan intends to improve
the budget processes in the student union and increase budgetary accountability as indicated in the long range plan.

– Director Beauchemin asked about the goals aimed at meeting students’ needs with food, drink, and accessibility needing to be more specific. He further inquired about the emphasis on international food options in INEWS and the Bomber Pub compared to the UW Food Services locations. Director Beauchemin was curious if demand existed. Vice President, MacMillan noted that there are international options in residences and the SLC, but that having formerly working at Bomber full time, the menu turns over a lot to keep up with demand and so opening to international menu options was a natural opportunity. He noted the high international student population on campus influenced decisions to increase international food options. Generally, the Vice President, Operations and Finance noted that as an organization the Federation should keep options that appeal to all members. Vice President, MacMillan noted that this was a data informed process.

– Director Plante asks how this data was collected. Vice President, MacMillan indicated a survey with UW Food Services and server-questionnaires had been conducted.

– Director Plante expressed thanks for the inclusion of rationale and confirmed it would be added into the plan. He further asked about point 1(b) and how the funding of the football team relations would work. Would Feds be paying for this out of student fees? Vice President, MacMillan clarified this would be money going into the operations, but that it would only be the cost of catering. Chairperson Velling clarified if this will be on the student dollar. The Vice President, Operations and Finance noted it would not be funded by undergraduate student fees.

– Director Duong inquired about the phasing out of plastics and straws as is being done by UW Food Services in an effort to be more sustainable. Vice President, MacMillan has noted that yes, commercial services has begun replacing plastic straws. Director Sesink asked to know if the Bomber was getting rid of straws completely because of accessibility legal requirements. Vice President, MacMillan clarified they were being replaced with compostable alternatives.

**Board Annual Action Plans and Goals**

**Be it resolved that** the Board of Directors tables the Annual Board Action Plan and Board Priorities for a special meeting to be determined by the Chair and President. *Chairperson Velling and Director Plante.*

President Wu informed Board he would put together a scheduling poll to find the best day. Chairperson Velling notified the Board that calling Special Meetings required at least 72-hours notice.

**Motion carries** unanimously, the agenda item is now Tabled.
**Motion for Online GM Proxy Submission**

Be it resolved that the Board approves for General Meeting ratification the bylaw amendment pertaining to online proxy submission referred by the Task Force on General Meeting Engagement and Council as a Meeting of Delegates.

*President Wu and Chairperson Velling.*

President Wu deferred to Chairperson Velling to introduce this on behalf of the Task Force. Chairperson Velling indicated that this change was a minor edit to Article 5: General Meetings, Section 5. Voting of Members, Clause (2), paragraph (a) & (c), to allow electronic submission of agenda items.

The bylaw amendment would result in the following which would open proxy submission to electronic submission:

(2) A voting member may appoint any individual to vote by proxy on their behalf, in accordance with Section 84 of the Act, subject to the following conditions:

a) Proxies shall be executed *in writing or electronically*, and shall contain the signatures *or the electronic equivalents* and the student’s identification number, if applicable, of the proxy holder, as well as any restrictions placed upon the proxy holder;

... c) Proxies to be used at a General Meeting may either be deposited at the Head Office of the Corporation *in writing or submitted electronically* no fewer than twenty-four (24) hours prior to the start of the meeting, or at the end of the last business day prior to the day on which the meeting is to take place, whichever is first;

Director Duong asked if this is being implemented with Feds IT was underway or being discussed. President Wu and Vice President, MacMillan indicated these conversations are happening with the manager of the IT department.

**Motion carries** unanimously.

**Financial Resources for Directors**

Be it resolved that the Board adopt the resolution on Financial Resources for Directors:

**Whereas** Feds by-laws stipulate that the Board of Directors is expressly empowered to ‘review the finances of the corporation’ and that currently, financial updates are not given other than the annual audit and budgets,

**Whereas** this leaves many directors, especially those without a background in finance, without the proper knowledge and resources to make informed decisions on reviewing the finances or budgeting,
Whereas more frequent financial updates from the VPOF and/or the Commercial Operations Manager would Vice President, Operations and Finance remedy the previous statement,

Whereas Directors have expressed the need to be more informed of the finances of the corporation in order to properly carry out their duties, and

Whereas intimate knowledge of the up-to-date finances is required when approaching financial decision-making.

Therefore,

Be it resolved that the Vice President, Operations and Finance, or a designee thereof, be mandated to present a formal report on the overall finances and financial performance of the Federation to the Board of Directors on a termly basis and an informal mid-term update report on a termly basis;

Be it further resolved that an end of year fiscal report shall also be presented at the first meeting of the incoming Board of Directors;

Be it further resolved that such reports shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Updates on the overall financial performance of the Federation including, but not limited to, Commercial Services, the Health and Dental Plan, General Office, Marketing and IT with respect to at least one previous year,
2. Highlights of outliers, causes for concern, or atypical expenditures and revenues and recommended courses of actions to address these,
3. Current progress and next steps with respect to goals related to finances including long term planning, capital investments and Commercial Services, and
4. A single-page year-to-date budget summary update;

Be it further resolved that such a report shall not be held private.

