

Chair Burt: Outlines rules and schedule of events for the General meeting.

Presentation by Chair Burt on the State of the Federation of Students

**Call to order 3:21**

**Motion: BIRT the General Meeting approves the agenda**

– Moved by Prashant Patel, Brad Krane

**Amendment: Move items 6. Approval of Board Meetings Change, 7. Approval of SLC Market Place Motion, and 8. Approval of SLC Accessibility Motion before item 5.**

**Amendment of Bylaws** – Moved by Beverly Foster, Alvin Galley.

**Chris Lolos:** Can I ask that we keep the financial statements because that's something we legally have to do at this meeting. Like everything else is just like, we can kind of do, but that's something that needs to happen so I'd rather than happen first.

**Amendment passes**

**Motion Adopted Unanimously**

**Motion: BIRT the General Meeting approves the minutes from 2013 October GM & 2014 March GM**

– Moved by Chair Burt, James Koo

**Motion Adopted Unanimously**

Presentation by the Accounting Manager on The Federation of Students Financial Statements Report

**Hannah Enns:** My question is just to, if it's a decision to approve then were we not supposed to be provided with the documents that we're supposed to approve, i.e. the audited financial statement, in order to give the membership time to look over it and given that at the time of the notice for the meeting?

**Danielle Burt:** So at the time they were in draft form but I'm going to hand it over to the chair of the board to comment on that.

**Chris Lolos:** So I think the term approving the audited statements is a little bit misleading. It's not that we're approving them, it's just that we're accepting them. The board approves them like as required by law and then the general membership just accepts that the board has done so. We accept the audited statements. There's nothing that we're approving.

**Hannah Enns:** And then do they get approved at the general meeting in March, is that where the approval happens by the general membership?

**Chris Lolos:** There is no approval by the general membership. It is approved by board and then just accepted by the general membership.

Presentation by Chair Burt and Brad Kelley, Partner, Global Governance Advisors, on The Federation of Students Governance Review Report

**Question Period:**

**Male:** What sort of activities does the board used to like label as being business-oriented as opposed to being community-oriented?

**Brad Kelly:** Well the board is primarily business focused.

**Male:** What sort of activities though, can you divorce from community interests?

**Brad Kelly:** So in this situation we looked at the primary responsibilities of the Council, which is to look at the policies and procedures within the organization within the community that reflect the views and interests of all your various faculties and student interest groups. Then board is primarily focused on the financials, the broader business objectives negotiating and managing all your business contracts, the relationship between the schools students and the University. The division between the policies and procedures in the views and objectives is divided from the actual business objectives of the actual executives and board.

**Male:** With times changing, did you see any positions, I know you said every position is important and tried-and-true but are there any that you saw that were either like competitive or any positions that needed more assistants?

**Brad Kelly:** Primarily we saw the position of the president has been watered down in terms of not having a specific scope or span of leadership responsibility so with the previous president, he is more of a glorified liaison so to speak. We think that that presidential position should be bolstered a bit more so that there is more accountability within the executives to the president so that it's more of a typical management or leadership style as opposed to something that has kind of a weak figurehead like the United States. Sorry to make the correlation but it's true.

**Male:** Do you mind if I add on? Like I mean a few of us here like myself have been in the same sort of position as Danielle in a very diverse organization. Like what specific recommendations can you give to us to improve that sort of situation, to make her more of a manager and make more people accountable to her or to the position itself?

**Brad Kelly:** Will there should be more of a hierarchy within the executive structure itself see how your elected executives but right now they were kind of as a team of equals, and so the other executive have defined roles in terms of responsibilities that they are elected for. The president is kind of a broader figurehead and the president really should of a broader leadership role in terms of overseeing both other portfolios to make sure that they are being adhered to as properly as possible. But that being said, I don't know the actual specifics around the organizations that you're talking about. Every organization is unique and that's why you have to take kind of a unique view of all organizations. You may be in a flat organization where you have all hands on deck so your executive is really kind of your entire staff and everybody has to work together as a team of equals. So I can't speak specifically to what you're thinking but that was our view and opinion of the current executives. Anything else? Any questions for the accountabilities side? Thank you very much.

