

University of Waterloo

FEDS October General Meeting

Date: Monday, October 28, 2013

Official Start Time: 4:50PM

Chair: Introductions –will be Chair for this meeting. Fantastic turnout! 2<sup>nd</sup> largest in FEDS General Meeting Assembly. Roberts Rules of Order –intro Sean Hunt will be our parliamentarian.

CHAIR: Do you mind if I just get through my remarks? Bomber –providing the pizza. We're here to rep students and empower students –all decisions we make should be with students being kept in mind. We hope to run a very successful meeting. Dialogue w/ decision making. Hopefully by the end we "serve and empower". Reminder for proxies –throughout we will have for-side vs. against side. Get through our extensive agenda as quick as possible. Thank-you very much for coming. Approval of the agenda

Chair: Sean Hunt should be approved as Speaker, any objections? Edward is committed to hold Sean's proxy. Anybody with issues? Seeing none.

Chair: Make sure every one has a say, then have the discussion piece covered.

Item number 1: Approval of the Agenda

Moved by McIntosh, Forsith

Chair: Amend the agenda?

SB: I'd like to amend the agenda point item 4 after board of elections

**Motion:** Move item 4 after the Board of Directors election.

Chair: seconded by

Chair: those speaking against and those speaking for –not voting, this is the discussion period

For: late start, motion to have vote of board election after the meeting since there's a lot of people

Against: proceed as, we'd like to go through them asap because other people have classes

Chair: explaining how the voting process works. Scrutineers calculate the votes (for and against) and let you know who wins.

Vote: Motion Carried

Chair: Discussion on the agenda? Seeing none.

Vote: Motion Carried

**Motion:** Approval of the Minutes

1. **RESOLVED**, the membership approves the minutes of the 2013-03-28 meeting.  
**RESOLVED**, the membership approves the minutes of the 2013-07-16 meeting.

Moved by McGuinness, Forsether

Vote: Motion Carried

**Motion:** Election of the three Director seats

**RESOLVED**, the membership ratifies “Blank”, “Blank”, and “Blank” as Directors.

Moved by McIntosh, Henry

CHAIR: Those running for board seats, please stand by Brendan. Those with questions, just wait for a bit.

MCGinnis: **Motion:** given the number of candidates, I'd like to motion for a ranked vote.

Seconded by McIntosh.

Sean Hunt: candidates with most votes, if receiving majority of votes, will take the seats. E.g., 300 votes – you need at least 150. If it doesn't work out the first time, you will do a revote. If McGinnis motion is adopted, instead you will receive a ballot and ranked, ranked by first choice, smallest pile will be removed; then repeat. Done until 3 candidates are remaining.

Vote: Motion Carried

Nominees:

Elizabeth Bate

Ryan Jeethan

Ben Carol

Maaz Yasin

Cassandra Tower

Stephane Hamade

Elizabeth McFaul

Lisa Belby

Chris Vanville

Danielle Burt

Mary Hayhow

Chair: You will have 5 minutes per person

McGinnis: propose two minute time-limit and then questions

**Motion:** Candidates to speak for only 2 minutes

Seconded by McIntosh.

Motion Carried

Bate: Like to promote student engagement, extremely concerned about student involvement. Want to help by having you guys help yourselves. Think Board of Directors is great –objectives: not all board members are student councilors, really important to have someone who is very involved

Jeethan: 4A student, very excited, idea of student development –involved: Don + involved in program bomber; throughout –gained different level of experience for development. Don-social, academic, bomber: other involvement. Never been as involved as others, different perspective. Really like the opportunity.

Carol: 2A comp sci, new perspective, not the same exp, but heavily involved in student council, past exp. Student trainer –can be translated, bring enthusiastic perspective to FEDS that otherwise would not be there

Cassandra: 2a mechanical, part of engsoc, phd student helps/funds, sustainable campus initiative –help voice citizens opinions, make sure that feds work the way students want it to work

Hamade: business student; math involvement, feds council for math, mathsoc prez currently, work with HR , legal and finance –key responsibility of board therefore my experience match.