Director Beauchemin and Director Plante.

Director Beauchemin and Director Plante explained that the purposes of the motion is to get better information on finances for directors. This would provide regular updates on the finances of the Federation to the Board of Directors. Director Plante refers to the presentation from the Federation’s legal counsel last meeting and the stress on financial decisions and the importance of information to inform the voting and improve understanding and resources to make prudent financial decisions.

Chairperson Velling noted this is resolution is bylaws and policy compliant. Additionally, the Chairperson noted that the resolution supports existing requirements in procedure but just adjusts what ought to be included in such reports.

Vice President, MacMillan asks about why the motion includes holding of information to public account. Director Beauchemin expresses information on our businesses should be made public for true transparency and accountability.

Be it resolved that the last "be it further resolved that" clause detailing public disclosure shall be struck.

Director Beauchemin and Director Plante.
Adopted by friendly amendment

Vice President, Richardson expressed concern that the clause “Be it further resolved that an end-of-year fiscal report shall also be presented at the first meeting of the incoming Board of Directors” might not include a complete assessment because Actuals are not always ready immediately at end of the fiscal year.

Be it resolved that "end-of-year" be struck and "year-to-date'.
Vice President, Richardson and Vice President, MacMillan.

General Manager Burdett clarifies that accounting does not always occur year-to-date but rather in typical accounting periods such as months, quarters, and years. So this would be acceptable provided there is general understanding this is year-to-date within the nearest accounting period, such as the most recent month’s worth of data.

Adopted by friendly amendment

Discussion returned to the principle motion, as amended:

Be it resolved that that the Vice President, Operations and Finance, or a designee thereof, be mandated to present a formal report on the overall finances and financial performance of the Federation to the Board of Directors on a termly basis and an informal mid-term update report on a termly basis;

Be it further resolved that a year-to-date fiscal report shall also be presented at the first meeting of the incoming Board of Directors;

Be it further resolved that such reports shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

• Updates on the overall financial performance of the Federation including, but not limited to, Commercial Services, the Health and Dental Plan, General Office, Marketing and IT with respect to at least one previous year,
• Highlights of outliers, causes for concern, or atypical expenditures and revenues and recommended courses of actions to address these,
• Current progress and next steps with respect to goals related to finances including long term planning, capital investments and Commercial Services, and
• A single-page year-to-date budget summary update;

Motion carries unanimously, the resolution is adopted.

COMMUNICATION OF FEDS FEE CHANGES TO MEMBERSHIP

As a preamble to the discussion the following information was referenced. Preamble:

The following motion passed the 2018 Winter GM:

'Voting on main motion: BIRT the General Meeting ratifies the 2018-2019 first-year Orientation fee increase by $1.71 to cover all current budget expenses under Feds’ Orientation department budget and defer to [the] Board of Directors to make appropriate decrease for the Feds fee (sic.)'
Moved to a vote.
Motion passes.
Secretary’s Note: this information was quoted from the Winter 2018 General Meeting Minutes.

The Vice President, Operations and Finance introduced this agenda item and informed the Board that Director Plante brought this up with him a few weeks ago inquiring as to why a fee change had not been observed or communicated.

To provide context, the Orientation line worth $12,000 was shifted to its own budget and the General Meeting voted to reduce the fee for students by this amount (adjusted per capita) for the future. However, that same General Meeting approved an increase in the Feds fee for the new racialized student service. This new service increased the fee by roughly the same amount as this decrease reduced the fee cost, so the reduction could be considered in some manner more of a service offset, explained Vice President, MacMillan. In addition, the GM approved other increases as well which led to a total increase in the Feds fee.

Director Plante noted that his point is that this makes sense for balancing of fee increase and reduction, and when verified against the UW Board of Governors (BoG) attachments, this is clearly reflected. That being said, Director Plante emphasized that this was a GM motion and there seems to be a general lack of communication. Some Directors felt that Director Plante should not have had to ask about this information to find out and agreed proper communication was lacking. The prior Board’s minutes did not reflect anything had occurred about this. As this was passed at a GM this ought to be communicated to students. If the organization does not let people know what happened, the membership often jump to conclusions that what was supposed to happen did not occur. Communicating follow through on action items demonstrates commitment to the membership and builds trust. Director Plante brought attention to the fact that while he might have verified the numbers with the BoG agenda, other undergraduates would likely not, they would simply assume nothing came of this. Another Director noted that from an optics perspective students should have a right to know what occurred. Director Plante agreed and noted it would likely be positive for the Federation because the average student will be happy to know the decrease occurred — or rather it off-set an increase. Additionally, the Board generally concurred with the sentiment that it was poor form that this was change was not documented in previous Board’s minutes and made public to students.