## **Motion: Approval of Board Meetings Change**

– Moved by Thomas Little, Hannah Enns

WHEREAS the Board of Directors is the chief decision-making body of the Federation of Students;

WHEREAS the Board of Directors recently closed their meetings to the public and students are no longer able to attend board meetings;

WHEREAS undergraduate students are the chief shareholders in the Federation of Students and the Board of Directors manages over \$2.5 million dollars of student funds annually;

WHEREAS the decision to close meetings of the Board of Directors has a negative impact on students and decreases transparency within the Federation of Students;

BIRT students charge the Federation of Students Board of Directors to reopen their meetings to students effective immediately; and BIFRT Student Council establish

**Thomas Little:** It's a really basic thing in an organization that the members should be able to see what kind of decisions the Board of Directors are making and these board meetings have been open for years and it's only just recently that they've been closed. So I see it, and Andrew sees it, as a step back in transparency which doesn't seem to mesh with the transparency platform, so I don't really understand why this was done but we should have it back the way it was.

**Chris Lolos:** Notice I'm not on either side because this statement I'm about to read does not take a side. So last night the Board of Directors passed this motion which is just to say that we would like to endorse this statement. So the statement is as follows: the Federation of Students Board of Directors has numerous responsibilities ranging from the financial to human resources to legal and contractual matters. As such meetings of the board must be dealt with in a serious manner both for directors and the general membership. In the 2013 – 2014 board term meetings included in open session where anyone could attend the meetings in the gallery. Prior to that year all meetings were conducted in closed session. That is only members of the board and invited guests were permitted to attend meetings. During open meetings parts of the meanings remained in confidential session as the nature of certain discussions are required to be private either by law or by the best interest of the corporation such as when discussing negotiation strategies for the University where it would be highly detrimental to have a gallery in attendance. Then within the same 2013 – 2014 board took a committee was formed to evaluate all aspects of board meetings. Among numerous recommendations there was one to return to close board meetings because the committee felt over the previous year that the presence of a gallery created a disorderly atmosphere during the meetings. After considerable discussion this recommendation was made and subsequently adopted by the board. Both the Fed's lawyer and the recent independent governance review strongly advised close meetings. All of this being said, the Board of Directors recognizes there is a push from students to help board meetings open to the membership. As per our charter of incorporation the Federation of Students exists "to promote the welfare and the interests of the students of the University of Waterloo." If it is determined that the general membership of this corporation, after considering arguments for both sides of the discussion, wishes for board meetings to be open then the board shall do so. Indeed all current directors were elected at a time when meetings were open. None of the current members of the board agreed to their position on the condition that meetings be closed.

Regardless of the outcome of this motion the director shall continue to uphold their fiduciary duty to the Federation of students and serve students of this university as best we can. Sincerely, the Board of Directors, Federation of Students, the University of Waterloo.

**Adam Savage:** I'm against open meetings as they work for the University and have been in the workforce for a long time. As soon as you open up meetings to a larger audience the results of the meeting are much less positive. You get a lot less accomplished, a lot less done, and in terms of our Board of Directors I think these meeting should remain closed and we still have this open forum here in which we can participate in. I would also like to hear from Mr. Kelly on what his recommendations were for the closing of the board meetings.

**Hannah Enns:** I'd also like to speak to the motion as well. Given that students' money is going to this it should be open for students to be able to be there and participate in the conversation. Again, that increases accountability. It invites students also to be a part of what is happening. It also can be used in an educational. For students who are interested in getting involved in Board of Directors in the future. That way if meetings are open then you can go and see how this process actually happens. Also, if you're considering being a Board of Directors at University maybe it is a good idea to go beforehand and actually see what happens within a meeting. Therefore you're actually going into that role more knowledgeable as to what that role actually entails.

**Carly McCready:** I'm a Feds councillor on the Council and I would just like to speak to the point about students attending Board of Directors meetings. So right now on the counsel I have seen zero students sitting in the gallery at our Council meetings except for those who are wishing to be elected or appointed to positions within Council like on our committees to speak to that. So I understand the desire to have meetings be open for transparency or democracy but in my past experience as a counselor at our Council meetings for the past three months there have been no meetings that are Council meetings that very little interest in actually physically arriving at meetings.