McFaul: double degree, marketing/stats, past experience, HR, policies and procedures, working w/ board, since this term –understand roles of board and power. Mathsoc as prez, HR and operational, would like to be on it; good knowledge on how it operates and how it should, filling the gap b/w what students know /don't. what's worth doing and not.

Lisa Beldeck: exec for society, FOC, interested to help, board of director member right now, budgets, policy changes, I work on those, that involves a cdn corporation, thanks for listening!

Chris Vandeveld: care about student body, want to help feds to be a trusted. Engsoc, directorships, been director since 2<sup>nd</sup> term, FOC, want to help it the best it can be

Burt: 3B math/business Student –new perspective –volunteer and paid, social as well. Vol; 2012 –FOC, heavily involved in feds of students. Paid –VP Ed. – Adam Garcia for co-op placement –advocacy, policies and bylaws on our campus. Want to bring fresh exp. And haven't been involved in board previously, have seen student council, so she thinks she has good idea of how it works. Connect with students in a 2way stream. Serve and empower undergrad students

Maaz Yazim: econ and finance, involved for past 4 years. Most students assoc, PT employee – empowered me, help inquire skill and help. Like to give back by being on board, overseeing financial, CRT, and a leader , advocating for students (salaries on jobmine) vending service (?), multi-million dollar budgets, all ops and finance will be in best interest, support projects and organizations you're part of. Strong skill with getting things done.

Mary Hayhow: people experience, 3 coop terms, law firm, business and law for the past 4 years, high school: student council, prez for last 2 years, more involved with feds, welcome week, also attend the meetings, lots of issues she's aware of.

CHAIR: candidates will take questions from the floor

SB: what do you think you actually do as a member of the board?

Elizabeth: decisions that are made, our version of; facing issues, employment, HR

Ryan: reading the binder that has bylaws, supervises and manages the management of corporation, also prepare and present budgets, issues with cheques –there are some people that aren't as informed, and I feel that while knowledge is limited, it's something that can be worked on.

Carol: board is group of people who serve and protect the students –protecting us from issues that may harm us.

Cassandra: rep students, final says in what FEDSS does, bring students

Hamade: key role, legal, finance, those are the main key points

Bate: strategy –BOD, runs the corporation –bod not just year to year vision, also looking at longer term (HR) contracts, leases etc.

Lisa: example, general meeting, agenda –we get to see what the exec is doing to rep you, making sure exec does what they said they would do

Chris: manage as a corporation, HR, finance, level of government, overseeing what the council does

Danielle: financial, legal, contractual things –need BOD; focus: manage activities and services that affects FEDS, the FT staff, and the FED of students that rep. the students

Maaz: financial matters, op financial matters –approve budgets, e.g., op matters: in charge, overseeing the SLC, study spaces

Mary: run itself under the bylaws, very important points, BOD is resp. for making sure that the bylaws are carried out.

SB: What's the worst thing about FEDS and how are you going to fix it?

Mary: I'd like to think that FEDS is running pretty well, welcome week + other activities are pretty awesome. In terms of board, not a lot of complaints. New decisions, new opinions that's why there's an election

Maaz: improve on getting the voice out there, communicate what Feds is doing –why is feds relevant to them; student engagement.

Danielle: great to see all those faces, this is the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest gen meeting, this is heavily based on the agenda and how controversial the things are, flaws: not always the types of attendance, we should always put the issues up, more students need to bring forward the issues plus suggestions from people on BOD.