Vice President, Gerrits spoke from a governance perspective, explaining that because Feds are not in the habit of putting this information out about fee changes generally there’s little need. He agreed that the organization needed to tackle this communication and accountability gap in the future. The Vice President, Education recalled that in terms of the prior Board, which he had served on as a Director, not recording this in it’s minutes, this is because Board did not need to discuss the matter so long as the GM decided it and the required changes were sent to the appropriate actors on Board’s behalf (viz. UW Board of Governors). Vice President, Gerrits offered that this could end up being the website or that perhaps instead noted at the next GM.

Vice President, MacMillan expressed that doing a press release or mass emails can be
difficult, and that as an organization Feds need to go through the correct channels. The opinion of the Vice President, Operations and Finance was that getting this approved by the Registrar is a waste of organizational staffing time and resources for little gain. In requesting this be set, the Vice President, Education would lose a bargaining chip with the Registrar on negotiation for future mass email and notice communication arrangements just to inform the membership that their fee has only been offset or in total increased.

Chairperson Velling mentioned that it might be worthwhile to use the Feds News & Updates website section. The Chairperson also called attention to precedent of increases being communicated by the former President, Antonio Brieva, via the same News page of the website to address concerns raised by Vice President, Gerrits.

Vice President, Gerrits acknowledged the precedent, but stated that how this communication should occur should be discussed out of chambers. To clarify the scope of the discussion, Director Plante noted that he brought this to Board to see what people thought about communicating it generally. Chairperson Velling proposed the President, Vice President, Operations and Finance and Director Plante work to draft a statement to the membership though a medium they determine if such action is amendable to board. The Board supported communication and tasked Director Plante Vice President, MacMillan and President Wu to discuss how this shall occur outside of chambers.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

No Other Business was presented.

With no Other Business, the body recessed for 10 minutes.

**Be it resolved that** Board recess for ten (10) minutes to reconvene for confidential session.

*President Wu and Chairperson Velling.*

With no objection the Chair adopted a privileged motion and the body was recessed for ten (10) minutes.

**Confidential Session**

Reconvened by Richard at 19:54.

**Be it resolved that** Board enters Confidential Session.

*Vice President, Gerrits and Vice President, Richardson.*

**Motion carries** unanimously.

Deliberation of confidential session is not included in the public record.

**Be it resolved that** Board concludes of confidential session

*Chairperson Velling and President Wu.*

**Motion carries** unanimously
Reguler Session

Other Business

Chairperson Velling followed up on the legal service survey which was conducted last term and whether Board needed to prepare for action going forward, like a Request for Proposal for competitive bids or seeking brokerage via StudentCare or a similar entity. President Wu replied that he is following up and prepare information for the Board on this.

**Be it resolved that** the Chair adjourns the meeting at 21:57

*Vice President, Gerrits and Vice President, Richardson.*

Motion carries unanimously
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PRELIMINARIES

CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Chairperson Velling called the meeting to order at 17:30.

Special Session

GENERAL ORDERS

BOARD ANNUAL ACTION PLANS AND GOALS

Chairperson Velling informed the Board that the President and himself had put together a brief presentation on common underlying themes to Directors’ proposed annual goals
and action items.

The Chairperson was given leave to present the information by the Board.

**INTRODUCTION**

The Chairperson explained that he and President Wu were trying to explore some broad themes underpinning most of the goals and to highlight unique ideas proposed. Based off of this, the Board should then determine where it would like to go to from there.

The purpose and goals were to give Directors the opportunity for collective input on some different areas to frame the annual direction and action plan for the Board and generally the entire corporation.

**Governance Themes**

- Many Directors spoke to ratification by the Board of committee decisions to alleviate time consuming in-depth discussion in Chambers. This would transfer more responsibilities to the Board’s committee.
- More opportunity for arguments to be first brought to committees.
- Direct reporting of committees to the Board rather than subsidiary bodies like the Executive Committee or other groups.
- Establishing a balanced approach to AGM and empowering Council.
- Balancing Council’s mandate and popular will of the membership with the Board’s responsibility for the corporation’s stewardship.
- Stronger Board to Council connections.

Chairperson Velling opened the floor to discussion of thematic governance goals for the year.

Vice President, Richardson commented on Vice President, MacMillan’s behalf, indicating that a budget committee would probably consist of a large percentage of Board on the committee and that returning responsibilities of the full organization’s budgets to the SC Budget & Appropriations Committee may not be in order due to the confidentiality of restricted budgets.

Chairperson Velling replied that he and President Wu had addressed the possibility of having Council members of the Budget & Appropriations Committee to sign confidentiality agreements, and that procedural changes to make this a requirement had been instituted. The Chairperson emphasized that he preferred this option over a separate Budget or Finance Committee for the Board because, as the Vice President, Operations and Finance indicated, that committee would largely be composed of most of Board.

Vice President, Gerrits requested that the Board make sure there is a clear distinction between what the Board’s principles were and what its objectives were. He further commented that Directors goals of ensuring separation of responsibilities between Board, Council, and the AGM and the goal for Board-to-Council connections were not contradictory Chairperson Velling replied that he did not inherently see them as contradictory because the point of connections remaining as a goal carried over from the prior Board was
because it was advised by outgoing exec and chair and would allow great accountability of the body to the membership through their representatives.