**Brad Kelly:** As was noted in our presentation there we do a very deep dive. Normally when we do a board assessment we will meet with maybe 5 to 7 board members in total and that in its entirety gives us enough information to really assess how the organization is functioning. Here we went to 20 individuals, we looked at the Council, we looked at the role of the Imprint, and if you notice a whole section was based on accountability, increasing account ability. So I'm shocked that you're raising such a major issue around something that is not universal for boards that are focused on business issues but you don't hold your counselors accountable at all. You elect them through your societies, they may show up they may not show up. They may give good information to the Council, they may not give information to the Council. They may or may not be asked to provide good, effective, concise overviews in your society meetings. That is a process that you need to strengthen.

So right now your executive board deals with issues that due to their fiduciary duties can be liable, they can be liable for discussing things like financial statements that haven't been properly vetted, HR issues, personnel issues, compensation issues all of which is they get out into the public forum actually can be sued. And so basically this is a protection for your board to allow them to fully vet these issues without people sitting behind them. One of the comments that I made to the board was that I thank God that I was on Student Council prior to twitter and Facebook and all of these things because people can actually sit in these meetings and tweet things out before they haven't been vetted. So what I found to my interviews with 20 individuals

was a lot of them are holding back and not fully participating in the meetings because they were scared to actually voice their true opinion because if the people sitting in the gallery. That is not an effective board. An effective board basically depends on the views and opinions of all of the people who are on the board and that's why you elected them. That's the democratic process. That's where you set your representatives and they are now in that room were sent in your interests, your best interests. If they can't do it to the best of their abilities and you're actually stagnating or you're actually truncating their overall effectiveness on the board.

So if you notice communication should be increased, accountability with your Council should be increased. The Council should be more effectively utilized in the communication between the societies, the Council, the executives, and the board need to be improved. Relationships with Imprint, the role of Imprint is tantamount to this. So they need to play a positive role in this as well in terms of keeping your board, keeping the execs accountable in a more positive way. Okay? So my view on my recommendation is if you close meetings and allow your executives and board members to truly discuss and vet issues with the protection that they can speak their minds and truly explore all the options and then collectively come up with the result then you're actually increasing the overall effectiveness of your board, and then increasing the communication and reporting after that the attendance of this meeting, I suggest you look at the attendance of these meetings too. If you want people to be more accountable and you want to increase communication you need to actually be part of the solution, you need to actually step up and get involved. I apologize because of actually preaching to the choir here because you're here, you're all here, but it's the mass that isn't here that was more of the problem that I think, and if you talk about getting involved in may be wanting to sit on board are wanting to become part of the execs are wanting to be on the Council, actually strengthening the communication between the Council getting your counselors to actually participate in societal meetings more effectively, I think that is what is going to actually increase the overall interests in your first years or your second year so by the time the third or fourth year they're ready to step up and take more of a leadership role. Okay? That may be a utopian view but that is our view of the recommendations that we provided. Are there any questions or on that?

The typical current best practice is when an outside individual is being asked to participate in the board meeting they are asked to participate because they are a subject matter expert in one particular area that the board is actually trying to bet or address. They are invited in and usually it's approved by the chair and the president, the executive director or whoever the top executive is, and then that person is normally invited to come and attend that one agenda item and only the one agenda item and then they are politely asked to step out after that. That is the current best practice. I don't know the current situation is but that would be our recommendation.

**Chris Lolas:** So specifically for invited guests the process is similar to what he said. So I as the chair can invite a specific person for the specific motion who is an expert in that field and then they would leave during the rest of it. However, I can be overturned by the majority of the board as well. So if I say that this person I don't feel is an expert in the subject and should not be allowed to attend the rest of the board can say no they should and it's just a majority vote.