Chris: communication; efficiency, problem: being where the students are, not always available to tackle issues and concern,

Lisa: going to societies meeting, but as BOD they can't really do it, but can push for it to happen

Elizabeth Bate: communication, difficult to hear about what's going on, what projects, and what's being accomplished –like to address; a lot of the issues is that the problems can't be solved by BOD, more on exec level and staff level. Want to focus on issues that can be solved by the board, eg., HR, so that other people who can work on the issues can help you and support those people

Hamade: find out their opinions, student general –

Network collaboration, engsoc, mathsoc, finances

Carol: don't know how to get involved, or where they can get involved –the way we brand ourselves to students can be improved

Ryan: Significant issues –not everyone will get their way. Sometimes people get too focused on the position, a lot of conflict –we need to get back to the middle ground and collaborative solution rather than a binary choice

Elizabeth Bate: student engagement –really important for us to reach out, there isn't one solution to what's going on, but we need to come up with innovative solutions to get people involved

SB: McIntosh: what are the interests that you have and how will you make sure you get through them efficiently?

Bate: involved in school, really care

Ryan: worked at bomber, security supervisor, no conflict of interest, issues coming up with that, --, I care about you guys,

Carol: no conflicts of interest

Cassandra: conflict of interest;

Hamade: minor conflict of interest being part of engsoc

Bate: no conflicts

Lisa: yes yes yes no

Chris: --

Daneille: instructor in athletics, not conflict, no decision power

MAaz: academic affairs commissioner, discussion about service or discussion, if it was deemed a conflict of interest, I would have resigned from position

Mary: no conflicts

Ramdev: long term vision for feds; what's one thing you'd want to change if you get elected, what's one thing in slc you'd like to change to make it more welcoming from students

Mary: more seating in great hall, long range –

Maaz: want to let students know what FEDS does, slc change

Danielle: FEDS –accessibility and health care; SLC: tutoring cord

Chris: FEDS: more involvement, SLC – wouldn't change it?

Lisa: SLC – FEDS:

Bate: FEDS: emphasis on student opportunities, so you can know where you can get involved; SLC- more people can use it more effectively, and is in best interest of students

Hamade: FEDS: more things in what's available, making students more aware SLC –more study space, plenty of space

Cass: FEDS –communications and operations SLC –make it easier to find the services

Carol: no opinion

Ryan: FEDS- better use of funds, SLC- love this building

Elizabeth: FEDS more opportunities for students: volunteer; SLC: study space

Chair: two more questions

SB: yes or no to the referendum

Elizabeth: yes

Ryan: yes

Carol: yes

Danielle: yes

Chris: yes

Bate: yes

Lisa: yes

Maaz: yes

SB: decisions based on students best interest, how do you exactly decide what is best for students?

Mary: no brief answer, but that's why you have a democracy

Maaz: BOD general consensus of students – voting us in to do the best for you guys

Danielle: take sources, personally, if more than one group of people say it, it's usually enough for a discussion

Chris: voting = advice

Bate: asking students when appropriate, the binder –lots of policies students have decided; what students believe and making sure we follow that

Cassandra: knowing

Carol: benefit the greater pop of school

Ryan: is this the best use of the money? Does this choice provide the greatest choice? Does it have a positive effect on the vast majority of students

Bate: communication, trying to understand what it is that people say, for confidential – just like what Stefan said

Chair: no other questions, Sean Hunt will explain voting process –go ahead with voting.

Sean: ballots with the candidates' names should've been received. Preferential ballots: rank 1-11, rank ea. A diff number, but don't need to rank everyone. In your best interest to vote all 11, once vote is written down, we will set up voting stations, fold ballots in half, mark placard to only write once, then put it in ballot box.

Chair: vote; 1 minute, then call people in by rows. Names of candidates once more.

Voting commences: 5:58PM

Chair: Let's get this meeting back on track. For those who haven't voted, make your way into the MPR.

Voting halts: 6:08PM

Motion:

**WHEREAS** every full-time undergraduate student currently pays a refundable fee of \$4.75 per academic term to the Waterloo Public Interest Research Group (WPIRG), a not-for-profit corporation; and  
**WHEREAS** this fee was initiated by the Federation of Students; and  
**WHEREAS** WPIRG has very low levels of on-campus student involvement and oversight, thereby lowering their standards for accountability; and  
**WHEREAS** WPIRG has not publicly released an annual report since the 2010-2011 year, and currently makes no annual reports available on their website; now, therefore, be it  
**RESOLVED** that the Federation of Students shall hold a referendum of the membership, for the purposes of determining whether or not students should continue to be assessed the WPIRG fee; be it further  
**RESOLVED** that such a referendum shall take place prior to the March General Meeting of the Federation of Students; and, be it further  
**RESOLVED** that Students' Council shall be expressly empowered to determine the specific wording and date of the referendum, within the framework of the requirements set out in this resolution.

