

**UWSA Board of Directors
Meeting #6**

Our mandate: "To serve, represent and advocate for students."

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD (EX-OFFICIO, NON-VOTING):

- Board Facilitator Sami Pritchard
- Board Chair Mohamed Mahmoud
- Board Minute-taker Anna Sallah
- President Jeremiah Bowers
- VP Student Advocacy Arop Plaek Deng
- VP Student Services Ahmed Abdallah
- VP Finance & Operations Sahibjot Grewal
- General Manager Maria Hamilton (Board Observer)
- Society Presidents Various (Board Observer)

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD PRESENT:

- Amber Tazzman
- Mohamed Mahmoud
- Davinder Singh
- Jasleen Dayal
- Gagneet Kaur
- Kevinprecious Fawehinmi
- Lena Sleiman
- Biane Deghaiche
- Quessia Mugabo
- Linden Crain
- Andre Ducharme
- Paramjot Gogia

REGRETS

- Dehanna Cober
- Mehjaas Singh Jasvinder
- Mohamed Hannan Sadar

ITEM DISCUSSION

ACTION

1.0 Call to Order

2.0 Land Acknowledgment

We acknowledge that the land on which we gather is the unceded and traditional territory of the Three Fires Confederacy of First Nations, comprised of the Ojibway, the Potawatomie, and the Odawa. This territory is covered by the Upper Canada Treaties. Today, this meeting place is still the home to many Indigenous peoples from across Turtle Island and we are grateful to have the opportunity to work on this land.

3.0 Chair's Business

3.1 Teleconference –

3.2 D. Cober and M. Singh's resignation will be approved at the next meeting.

4.0 Unfinished Business

Discussion

An invitation was put forward by S. Pritchard for members of the Board to join the Finance Committee.

BIRT M. Mahmoud is a member of the Finance Committee.

Mohamed Mahmoud

J. Dayal/A. Tazzman

(CARRIED)

5.0 Approval of the Agenda*

Approval

6.0 Approval of the Minutes*

Approval

6.1 September 18th, 2019

6.2 October 2nd, 2019

6.3 October 23rd, 2019

7.0 Business Arising from the Minutes/Action Items

8.0 Presentations to the Board

Information

8.1 Nimbus Tutoring Presentation

Ben Attal

- L. Sleiman asked if there was a way to rate both the students and tutors. B. Attal stated that numerical scores are used to rate tutors and there is a score based on factors such as knowledgeability, organization, and a review can be given too. If the tutor falls below the average score, the program manager will be informed. Tutors can rate students, not through a score, but more of feedback. He further added that there are variability and customization options that the Board can utilize.
- J. Dayal asked how the Board can determine who is fit to be a tutor. The response entailed the fact that the person must have firstly taken the course and passed with a good grade. He further asked if there is a way to check the accuracy of the claims made by the tutors pertaining to their experience. B. Attal stated that the tutor does not create the profile, it will be the responsibility of the UWSA through a three step process. The tutor will send transcripts and there will be an interview. He stated that the interview process is up for discussion with S. Grewal, as they usually charge a fee to conduct interviews. Finally, there will be a review and vetting. A background check is conducted, excluding a criminal record. Referral checks and transcript verifications are conducted, with any questions pertaining to the resumes asked during the interview. A quick ten minute lesson is conducted at the interview to ascertain communication skills.