**Brad Kelly:** I should add that I didn't properly introduce myself in the beginning. I'm the partner and cofounder of Global Commerce Advisors. We are a board advisory firm. We have offices throughout North America since 2009 so we have expanded very quickly because of the focus and the importance of governance and compensation management throughout our North American economy. That being said I work with hundreds of boards. The most effective boards, the ones who have closed meetings and are able to get things done, they are able to speak

their minds. There could be a lot of discussion, dissension between the board members' various views, I think that is important, but that the most ineffective boards that we deal with are the ones that are actually publicly televised the company get posturing, you get people who are saying things that may not necessarily believe where they may just be speaking because they feel they need to speak and the meetings tend to ramble on for eternity but they never actually address the true issues or they never get the true opinions of the members because they are afraid of either misinterpretation or issues around vetting their true feelings. I think if you were to look at the broad spectrum of organizations that we deal with, again our recommendation is closed meetings are the most effective as long as you have strong accountability measures around it, the strength of communication to make sure that that group of individuals are going to be held accountable.

**Dave Foster:** I would like to speak a bit against the motion. Speakers have said in regard to the board culture and how people feel when their participating. I heard, I think it was you, you said that it becomes disorderly when students are listening and that we heard from the counselor as well that students aren't going anyway so I'm not sure where the conflict comes from. I want to speak a bit to the board as a business as opposed to the board as organizing the Federation of Students which I think should be its primary role. The motion is that we can set up a policy to have certain closed meetings if that meeting needs to be closed for legal purposes but otherwise the default should be that it's open. I apologize that if you feel having students doing what you're saying at the meetings oppresses your ability to speak your mind but that's honestly a bit how I feel as a student having to discuss emotions whether or not I'm able to hear what you're saying. I feel like my ability to participate in these things become limited by my inability to actually go to the meetings. Finally, I'd like to speak a bit to student turn out and student interest and student participation in this stuff. I'm not sure that the way that we increase student interest and participation in governance is by limiting their ability and their number of opportunities to participate or to listen into what's happening. Thank you.

**Ben Belfour:** So as a board member I can speak to the feeling of not being able to voice my opinions fully, ask questions about things that I don't feel comfortable and I don't have the knowledge about. So when we, Brad made the point very well, but when we look at the board that we have and we look at the millions of dollars that are being flowed through this board it is important that we can ask the questions that maybe are stupid, that we think are dumb, so that were not being judged by the people sitting around the outside of the table. So that is my point to that one. In terms of the things that go on within the board we are posting agendas before him, we're posting minutes after, which in all circumstances gives the students what we're doing and it says how and why we are making the decisions that were making even though you don't necessarily need to be in the meeting. I think I would really just like to reiterate Brad's point about Council being the place where we need to improve the amount of communication. When we look at the structure of the Federation of students and the role that board players versus the role that the Council plays the Council is the place where policy and procedure are created, where student opinion is voiced, and is then acted upon by the Federation of Students. The board is where business happens. So this is the business. I'm not trying to be confrontational at all that this is a business. At the end of the day we are running a corporation. We run this building, we run several commercial operations, and we have over 25 full-time staff which we must ensure that we are taking care of their HR responsibilities and duties. There's a lot of legal things that go on in this business outside of the forward facing events and clubs and services that students see on a regular basis. So when we look at the role of the board is taking care of that stuff, the not so fun stuff, and Council being the place where students can vet their opinion and have their voice heard we really need to recognize the duty that each of those bodies have

and how we can allow them to properly and most efficiently operate. So that's why I'm speaking against the motion to open the board. I feel that close board is the best way to go.

**Kumar Patel:** The other half of it is the personnel, it is the strategy that we use when you're dealing with administrators and personnel. Those are a lot of sensitive issues and when people's jobs and their livelihood are at stake, and staff members, it could set us up for a lot of liability you know that our organization can't afford to take on. We are not \$100 million Corporation like Walmart and they can just close a store and that staff member is no longer there anymore for example they can absorb that cost. Unfortunately were not in that situation and we're not in it for that either. We're here for the students. We want to maintain the financial integrity of our organization. I really, really, really do you advise you guys to vote this down. Against it.

**Zac Hogg:** I'd like to call the question.

**Chair Burt:** We have a motion to call the question on the motions.

**Call to question motion passes.**

### **Motion Passes**

#### **Motion: Approval of SLC Market Place Motion**

– Moved by Shifa Abbas, Dave Beverly-Foster

Whereas tuition and student debt increase annually due to the choices and policies of senior university administrators and governments,

Whereas a large majority of students face financial hardship and are especially vulnerable to the sales tactics of banks and other financial services companies,

Whereas the Student Life Centre (SLC) is the only student managed building on campus and should be as student friendly and supportive as possible;

Be it resolved that the Federation of Students ban for-profit banks and all other for-profit financial services companies from using SLC space to solicit students to register for credit cards, including both physical and advertising space, with the only exception being the existing premises of the CIBC branch in the SLC.