Moved by Fostner

Chair: For or against take their respective sides. 10 minutes of speaking turns; will make statements and questions during this period, questions will be directed at chair of meeting and then to Fostner. From there alternating sides.

McGinnis: Motion that it isn't going from either side

Chair: First speaker

Forstner: amazing how much can change from writing and submitting motion to start of a meeting when that actual motion is discussed. When I originally put t the motion forward, it was on the suggestion of other people of other people not in power. When I looked at this, it seemed that there was a lack of transparency and very low level of activity. The attendance shows how very wrong I was. I want to start with the Whereas statements, they don't actually affect the motion, so it's unnecessary. I still support a referendum. Why? When you strip away the complicated details surrounding how students feeds work, there are two fees: ones that we can't choose we pay or not, versus, there are fees that we have chosen to pay. These fees are assessed by BOD however, the fees we choose to pay, are initiated and changed by student referendum. Feds like WPRIG are possible to be refunded; idea: fees we have chosen to pay, from time to time, should probably be run past students to make sure we're still on board to pay for them. Other peoples money should be expected to justify why they're receiving that funding. Why now? Most recent one was in 2005 (referendum) before that, year 2000, that was 8 years ago, so two reasons why referendum should be now: 1) world before is very different from now, a lot has changed in economics –enrolment increased significantly, priorities of students have shifted, and are not the same. 2) students of today are not students of 8 years ago –most of us are here for 4-5 years, some are here for 6, some are even here for 7, very few are here for 8. The fact of the matter is, the students that pay wpirg....THE STUDENTS did not agree to pay this. That being said, I do not doubt that WPIRG does good work –I have done my research that WPIRG is doing good stuff. In an ideal situation, the referendum simply validates students importance to campus. Key: we can' askew that that is what will happen. We can't assume that we already know the answer so that we don't ask the question. Proposal here because I think this is the best forum for open discussion and debate, if there is good reason to not hold debate, this is the place to say them. I encourage you all to bring orward your ideas, and make a decision that you think is right. My recommendation: say yes to what students want. I will take questions.

CHAIR: Any questions for member Forstner? Please raise your placards. Seeing none. Do you have any further comments?

Forstner: I look forward to hearing the discussion.

**Motion:** to have a recess.

Moved by Fitzah, Robyn

Vote: Motion Carried.

Chair: 25-minute recess so we will come back together at 6:45PM.

Recess at 6:20PM.

Meeting brought back to order: 6:45 PM

Chair: There has been a change of secretary, Alana Watson will be filling because Julia had to leave

Motion: WPIRG Referendum Motion proposed by Sacha Forstner

WHEREAS every full-time undergraduate student currently pays a refundable fee of \$4.75 per academic term to the Waterloo Public Interest Research Group (WPIRG), a not-for-profit corporation; and

WHEREAS this fee was initiated by the Federation of Students; and

WHEREAS WPIRG has very low levels of on-campus student involvement and oversight, thereby lowering their standards for accountability; and

WHEREAS WPIRG has not publicly released an annual report since the 2010-2011 year, and currently makes no annual reports available on their website; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the Federation of Students shall hold a referendum of the membership, for the purposes of determining whether or not students should continue to be assessed the WPIRG fee; be it further

RESOLVED that such a referendum shall take place prior to the March General Meeting of the Federation of Students; and, be it further

RESOLVED that Students' Council shall be expressly empowered to determine the specific wording and date of the referendum, within the framework of the requirements set out in this resolution.

**Motion:** to restrict speaking time to 3 minutes because there is a large volume of speakers and we would like to maintain timeliness.