- L. Crain raised the point of a couple of tutoring services already running on campus, and further asks if this will have an impact on them or if they will collaborate. B. Attal states that they can sub-brand under Nimbus, whereby it'll say SOS tutor, for example, instead of Nimbus tutor. This will all still be under the UWSA branding. S. Grewal clarifies that upon discussions with SOS, they have stated that they are okay with Nimbus coming on board.
- L. Sleiman states that Nimbus can be for any class at any point throughout the semester, whilst SOS is specifically for exam preparation, hence a student does not have to wait until the end of the semester.
- S. Grewal avers that SOS is usually not one on one as with Nimbus.
- M. Mahmoud asks if the UWSA has to decide the courses or if it will be according to the tutors who come forward suggesting particular courses. B. Attal states that all courses available at the UWSA can be uploaded. Bishops has 200 courses on the Nimbus platform. The first step will be to list all the courses. A tutor can then apply from the list uploaded, the tutor will then be processed and approved for those courses selected.
- M. Mahmoud's second question entailed if a student can put in a request for a course to be taught, to which the response was yes. He further asked what happens to the money paid if the meeting is cancelled. It is stated that the money is fully refunded to the student, dependant on the cancellation policy. The cancellation policy can be standardized by the Board, or the tutor can decide the terms. The stripe fee will still be covered.
- M. Mahmoud's next question was if the student can have access to the materials the tutor uses. The answer was yes, this can be done through messaging on the app, with attachments of up to 25 megabytes which is the standard used by apps such as Facebook. He further raised a point of Board members from each faculty introducing the idea.
- M. Mahmoud asked if the Board can get reviews from other Universities. B. Attal stated that that can definitely be attained, and

there has never been a problem with demand. Stating that Fraiser sent a poll out to their students, and 83% voted yes to the app, with double the number of people who usually participated in polls. He also stated the advantage to tutors, with a tutor receiving a reference letter upon giving ten tutorials. 75 applications were received in the first week of piloting of the app. It was evidenced that the academic standing of tutors goes up after tutoring for a period of time, enhancing job prospects.

- M. Mahmoud asked a question about the average price of a lesson and the length. B. Attal stated that it depended on the University in question and the hourly rate. Manitoba have a rate between \$5 and \$25, and tutors choose the rate for their lessons, while other Universities utilize a flat rate. Carlton has an option of volunteer tutors and paid tutors.
- M. Hamilton inquired about if others can have access to the feedback the tutor gives the students, as privacy boundaries are a concern. B. Attal assured the Board of only the program manger having access to this information.
- G. Kaur asked about how the authenticity of resources provided can be verified, checking plagiarism for example. B. Attal stated that the tutor is usually fully responsible for handling materials used. He further stated that if the UWSA wants to provide part of the material to ensure authenticity, that can be done. He further raised the point of a Code of Conduct being signed upon attaining the role of a tutor at the University of Manitoba.
- A. Tazzman asked if the session can be shared with others. The software is currently only for one to one sessions, but in September 2020, there will be new features, such as inviting a friend.
- J. Dayal asked if there is a cap number of tutors per course. That is under the control of the UWSA.

9.0 Proposed Motions

Approval

BIRT the Board approve, from the SOCR Fund, \$0.56 per student, based on the average opt-in rate of UWSA non-mandatory fees, for the Winter Semester of the Nimbus Tutoring program.

- The Nimbus representatives excused the Board for a private discussion to be held.
- L. Crain asked what exactly the Board is voting for in this instance, to which the response entailed the Board voting for a trial run for one semester, with students paying for it in subsequent semesters. Voting today ensures the trial runs from January 2020.
- S. Grewal stated the specifics of the tutoring application, stating that the money will be deducted from the SOCR fund, which has about \$70,000. He further stated that the final amount to be paid for the trial will cost between \$3000 and \$4000. After the program has run for a semester, a referendum will be held.
- A. Ducharme, against the motion, states that Nimbus is not necessary as there is SOS, and there are many Teaching Assistants across campus. He further states that if this is to be implemented, it should be an optional fee.
- L. Crain, against the motion, raises the issue of the application creating extra work for the UWSA as scanning different applications and administrative work may be tedious. He suggests that Nimbus needs to pay the UWSA as the Hum did, as they will have access to our database of 10,000 students. A point of correction was raised by M. Hamilton stating that the Hum was owned by the UWSA.
- L. Sleiman creates an analogy of a pizza shop opening despite the existence of other pizza shops, stating that the UWSA has not done anything tangible for students recently, and this will be a good initiative. She state that the Board does not get to say no to students without allowing them to make an option, and there must be due diligence. Students can be able to make some money and will have an addition to their CV's.
- A. Tazzman, in favour stated that she did not have as many Teaching Assistants with her course.