Be it further resolved that the Federation of Students work with the University of Waterloo administration and advocate to adopt a similar policy on the rest of campus.

**Shifa Abbas:** The purpose of this motion is to set a precedence for the kind of space that we want to create in the SLC. Now that the SLC is managed by Feds we have the opportunity to create a student-friendly space in which we actually serve and provide for students rather than create a space where students are harassed. The SLC space survey had an emphasis on community building. Credit cards are the exact opposite of community building. A large amount of students on campus are suffering from a significant amount of debt and financial stress and we have an opportunity to support them by creating a place on campus where they aren't encouraged to go into further debt and aren't accosted by companies, encouraged to make

decisions that will negatively impact them and cause them further stress. So mental health is a big issue on campus, something that Feds as well as a lot of other great student clubs and groups have been advocating and campaigning for, and the SLC is the only Feds run space on campus. I feel, and many other students feel, that it should be easily accessible conducive to mental health and well-being, and being harassed every time you walk across Vendor's Alley does not align with that. So the revenue from the credit card vendors is approximately \$15,000 which is less than 1% of Fed's annual revenue, and when considering the support that we provide service when removing these companies from the SLC it's well worth the loss in revenue. Feds was last year operating on a surplus. So Imprint recently reported that Feds is spending over \$30,000 of student on kiosks for the SLC as part of an effort to make SLC more modern. This is an investment that students had no say over, but if we can afford this kind of investment into three kiosks, surely we can invest money to make the entire building a little bit more student friendly. We have the opportunity to make it the most student friendly on campus. To sum up, this motion results in a loss of less than 1% of Fed's annual revenue and therefore the financial impact is insignificant and something that the corporation can absorb. Furthermore, the Federation students have the responsibility to factor in other people's consideration in financial decisions and we should acknowledge that credit card companies do not belong in a building that is meant to serve as a hub for student life on campus.

**Hannah Enns:** I personally as a student feel like the Student Life Center should be a place for student life, not be a credit card company's paradise for nagging students already wracked with a lot of student debt and I don't know about you but you probably feel the same way I do that when I am walking through Vendor's Alley and there are credit card solicitors there I am trying to avoid eye contact and walk as fast as I can. Now this is not promoting a safe space for me within the SLC, a space that I should feel comfortable in as a student, a space that I should be able to go to and distress, be involved in organizing future events, be involved in meeting up with friends, be involved in finding out what actual student groups are up to in Vendor's Alley. That's what the space should be used for, creating a student life space. Having credit card companies there is just another way that we are not allowed to actually have ownership over our own building, and I think that is just preposterous. As students we should have a say over what happens here in the building and not relinquish that to credit card companies whose only goal is to push us further in debt.

**Female:** So I am new to this meeting thing as well, but is a few points that I would like to address. The first one is the things that Shifa Abbas mentioned are there is evidence to what she is saying. You don't need to go to a psychologist to know this but you just need to read an article or two. The Feds in the past has constantly mentioned that they are for pro mental health. In fact, they have gone so far as to say we like to take active steps toward this. Well this can be that active step because things in psychology and more specifically in cognitive neuroscience and social cognition has shown that the prime of a credit card of the prime of some financial aspect in terms of like credit cards, banks, even something as a logo can actually increase someone's anxiety and you might think that's something insignificant and it's not if you consider the amount of people who walk through the SLC, the amount of people who actually have anxiety on campus. Though acknowledging this would be acknowledging the existence of anxiety that is prevalent among us, the students, and I would like for you to consider that evidence that supports this motion.

**Adam Savage:** I just wanted to speak to diversity and not creating a monopoly inside the SLC. As students, most of us, I will include myself in that as I have been here for a while, having only CIBC on campus really herds us toward one institution. I would support having more options,

more availability to give you something that you can find information about. Most students don't have access to cars in their first year. It's hard to get to branches to find out these information. I think it's nice to have it available on campus. I don't know if the SLC is an appropriate place for it, but I can't think of anywhere else that would be, so, I am for having credit card vendors here.