Vice President, Richardson informe the Board that General Manager Burdett wishes to provide input based on capabilities of the organization and her historical experience. Chairperson Velling proposed that perhaps Board have a holistic discussion after the meeting about what ideas and direction it would like to take and then approve it at the next regular meeting.

Director Plante emphasized he was in support of empowering our committee structure to make actual Board meetings more productive, to allow Directors to get more into the weeds outside of chambers. Chairperson Velling commented that many other Directors expressed similar sentiments with alternative options and that Director Plante was not alone in his belief that discussions in chambers could be more strategic.

**ACCOUNTABILITY TRANSPARENCY THEMES**

- Increasing access to agendas and minutes of the Board.
- Increasing Feds' brand awareness, and making sure members know what is communicated, how it is communicated, and when it is communicated.
- Elections awareness and engagement — both for Council and Executives but also for the ratification of Directors.
- Society engagement and outreach.
- Executive Board accountability to Board.

Vice President, Richardson inquired if the accessibility of information was predominantly focused on just agendas and minutes, or was there more to do? Chairperson Velling responded that the underlying concerns expressed by a few directors in the planning document were focused on how does the Board and the membership hold Board to account for relaying what is going on and decisions being made. Vice President, Richardson noted this tied into her next question. She emphasized that not all things need to be communicated, some things are too minute, we should figure out what we do and don’t want to communicate Chairperson Velling agreed and supported the idea of building criteria or thresholds of characteristics could be able to evaluate a decision as being valuable enough to inform the membership.

Vice President, Richardson spoke to Society Engagement and Support specifically as something that her office and her commissioner already try to tackle a lot on the operational level, how does Board ensure that in chambers this conversation is kept strategic. Director Beauchemin emphasized that this point tied into the overall communication strategy already discussed in prior meetings; making sure that they approaches are effectively integrated. He noted that Feds could lean on societies to help promote Feds and common goals. Chairperson Velling commented that generally this was more a Council matter as well, but that the organization should be able to engage societies on university advocacy a little more, particularly that the clubs/societies team needs a bit more visibility. Vice President, Richardson believed this is less of a Board responsibility, and
emphasized her agreement with Chairperson Velling’s comment regarding this belonging with Council.

Vice President, Richardson, on behalf of the Executive Board, expressed interest in Director’s comments about the accountability of Executive Board to the Board of Directors. She informed the Board that the committee meets thrice (3x) a week, and a large amount of the discussion is not strategic. The Vice President encouraged that if greater accountability frameworks get implemented that the Board makes sure that there are good guidelines for when Executive Board discussions or decisions are actually brought forward to the Board. Chairperson Velling agreed with the Vice President. He mentioned that perhaps a summary or digest of decisions should be passed in agendas to Board for information only. Director Plante echoed the Chairperson’s suggestion, noting his plan in this regard was to better inform Board about what the organization and the Executive are doing. He stressed that until Vice President, Richardson mentioned the on-goings just now, he did not know what it is the committee did; and that this itself emphasizes the need for better communication. He suggested that this needn’t be a formal mechanism, that perhaps even an email could be sent out every week to Directors keeping them informed. Chairperson Velling inquired to the remainder of the Directors present if something like this would help directors ask questions and learn about the Executive’s actions. Vice President, Richardson asked if the Board has exhausted discussion and was ready to move on with the presentation. Director Siemons stated he was not ready to move on and noted that it might be worthwhile to have a metric for analyzing how significant a decision is that it warrants being part of said digest/summary of actions. If something was significant enough, that is when decision accompanies such a summary/digest to Board; and similarly with Board, if the decision of action of Board is significant enough it is communicated to Council and the students-at-large.

**Commercial Operations Business Practice Themes**

- Establish long term vision for businesses including financial sustainability.
- Consistent budgets and financial reporting.
- Summary of strategies for the membership.
- Reviewing Student Life Centre (SLC) leased spaces
- Explore other university’ pride in student establishments.
- Educating people on what Feds provides.

Vice President, Gerrits inquired to whom does financial reporting allude in this presentation. Chairperson Velling responded he was not sure but presumed teh Board. Director Beauchemin replied that it should be a goal to make things more transparent to membership than simply an auditor’s report. Chairperson Velling agreed and suggested that summaries, bottom lines, annual business goals, and long-term business strategy could be passed to membership reasonably without substantial risk. Vice President, Gerrits highlighted that significant thought would need to go into what information is released in terms of business strategy. Chairperson Velling stated that explaining bottom lines and informing membership or Council of why they are where they are and how we
intend to improve them is critical; he noted that sometimes losses are strategic and if the membership sees loss with accompanying explanation undue concerns can be raised. Director Plante explained that his comments on this point were aimed at making substantial amounts of the business strategy clearer for the Board, but agreed that we could do more in improving communication to the membership on our restricted and business finances.