- J. Bowers raised the option of still having a referendum even if the Board does not approve the motion. He also stated the option of waiting until next year, and there will be a year full year to deal with the issue.
- P. Gogia, opposed to the motion, stated that it is a good initiative but there is a concern pertaining to how much duty this will add to the duties of those taking over next year. He further stated that SOS is usually on a voluntary basis, and a conflict of interest exists. He suggested tabling the motion until the Board is more certain and can make a concrete decision.

BIRT the questioning period be extended, with two people talking for the motion, and two against the motion.

A. Ducharme /L. Crain

(CARRIED)

- A. Ducharme states that he is not completely against the idea, but faculties such as Odette must be asked if they want to opt in as there are more than enough Teaching Assistants. Those faculties must decide if they want to opt in or out.
- M. Mahmoud, in favour of the motion raised a concern of if there will be a survey for students that want it, and the issue of the biggest faculties not benefiting from this as there are similar services at a better cost. Students input before going ahead is crucial.
- L. Crain stated that over the summer, Deliverbay was charged a fee, and there is a conflict of interest if we do for one what we do not do for another, and hence a fee must be charged. S. Grewal stated that Nimbus is a UWSA owned initiative unlike Deliverbay.

BIRT that the motion be tabled until the next board meeting.

- M. Mahmoud motivated the tabling stating that student reviews from other Universities, including the noticed changes and difference between Nimbus and other tutoring services must be presented. Until the Board can draw a comparison, he does not believe it is fit to vote on the matter.

- A. Tazzman, against tabling of the motion, stated that we are heading towards the end of the semester, and it will not be a good idea to keep postponing the motion.
- A. Abdallah, stated that the trial period starts next semester, and information can definitely be derived from other schools, but the information may not be complete or concrete as there is only two weeks in between Board meetings, and two weeks is an unreasonable time-line.
- S. Grewal states that a decision must be made by the next meeting if the application is to pilot in January.
- P. Gogia asks for a plan from the Executives who will be in charge of the project, and how it will be facilitated.
- A. Ducharme, raises a positive aspect to the motion being tabled, stating that there will be more voting members at the next Board Meeting.
- L. Sleiman, against tabling the motion, raises the point of two weeks being a short span of time to conduct a survey. The first semester is just a trial, and students will eventually choose if they want Nimbus through a referendum. She believes that this a trial run gives students an idea of the structure as opposed to them voting for a strange concept.
- L. Crain raises the fact that the UAC Committee is developing a survey relating to student experience, and this can be included.
- M. Mahmoud believes that the trial period will cost students money, and will students be paying for the trial period. S. Grewal responds and tells him no, as \$4000 will be deducted from the Football fund.
- A. Ducharme raised a point of the quorum being lost through the previously held AGM, and Ahmed clarified that voting will be through a referendum.
- All further questions must be directed to the Operations Committee.
- S. Pritchard advised that the motion is not tabled for the second time.

M. Mahmoud/Q. Mugabo

(CARRIED)

10.0 Reports

Information

10.1 Operations Report

10.1.1 Additions

1. VP Student Advocacy

- There was a walkout with a few board members, meeting with Robert Gordon.

2. VP Student Services

- A decision will be made by Monday in hiring a service coordinator, with the process starting tomorrow, hence Campus pride will be open as soon as possible.
- Ahmed is working on a project with M. Hamilton, selling basketball tickets to a game in Detroit in December. Logistics are still being sorted out, including factors such as a bus, and sponsorship.

3. VP Finance and Operations

- The sponsorship package has been finalized.
- J. Dayal inquired as to if the owners of the \$10,000 were found. S. Grewal stated that when clubs have events, everything goes to one UWSA account, clubs are supposed to claim the moneys attained but most clubs have not claimed the money, hence the amount of \$10,000 from Eventbrite was unaccounted for. He stated that the smaller amounts of money were accounted for, but the large one was not.
- A. Abdallah stated that he had emailed Eventbrite and they had assured him that they will look into it.
- B. Deghaiche asked if S. Grewal could track the club according to timelines. He stated that he did but the clubs stated that the money was not theirs.
- M. Mahmoud raised a question of the capacity of the venue for WinterFest since there is an ongoing construction. He further emphasized that this is big

news as there was a hope of breaking even, and if that was still a possibility.