**Rebecca Reddin:** So as for credit card vendors in the SLC, it is good that we have the CIBC downstairs but that's only really utilized by people who if they are on campus are like oh I'm going to use the ATM, stuff like that, but all the same but I have heard a lot of people saying like Fed shouldn't be making financial decisions for us. Yeah, that's true, they shouldn't be making financial decisions for us so therefore I don't see the point in having credit card vendors because I know where to get a credit card if I want one and I have the internet now to kind of compare the different types of credit card companies and also the credit card vendors and just kiosks, they're not necessarily, they don't give you financial services on the spot, so if I were interested in them I could just look up, oh what are the ones featured in Canada? What are the ones featured in Ontario and go find them on my own. I'm an independent student, I'm financially independent. I can go and figure that out by myself and I don't need Feds to tell me which ones. In my head that is a monopoly that they are these credit card companies taking up, monopolizing space in the SLC when realistically you can sell that space to somebody else. So that's everything.

**Ben Balfour:** I just want to make things clear, I'm not speaking for or against. I just would like to provide this body with a little bit of information. So it was referenced before about the percentage of income that is generated through the SLC marketplace. It is currently just over \$120,000 per year. The revenue generated from financial institutions is roughly 12% of that. There is a couple other considerations that need to be had in terms of a tenant that we have within the building which is CIBC. Scott, correct me if I'm wrong, but they by signing the lease have a right to hold booths in the SLC marketplace. Yeah, so they have a right to advertise and market their service within the building which includes the SLC marketplace. There is also another agreement not made by Feds but made through the university that affects this motion, that being an agreement between alumni affairs, alumni relations, and the Bank of Montreal. In this agreement the University of Waterloo receives a percentage of every transaction made by students on credit cards signed through this promotion. So by making this agreement we can potentially affect an agreement made by the university with an external corporation and I am not 100% sure how legally that will fall out, so I don't know how that will be resolved if this motion passes. I think that's about it. Yeah, so the amount that is received by alumni affairs that is generated for the university is easily in the 10s of 1000s of dollars. Questions?

**Dave Beverly-Foster:** I think it's unfortunately that we have made decisions that mean we can't control who gets to advertise in our SLC. I think that was a big mistake and we should perhaps consider not signing such contracts in the future.

**Ben Balfour:** Just to clarify the lease that was signed with CIBC was signed like the 60s so that was signed between the university and now because we are now the managing corporation of this building and we have assumed that lease. The terms are for 17 years. So, yeah. That's just how the dust has settled in terms of us taking over the management of the building so we did not agree to that clause. That was agreed to by the university years ago.

**Scott Pearson:** I am the operations manager for the building and I just want to make a point of clarification. CIBC's prime purpose is just as a tenant. They do not really do very much credit

card solicitation. Any of the marketing that CIBC does is generally just to encourage people to be aware that there is a branch in the building. I just wanted to make that clarification.

**Male:** Yeah, so I think the fact that they haven't historically advertised credit cards kind of makes moot the point that we would be providing a monopoly for CIBC if we banned credit cards out there. I think it's fair to say that.

**Vote for original motion: In favour: 36 Against: 18, motion passes.**

**Motion: Approval of SLC Accessibility Motion**

– Moved by Rebecca Reddin, Maaz Yasin

WHEREAS the Student Life Center (SLC) is managed by the Federation of Students;

WHEREAS the SLC should seek to set an example as the only student managed building on campus;

WHEREAS the students of the University of Waterloo are concerned with the inaccessibility of the Student Life Center, in particular, the accessibility of the entrance facing the PAC parking lot;

BIRT the Federation of Students work with the UW administration to upgrade the SLC entrance facing the PAC parking lot to one that is accessible and automatic by August 2015; and

BIFRT that the Federation of Students complete an accessibility audit of the SLC be done and completed by April 1st, 2015

**Rebecca Reddin:** Originally our proposal was because a lot of students had noticed that some other students were having trouble with the fact that the doors on that side are not accessible and kind of after talking to a bunch of other students we had noticed that other parts of the SLC as well were a little bit more inaccessible. However, it kind of disregards the fact that there is a spectrum of disabilities and a lot of those disabilities can be invisible and a lot of them need alternate ways of getting around, and if we really want to be like a really good student governed building we would like put into effect all the different types of abilities within this school and within the way that our super large population of students has to orient themselves around a building.