Director Plante informed the Board that recently an SLC space audit was conducted, but he was not sure by whom, this is something the Board may want to revive considering the SLC-PAC expansion. Chairperson Velling stated that we should be ensuring that student value is being assured through our tenants as well, make sure that tenants are responsible, and that unused space is properly used; the Chair highlighted concerns raised regarding the Campus Dentist at the Students’ Council in March of this year. He continued that it might be worth looking into doing another space audit after the SLC-PAC expansion had completed. Vice President, Richardson stated that the organization has full time staff assessing value of leasing arrangements and ensuring these tenants meet student needs. She asked that the Board keep this in mind while considering the proposal. Chairperson Velling was not convinced the organization was succeeding in assessing value to students, and that the Campus Dentist was only an example of somewhere better value could be provided, but that perhaps greater student consultation in this process was needed.

Vice President, Gerrits spoke to the theme of student pride in establishments, such as the campus pub. He noted this was neither a principle nor a goal Vice President, Richardson offered that perhaps this was something not to be taken on as a Board, but maybe in a research pair with Directors partnering with Executives or Staff to explore addressing this. Chairperson Velling stated that it was important to make sure that we identify a need if it is there, and that while specific research could come from the bottom up but that the assessment of need and direction can be asked for by the Board. asked if for the next Feds’ Strategy Plan it will be important to put thought into the organization’s identity.

Vice President, Gerrits defended the organizations communication to and engagement with students on educating them of the organizations purpose and actions. He stated this was something integrated into everything the organization does. Chairperson Velling agreed generally, but multiple directors had expressed that it will be important to have metrics to verify this and ensure success of practices.

**FINANCES AND HR**

- Value-for-Money in the organization.
- Consistent financial practices.
- Is our workforce performing operations well and where can we better support them to better achieve organizational objectives.
- Where are executives to be better supported?
- How can the Board increase communication with Staff.
Director Plante spoke to the value-for-money. He noted that this was a recent corporate policy passed by the membership at Council which requires the Board to better address value-for-money. He asked how the Board was thinking about compliance. Chairperson Velling noted he intended to inform the Board at the next regular meeting about the new policy requirements imposed on Board and proposing procedural changes for compliance soon.

Vice President, Gerrits addressed the comment for greater lines of communication between Staff and Board. For information, he would hope that the management structure is what should allow operations to be efficient. Vice President, Richardson noted that the lines of communication between Staff and Board might need more justification. Having staff provide reports for strategic decisions might be important, but beyond that exec should be sufficient, would love to hear some more rationale. Chairperson Velling stated that his suggestion had come from prior directors and the 2015 Governance Review points to this. At the time the Board had just moved away from being a Council-Board; as an organization Feds implemented some but not all of the recommendations and there are areas where recommendations are still very valid and ought to inform our process moving forward. The Chairperson highlighted the potential risks in only having one conduit for communication with the Staff (the General Manager), particularly considering Executive turnover might make it difficult to spot problems that better communication with staff could address. The Chair stressed that different options are provided and it need not be stepping on Executive toes, nor would this be aimed at involving Board more in Staff operations. He suggested that managers could recommend strategy and come in and present to Board about their area of expertise (e.g., the Director of Commercial Operations could present the commercial operations strategies, performance, and budgets to Board and take specific questions which the Vice President, Operations and Finance could support and help answer but would provide more insight in history and performance).

Chairperson Velling recounted that the manner of the Board used to be heavy handed with staff, generally a good goal for any high-level management, executive, or directors are to know their staff and ensure their staff are comfortable and trust in the Board. The Chair sees it as part of a Director’s responsibility. Additionally, many large for-profits are opening up their Boards a bit, taking more steps to improve board-staff relations. Chairperson Velling thought this idea was commendable and could reasonably be considered for Feds as well.

**Board Transition Themes**

- Improve transition, including in length, and extent of training for Directors.
- Organize social events and team building opportunities for Board and Executives.
- Introduce a checklist for transition of the Board.
- Improve understanding of corporate structure and accountability mechanisms.
- Essential to introduce greater support and professional development for Officers of governance bodies of the Federation — particularly the Corporate Secretary and Chair.
• Establish a global governance calendar for Executives, Board, and Council deadlines and activities to keep the organization on track and aware of forthcoming requirements.

Chairperson Velling suggested the creation of an ad-hoc Transition Committee to explore best practices from other universities and to recommend changes to improve transition for Board and other areas in the organization. The chairperson informed the Board he was working with the Budget Committee and President to allocate greater funding in the current Fiscal Year budget for transition for Board/Council and also for Board team building opportunities.

Vice President, Gerrits stated that he thought any governance calendar should be month by month, and that separately HR training for Directors might pose a challenge considering HR is outsourced to the University’s department.