- J. Bowers stated that there is a projection of 2500-3000 people and there isn't absolute certainty yet. Health and safety have been contacted and he will check with the fire inspectors so an estimate can be given at the next meeting, if not but December. If the capacity that can be contained is less, the costs of tickets will be higher. The ticket costs are currently estimated at \$40.
- Tickets are to pay for artistes and that is therefore not the sole determiner for breaking even.
- A. Abdallah stated that a working budget consistently adapts to the present situation, so this has been taken into consideration.
- S. Grewal raised a point of Board Members reaching out concerning sponsorships. There is a need for more people to reach out to, and the connections members of the Board have will be beneficial.
- M. Mahmoud avers that he does remember the Board consenting to assisting with breaking even. He asks if this is a requirement.
- A. Abdallah assures him that technically, there is no reliance on the Board, and their assistance will just be beneficial.
- M. Hamilton informs the Board that contacts they have will be beneficial.
- L. Crain states that to achieve maximum success, he suggests developing a committee and hence, those interested in planning and sponsorships can participate.
- M. Mahmoud suggests that the Finance Committee can take on aspects of the duties associated with WinterFest.

- J. Bowers informs the Board that those interested in volunteering can reach out to the particular Executive in charge of that sector, and a list can be compiled. He further states that the Board members can reach out via email.
- S. Pritchard makes a suggestion to the Finance Committee to figure out the current workload before deciding the way forward.
- A. Ducharme informs M. Mahmoud that the Finance Committee needs to have its first meeting, and cannot take on WinterFest duties without discussing it.
- L. Crain suggests focus groups to handle WinterFest.
- A. Tazzman expresses how unsure she is about approaching for sponsorships, if she does not have enough information about the specifics of WinterFest.
- A. Abdallah informs her that the sponsorship package has all the relevant information. He states that a committee can be formed for sponsorship rather than the Finance Committee as there are limitations with regard to the Finance Committee.
- J. Bowers reiterates the fact that the members can reach out to the Executives indicating the task force they want to be involved in, based on their skill sets.
- M. Mahmoud stated that his initial suggestion was so that M. Hamilton and S. Grewal do not handle all the workload.

10.2 Board Committees

- GPC and UAC

Meetings this week were rescheduled due to J. Bowers absence as a result of being ill.

The first UAC meeting had a very productive conversation. We set goals such as the elimination of evaluations over 40%, investigating the minor designations on degrees, and are planning an Academic Experience Survey

to go out campus-wide to help inform us of academic goals we should set for ourselves.

- Student services committee

A. Abdallah stated that they have met and discussed the Halloween event, providing some insight on their thoughts. They discussed events for rest of year, needed ideas, gave some insight and gave homework. There is a meeting on the 14th to discuss more issues.

- Hiring committee

The hiring committee has hired the CRO. Discussed a performance review after by election. If all is good, they'll hire for next year as well.

- Student Advocacy

- Working on Transgender day of remembrance with pride center.
- Had a communications meeting with LSRC.
- Dealt with student cases.
- Working on getting external partners with UWSA.

11.0 New Business Discussion

12.0 Question Period Information

13.0 In-Camera

14.0 Adjournment Approval

BIRT the meeting be adjourned at 8:26pm

A.Tazzman/A. Ducharme

(CARRIED)

Please carefully review the 'starred' (*) consent agenda items. As per the April 5th, 2018, meeting, 'starred' items are deemed non-controversial items and therefore will not be discussed during a scheduled meeting unless a member specifically requests that a 'starred' agenda item be 'un-starred' and therefore open for discussion/debate. This can be done any time before (by forwarding the request to the minute-taker/chair) or during the meeting. By the end of the meeting, agenda items which remain 'starred' (*) will be deemed approved or received.