**Chris Lolas:** So if this passes and you have a deadline of April 1, 2015 for the audit is that enough time to do a solid job on the audit?

**Ben Balfour:** I would not feel comfortable saying that I can get that done in this time frame based on all the other projects that are on the go right now. If I can say once again, I'm not for or against, like I can agree that the SLC space is not exactly accessible from that parking lot but I wouldn't feel comfortable agreeing to that timeline. If I were to suggest, I don't know whose going to be in office next time around so I can't really suggest how quickly it could be done.

**Chris Lolas:** I'd like to make an amendment that an audit be done and a progress report be completed by April 1, 2015. – **Moved by Chris Lolas, Doug Turner. Motion Passes.**

**Thomas Little:** I would propose that a clause be added to state that in the progress report there should be a deadline for the audit? – **Moved by Thomas Little, Wang.**

Danielle Burt: Thank you. Okay, do we have any debate on this amendment? For this amendment, against this amendment? I see none so... Are you against this amendment?

**Ben Balfour:** I'm setting a deadline for somebody who's not even in office yet. I'm setting a deadline for somebody that's not me and I don't know that that's fair, so... what's that? Well, what I read from that is when I give an update I give an update with hey this is going to be done at this point in time. Right, that's what you guys are trying to get at? So if I'm done April 30...

**Amendment motion fails.**

**Doug Turner:** I am for this motion, however I do have one concern that according to this, or the way I see it, the Federation of Students will bear the cost of paying for the audit and I don't think they have to pay for that, I think that's the university's responsibility since we wouldn't have to pay for any building repairs or maintenance in the first place. So I'd like to amend the final be it resolved statement to include that the Federation of Students complete an accessibility audit paid for by the University of the SLC. The trouble is there's no way... Sorry, the question was if I'm expecting the renovation to be paid for. I'm also expecting the audit to be paid for. Yes, I'm expecting both.

**Motion to amend:** BIRT the Federation of Students advocates for the University of Waterloo to pay for the accessibility audit and the upgrades. – **Moved by Doug Turner,**

**Thomas Little:** I would just like to point out that under policy 65 the university does have to proactively make efforts towards integrating people with physical disabilities so I think that it would be realistic for the university to pay for some of this so I am in favor of the amendment.

**Amendment passes.**

**Final Motion:**

WHEREAS the Student Life Center (SLC) is managed by the Federation of Students;

WHEREAS the SLC should seek to set an example as the only student managed building on campus;

WHEREAS the students of the University of Waterloo are concerned with the inaccessibility of the Student Life Center, in particular, the accessibility of the entrance facing the PAC parking lot;

BIRT the Federation of Students work with the UW administration to upgrade the SLC entrance facing the PAC parking lot to one that is accessible and automatic by August 2015; and

BIFRT that the Federation of Students complete an accessibility audit of the SLC be done and a progress report be completed by April 1st, 2015

BIFRT the Federation of Students advocates for the University of Waterloo to pay for the accessibility audit and the upgrades.

**Motion Passes.**

**Motion: Amendment of Bylaws**

– Moved by Chris Lolas, Ben Balfour

Resolved the Board of Directors Purpose State:

The Board of Directors shall primarily discuss and make operational management decisions relating to the legal, financial, human resources, high-level organizational strategy and long-range planning of the Federation of Students.

**Chris Lolas:** I just want to emphasize that this does absolutely nothing to the power of board. This is under the purpose of our by-laws and so it doesn't give or take away any powers of board. All it is for when a student reads through our by-laws and they're wondering what this board do, this is more clarification of the kind of things it deals with. Right now the purpose just says deals with the management of the Federation of Students. This gives some more concrete examples.

**Motion Adopted Unanimously**

Presentation by Chair Burt on the Long Range Plan Strategic Directions

**Motion to Adjourn**

– Moved by Maaz Yasin, Brandon Gaffoor.

**Meeting Adjourned at 5:39**