Chairperson Velling asked for other thoughts on transition themes from the remainder of the Board. Vice President, Gerrits expressed that the outgoing boards are an asset that could be used for improving transition. Director Plante noted that one issue is that things are not written down as to whose responsibility it is to conduct Board transition. Furthermore he expressed support for the ad-hoc committee. Chairperson Velling clarified that this responsibilities falls to the Chair — both incoming once elected, and outgoing — and so any failings in this were his responsibility and he apologized and intended to improve this going forward.

The Chair asked for discussion of another element of organization transition, as to whether Council should be assisted. Director Plante expressed that it was Council’s right to self-determine their transition and allocate funding for it. He stated it was better for the Board to solve its own shortcomings first. Vice President, Gerrits concurred with Director Plante and encouraged Chairperson Velling to push for this independently by merit of being on Council.

STRATEGY

• Promote identity.
• Improve lines of communication.
• Create transparent pay assessment.
• Make committees the place for analysis.
• Develop metrics for board success.
• Make meetings more accessible (focus on electronic and telephonic communication).
• Ensure actions of the organization, and the Board, are framed in and succeed in achieving long term vision.

Vice President, Gerrits expressed that developing metrics and alignment with long term vision are integrated goals and should be considered jointly. He also called attention to the need to consider how not to be inundated with ideas when staff are not actually thinking on a strategic level. Would prefer to see exec as the conduit and filter. Chairperson Velling suggested that the discussion goes back to the prior point of Director
Siemons’s that Board establish metrics to try and figure out principles to determine when something is brought to Board. He called Director’s attention to corporate policy 39, *Communication*, requiring that Board and Council communicate with one another and with staff regularly. He reminded Board of the obligation under the bylaws to respect and uphold the policies of the corporation to the fullest extent possible.

Vice President, Gerrits requested clarity on the use of the term ‘analysis’ in the highlighted theme. He stated there as ambiguity in the term analysis, could mean on one level doing the research, could on another level be considered evaluating options, rather than generating. Chairperson Velling expressed agreement, but called attention back to the failure to employ committees successfully. The Chairperson specifically focused on the Risk Management Committee. He expressed desire for training of the committee members. He also underscored the role of At-large Directors being the closest the organization gets to the traditional Independent Directors at other institutions on our Board. Director Plante noted he already spoke to this a bit on the finance side, but agreed that a word other than analysis should be used. As a whole, committees could cut down on frustration during full Board meetings. He commented that Board failing to use their committees at all is the current-state and that it was not a bad idea to experiment in this regard.

**STRATEGIC DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL GOALS**

The Chair limited discussion to anything throughout the presentation, other goals, and figuring out the direction Board wished to take.

Chairperson Velling began that Board may wish to task President Wu and himself to create *ad-hoc* committee if the Board felt this was an appropriate direction. The Chairperson asked that Board wished to do with the information that Directors proposed.

asked what the *Mr. Goose* identity was. Chairperson Velling informed that Council made it so that we should advocate to get rid of the current University mascot, and to make a Goose the mascot of the student union and the University.

Director Plante encouraged the Board to officially adopt some strategic goals, and develop something to point to to keep ourselves accountable. He proposed this be included on the agenda for the next meeting, on August 1st. The Vice President, Education asked if the next meeting special or regular meeting. Chairperson Velling replied that it was a Regular meeting. Vice President, Gerrits asked if the Chair could add in the next meeting agenda, and that Board could motion to task the President and the Chair to create a list for next meeting for approval of some of the items discussed today. proposed that President Wu and Chairperson Velling may want to select one or two items from each section. Director Plante suggested instead the top three items overall recommendations as adopted recommendations. Vice President, Gerrits encouraged that this ought to be left at the discretion of the Chair and President. Chairperson Velling stated he would include a motion to adopt the annual goals on the agenda for the regular meeting and asked the Vice President, Education to send the minutes from this meeting. The Chair also reminded Vice President, Gerrits to submit his updated action plan prior to the agenda release on Saturday evening. Vice President, Gerrits expressed apology for the late agenda item and stated the Chair would have it by this evening.
Chairperson Velling offered that in interest of prudence, the Board’s action plan/annual goals should be run by Council for consultation and be released publicly in a similar framework to the requirement that the Executive’s action plans seek Board consultation prior to approval. Director Beauchemin would be interested in non-binding Council feedback and expression of support for Board’s plans. Chairperson Velling stated he would like to see documentation developed going forward to better create better action plans in future years both for the Executive and the Board. Director Plante raised concerns that waiting to September for feedback from Students’ Council could mean Board would fail to approve the plan until October. Director Beauchemin suggested that Board could approve an initial plan encompassing annual goals and then revise it in October if anything of significance arises or Council expressed concerns. Director Plante supported this suggestion.

**Be it resolved that** the Board sets the following agenda item for the next regular meeting agenda:

**Be it resolved that** the Board adopts the Board Action Plan Annual Goals and tasks the Chair and President to seek Council consultation on the same.