Moved by McGinnis, Sidharta

Motion Carried

Motion: To amend this motion because it currently states that the WPIRG fee was initiated by the Federation of Students, but this is not true. I have a letter from the Federation president from 1973 that states the Federation approves the WPIRG fee and is in support of it, and that the fee was actually initiated in a petition that was facilitated by WPRIG and included signatures from 35% of the university student population. The fee was also approved by the Board of Governors in support of the Federation of Students but not initiated by the Federation of Students. Therefore making a motion to amend the last point of the motion that states the referendum wording should be controlled by the students council because the Federation of students does not control the WPIRG fee as WPRIG is a separate legal entity. Therefore, the referendum wording should not controlled by the Federation of Students. We want to amend the motion so the referendum wording is controlled by student committee of WPRIG members as well as representation from WPRIG not student council. Filzah

Point of Order: FEDS actually administers the referendum

Filzah: WPRIG fee is administered through the university and WPRIG has separate by-laws to initiate referendums as it is a separate legal entity. Referendums initiated by the Federation of Students are specific to be regarding Federation issues.

Unknown Member: asked a clarifying question

Filzah: If a referendum were to happen the Federation of Students shouldn't control the complete wording of the referendum because Federation doesn't control WPRIG.

Chair: We will not bring forward the amendment yet, the speakers must be exhausted then we will turn to the motion

Vice-Chair: With a complex motion like this there is a 2-stage amendment process. First any amendment to the resolving words are amended then amendments to the pre-amble can be attained because the content of the motion may change what is to be expressed in the pre-amble.

Chair: the italicized text to replace the struck out text. The italicized text reads "Resolved, that the date and wording shall be determined by a committee of student members of WPIRG". Do we have a seconder for this motion?

Seconded by:

Filzah: The federation represents full time and part time undergraduate students at the university but only full-time students pay the WPRIG fee so the Federation of Students has a larger student base and students council represents non-student members of WPRIG, so FEDS determining the wording of the referendum does not accurately represent WPRIG, so my amendment is to have a committee of students of WPRIG (so that's anyone who has paid the WPIRG fee in their tuition) to make the wording of the referendum

Unknown Member: asked a question

Filzah: There is a referendum committee for any referendum anyways, and it's made up of student council so I'm just changing that so it should be made up of student members of WPIRG. It's a more complicated process but student council doesn't represent WPIRG so it doesn't make any sense to have student council make the wording of this referendum

Unknown Member: are you saying that you are going to use student councils referendum committee but just ensure that members of WPIRG (students who have paid the fee) can sit on this committee?

Filzah: No, because the job of student's council is the represent students, they are not representing WPIRG

Unknown Member: how is the committee going to be formed?

Filzah: Through an application process, not sure how the referendum committee is formed through the student council. I understand it is a more complicated process I just don't see why the student council should word the referendum that directly affects WPIRG.

Unknown Member: if WPIRG forms the committee, how will we ensure there is no bias towards WPIRG?

Filzah: I'm not saying that WPIRG should form the committee, WPIRG members are any full-time undergraduate students who have paid the \$4.75 fee, so that's not WPIRG's committee

Hashman: Why does it matter who writes up the referendum, because you are saying people who are members of WPIRG are not necessarily members of student council, there might be non-student members who are members of WPIRG but they don't get to vote in the referendum anyways?

Filzah: It matters because they are deciding on the wording of a referendum that will affect WPIRG's funding but they are not members of the organization

Unknown Member: If there is an application process to be on this committee, who will be choosing who sits on it?

Filzah: the Federation of Students in combination with WPIRG

Unknown Member: how much of the WPIRG budget are we talking about today?