**Be it further resolved that** the President and the Chair shall develop a written plan for the next Board meeting based on special meeting deliberations for Board approval. *Director Beauchemin and Director Plante.*

Director Siemons encouraged the Board to include General Manager Burdett’s consultation in the agenda item.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**CHANGES TO CORPORATE POLICY FRAMEWORK BY COUNCIL**

The Chairperson notified the Board to be aware that changes are expected from Council with regards to Procedure 9 which would separate the Federation’s policies into corporate and advocacy policy. This was the recommendation of the outgoing Policies Procedures Committee which was largely composed of Directors. Pending Council’s agreement to the changes, Board will now have more involvement in corporate policy, albeit non-binding, but that Council would be required to seek Board’s written commentary on policies that are corporate in nature prior to any vote to approval, amend, or rescind. Chairperson Velling stated that the Officers of Council supported the changes and that the PPC unanimously voted to recommend Council’s immediate adoption of the procedural amendments. Director Plante expressed that at times the lines can blur between corporate and advocacy policy. He inquired who is determining whether future policies are advocacy or corporate. Chairperson Velling responded that going forward policies would be framed into sections for corporate and advocacy portions, but that the classification would be recommended by the mover. He stated that other changes were that corporate policy would now be permanent and non-expirable until Board recommends removal and Council confirms Director Plante inquired if this meant policies were no longer in the policy expiry cycle. Chairperson Velling confirmed
New Corporate Policy Aimed at *Value-for-Money*

Chairperson Velling informed the Board that the membership, through Council, had approved a new 'value-for-money' corporate policy requiring that:

- the principal actor (ultimately Board) responsible for any major expenditures or ongoing contracts must always be able to demonstrate the superior value-for-money of that expense relative to comparable options;

- ongoing year-over-year contractual expenses shall be reviewed for value by the responsible principal actor at least once every five (5) years through a reportable mechanism;

- the Board must now produce summary documentation to describe the nature of any contractual expenses of the Federation of Students to inform the general membership;

- the Board regularly review the corporation for continuous improvement in the way in which it exercises its functions through assessment of:
  - effectiveness — Are expected outcomes being met?
  - efficiency — Is the corporation running efficiently?
  - c. economy — What outside factors are contributing to the provision of services and operations?

  and provide an annual written assessment of this to Council.

- the Board has to develop operating procedures to reflect the above principles.

The Chair jokingly assigned homework to the Directors to read *Federation Policy 51*.

**Adjournment**

Be it resolved that the Chair adjourns the meeting at 19:04 PM

*Director Beauchemin and Director Plante.*

Motion carries unanimously
Value for Money

1. Federation of Students Policy #51, *Value-for-Money*, sets out certain requirements of the Board of Directors in ensuring that students are receiving superior value-for-money on membership dues. All definitions from, and requirements imposed by, Policy #51 apply to this procedure.

2. The Vice President, Operations & Finance and General Manager shall be responsible for ensuring any major expenditures or ongoing contracts are always capable of demonstrating superior value-for-money of that expense relative to comparable options.

   a. Before entering into any contractual agreement or incurring any contractual expenses, the Board will publicize a (RFP) for the services they are looking to buy.
   b. Such RFP will be posted publicly on the Federation’s website and such other media as determined by the Vice President, Operations & Finance and General Manager for a period of no less than thirty (30) days.
   c. The Executive Board, in consultation with the Chair, will determine some appropriate criteria to evaluate all proposals submitted in response to the RFP and have these criteria approved by Board before proposals begin to be evaluated.
   d. Such criteria shall, at minimum, include:
      i. Reputation of Company
      ii. History of prior contracts with the Federation
      iii. Capacity for the company to meet their requirements
      iv. Comparison to industry prices
   e. All proposals will be evaluated based on the approved criteria and the results of such will be presented to the Board of Directors.
f. The Board of Directors will choose the proposal that will incur the most superior value-for-money expense relative to comparable options, pursuant to requirements outlined in Policy 51, *Value-for-Money*.

g. Upon the completion of contract negotiations with the selected proponent, the Vice President, Operations & Finance will produce a memorandum or other summary documentation to be distributed to the general membership informing them of such action.

4. **Review of Contractual Expenses:**
   a. The Board of Directors shall review any ongoing year-over-year contractual expenses at least every five (5) years by publishing an RFP for set services.
   b. In order for this to happen, any contract greater than five (5) years in length, must include a Federation opt-out clause after five years at no additional expense; or a waiver shall be issued for such a requirement with no less than three-quarters (¾) of the Board voting in the affirmative and notice be publicly disclosed through to the Students’ Council.

5. **Financial Reporting Requirements:**
   The Vice President, Operations & Finance and the General Manager will regularly report year-to-date actuals of the Corporation to the Board and detail an assessment of the how spending relates to the following:
   a. Effectiveness — Are expected outcomes being met?
   b. Efficiency — Is the corporation running efficiently?
   c. Economy — What outside factors are contributing to the provision of services and operations?

At the end of each governing year, no later than April 30th, the Chair shall be responsible for providing a report, written in conjunction with the Vice President, Operations & Finance and President, for the Students’ Council which reviews the exercise of the Corporation’s functions and has regard for the value-for-money of member dues.