Chair: That is out of order, because it doesn't relate to the motion

AGAINST

McGinnis: Speaking against this motion for two reasons. The first that by law the Federation of Students must be the full administer of any student fees or changes to student fees or auxiliary fee, so in order for it to take effect we have to be following our own processes. For it to be considered a properly done referendum it has to be administered by the Federation of Students and this would be against our procedure. Just to clarify, there are a "Yes" and "No" committee formed by the Federation of Students and both committees must come to agreeance on the date and time and wording of the referendum question. So there is a guarantee that the question will be properly represented because WPIRG members would probably form most of the "No" committee and give them a fair chance at the table to make sure the referendum is well formed. If we aren't following our procedures properly and the referendum goes forward, someone could challenge us in court that the referendum was not properly done making it invalid

**Motion:** To call to question

Moved by McGinnis, Birnbaum

Chair: we are calling the question on the italicized motion "RESOLVED that the date and wording be determined by student committee of WPIRG members".

Motion Carried

In favour of stopping this from going forward:

Motion Carried

Point of order: Hashman: this amendment is unfriendly to the main motion because it effectively nullifies the main motion by opening up a referendum to legal action which means the referendum will be illegitimate in any case if administered by WPIRG and is therefore null and void

Chair: Rule that the point of order should have been made earlier before the motion passed

Hashman: Appeal the ruling

Chair: There is now an appeal for the ruling

Seconded by member MacIntosh

Point of order by unknown member: Please explain what an appeal is

Chair: an appeal means that a member of this body thinks that my ruling is not correct so they can appeal it

Hashman: The evidence provided that caused me to come to this conclusion was immediately followed up by a vote to call to question which made it impossible because of the voting process that was initiated for me to call the point of order during the vote so I called it immediately after at the first opportunity I had

Birnbaum: Against this appeal because it is obvious that those that support WPIRG have the majority and this entire motion will fail so I think the amendment was a waste of time, this appeal is a waste of time. So I would like to call into question this question, all previous questions, and the preamble.

Seconded by member Gaffoor

Chair: So if this motion is adopted we will immediately vote on absolutely everything. This means putting up your placard 'for' this motion means that you are for voting on everything. If you put up your placard for 'against' you are not in favour and you would like to continue with this motion to appeal.

Sean: the assembly voted to include the amendment above, and then there was a point of order that this amendment was out of order. The chair ruled that that point of order was not well taken, and that ruling was appealed. The question is on whether or not the decision of the chair will be sustained, so a decision in favour of the chair is a decision that the motion is in order and a vote against is to rule that the motion was not in order.

The ruling of the chair has been sustained, we will now be voting on the main motion

The main motion is:

WHEREAS every full-time undergraduate student currently pays a refundable fee of \$4.75 per academic term to the Waterloo Public Interest Research Group (WPIRG), a not-for-profit corporation; and

WHEREAS this fee was initiated by the Federation of Students; and

WHEREAS WPIRG has very low levels of on-campus student involvement and oversight, thereby lowering their standards for accountability; and

WHEREAS WPIRG has not publicly released an annual report since the 2010-2011 year, and currently makes no annual reports available on their website; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the Federation of Students shall hold a referendum of the membership, for the purposes of determining whether or not students should continue to be assessed the WPIRG fee; be it further

RESOLVED that such a referendum shall take place prior to the March General Meeting of the Federation of Students; and, be it further

RESOLVED that the date and wording determined by a committee of the student members of WPIRG Students' Council shall be expressly empowered to determine the specific wording and date of the referendum, within the framework of the requirements set out in this resolution.

Motion defeated

Board of Directors Results

Sean: Tellers Report:

**First Round:**

Danielle 79

Elizabeth Bate 13

Ryan Jeethan 37

Benjamin Carol 20

Maaz Yasin 138

Cassandra Tower 12

Stefan Hamade 22

Elizabeth McFaul 24

Lisa Belby 35

Chris Vanville 13

Mary Al 7 - Eliminated

**Second Round:**

Danielle 80

Elizabeth Bate 14

Ryan Jeethan 37

Benjamin Carol 20

Maaz Yasin 138

Cassandra Tower 12 - Eliminated

Stefan Hamade 23

Elizabeth McFaul 24

Lisa Belby 38

Chris Vanville 13

**Third Round:**

Danielle 81

Elizabeth Bate 14 - Eliminated

Ryan Jeethan 42

Benjamin Carol 20

Maaz Yasin 141

Stefan Hamade 23

Elizabeth McFaul 24

Lisa Belby 39

Chris Vanville 14 – Eliminated

**Fourth Round:**

Danielle 84

Ryan Jeethan 44

Benjamin Carol 20 - Eliminated

Maaz Yasin 148

Stefan Hamade 23

Elizabeth McFaul 24

Lisa Belby 46

**Fifth Round:**

Danielle 85

Ryan Jeethan 53

Maaz Yasin 150

Stefan Hamade 24 - Eliminated

Elizabeth McFaul 25

Lisa Belby 50

**Sixth Round:**

Danielle 86

Ryan Jeethan 54

Maaz Yasin 169

Elizabeth McFaul 28 - Eliminated

Lisa Belby 50

**Seventh Round:**

Danielle 89 - Elected

Ryan Jeethan 60

Maaz Yasin 177 - Elected

Lisa Belby 63 - Elected

Chair: Therefore the three positions will be filled by Lisa Belby, Danielle Burt, and Maaz Yasin. Congratulations.

Point of order: motion to adjourn

Out of order

**Motion:** Approval of Audit

Cheryl: reviews statements, General funds includes business and services. The dental care, health plan and UPass funds are restricted. Society fun is the aggregate of all the society funds and is also restricted.

Statement of operation, review of our investments. Discontinued operations is the final line for Fed Hall. Donations and other includes the Tim Horton's settlement and the SLC settlement. Had high staff turnover this year. This will all be posted on the website.

Motion Carried

Motion: Ranked Voting for Feds Election

Moved by McFaul, McGinnis

Liz: Sean provided a good explanation of the system when we voted earlier. You can rank as many candidates as you wish and allows you to vote for someone you like but might not win knowing your other choices will also count.

Berlingieri: is it what we just did?

Unknown: wondering as to line 5, why would it become an abstention?

McFaul: it should say vote cast. Can we make that change?

Chair: Any oppositions? No

Birnbaum: I want to pre-emptively speak against adjournment.

Out of order

**Motion:** Call the question

Moved by McGinnis

Motion Carried

Motion Carried

**Motion:** Fee decrease

Luke McIntosh: Statement from the Board.

Sacha: the feds fee is not refundable and in June I joined the budget committee with two goals, transparency and efficiency. I believe feds is subject to two forms of inefficiency, one is budgetary efficiency and that has been addressed by the board and their observation on staffing. Spending efficiency, spending 1000 when we could have spent 600 if you negotiated and took advantage of your resources. Lack of clear spending priorities, different departments put together budgets and send it to the exec. Departmental and unit budgets have regularly increased each year by significant amounts. I have a solution, reduce the fee by 10% and cap the increases at inflation for the next 3 years. Cuts will be needed in year one and will lead to institutional priorities. The big shift we need to see is from how do we spend the money we have to how do we do the most with what we have.

In year 3 we should have an efficient budget that will allow the board of that time to do some better planning.

Garcia: you served as a student at large on the budget committee; that is the purpose of the budget committee.

Sacha: it is chaired by the VPOF and 3 council members and one at large. There is a limit to how 5 people can set direction. We are currently looking at reviewing the process to see how we can get more direction from council and students as we develop the budget.

Ashton: do you have any specific recommendations as to where we can make budget cuts.

Sacha: I do, but I would like to keep them to myself so that council and board can make recommendations without my prejudice.

Sacha: out of time

**Motion:** adjourn meeting

Seconded by Kann

Question: when is the next general meeting and is it before fees are charged.

Our next general meeting will be in March and fees are discussed by the BOG in February

Question: Birnbaum, why are people choosing to adjourn, why don't you leave and the third is why do you think it is not sufficient people as it is more people than the last two times we increased the fee.

Vote: 89-74

Motion Carried

Adjourn