6. **Increments to the Dues Paid by Members:**
   The President and Chair shall be jointly responsible for notifying the membership of approved changes to member dues, ancillary fees, or administered fees of the Federation and their reasoning. Such notice shall occur within thirty (30) business
days of such an increment being approved by the Board of Directors, Students’ Council, or a General Meeting.
FEDS LEGAL SURVEY

Executive Summary

The Feds legal survey launched in January 2018 to discover if UWaterloo undergrad students are interested in having insurance coverage that provides them easy access to high quality legal support.

The survey was promoted during Winter Welcome to increase awareness: the Feds Promo Team solicited responses at Welcome Week events with ipads and also offered flyers with the survey URL for those who didn’t have time to complete it. Around campus, the survey was promoted with a poster run, digital screens (SLC and campus), and whiteboards / routing. There was also an online push including an article on Feds.ca and social media posts, with paid advertising on Facebook. To increase the incentive for students to take the survey we offered 3 prizes of $100 Amex gift cards and promoted the survey as taking only 5 minutes.

After the initial push during Welcome Week, the legal survey was completed mid-February with one last push by the Promo Team to solicit responses in person. In total, we received 513 responses.

Respondent Demographics

| Gender     | 48% | Male       |
|           | 50% | Female     |
| Other     | 2%  |            |

| Years at Waterloo | 21% | 1 year      |
|                   | 15% | 2 years     |
|                   | 25% | 3 years     |
|                   | 36% | 4 years or more |
|                   | 3%  | I have recently graduated |

| Age            | 1%  | Under 18   |
|                | 65% | 18 to 21   |
|                | 31% | 22 to 25   |
|                | 2%  | 26 to 29   |
|                | 1%  | 30 and older |

| Coop | 43% | Yes       |
|      | 57% | No        |

| Faculty          | 12% | Applied Health Sciences |
|                 | 18% | Arts           |
|                 | 19% | Engineering    |
|                 | 8%  | Environment    |
|                 | 19% | Mathematics    |
|                 | 24% | Science        |

| International Students* | 14% | Yes       |
|                         | 86% | No        |

*There is a disproportionate amount of non-international students represented in the respondents. This could be an area for us to explore what the overall proportion of international to non-international students is at the school; if this is an accurate picture of the overall student body then this gives a fair picture but if it is off we may want to look further to determine possible differences in needs between these two groups.
Responses

Q1. How would you rate your current level of financial access to lawyers and legal services?

Financial barriers are high for the majority of respondents with 58% answering either not very or not accessible. However, the next question provides further clarity:

Q2. Have financial barriers ever stopped you from seeking professional legal assistance when you wanted or needed it?

While financial barriers are high for a majority of our target group, for 61% of our respondents it hasn’t actually stopped them from accessing legal services if needed. In fact, a full 45% have never actually needed and/or wanted to access legal services -- a clear majority of respondents.
Q3. Have you ever had an experience at work, at your place of residence or at your university, where you felt you were unjustly treated, legally speaking?

Again, a majority of respondents have not had any of these experiences (51%) but 18% said they weren’t sure. This could be an area to explore -- if students had low cost access to legal services and were in a situation where they weren’t sure if they were being treated unjustly, there could be fewer people answering ambiguously to this question if asked in the future because they would have more easily accessible legal expertise to answer their questions.

Q4. Did you have access to a lawyer or legal service when this experience occurred?

Almost all respondents who answered yes to the previous question said that they did not have access to a lawyer (89%) so there is a clear opportunity to provide low cost legal services to students, though not all have self-identified as needing/wanting it.
Q5. Do you feel like your situation could have been better resolved if you had access to a lawyer or legal services?

Again, a clear opportunity to offer a service to students since, whether it would have or not, an overwhelming majority felt seeking legal advice would have either for sure (74%) or might have (21%) helped them resolve their situation.

Q6. In your opinion, how important is it for students to have legal assistance readily available?

An overwhelming majority (92%) feel that it’s either very or somewhat important to have access.
Q7. Would you be in support of Feds implementing a Legal Expense Coverage service for its members? This service would include access to a toll-free helpline and legal insurance coverage for up to $100,000 per case, to a maximum of $500,000 in legal fees for litigation related to labour law, housing law, and students’ academic rights.

Q8. How much would you be willing to pay for a Legal Expense Coverage service that gives you access to a toll-free helpline and legal insurance coverage for up to $100,000 per case, to a maximum of $500,000 in legal fees for litigation related to labour law, housing law, and students’ academic rights?

Out of the options provided, almost double than the next highest number chose the lowest cost option (38%) so it does seem to be quite a price sensitive service. The majority of the 4% “other” response were students writing in that they felt $5 was their threshold unless the service covered more. There were a few comments about wanting to know more before deciding how much they’d be willing to pay so there could be room to increase the price if a fuller service were provided. The third highest response was to opt-out (17%) so there is strong evidence suggesting that we should provide an option to opt-out of the service if/when it’s offered.