



BOARD OF DIRECTORS – MEETING MINUTES

<b>Meeting Date</b>	April 28, 2025	<b>Time</b>	1:00pm
<b>Meeting Title</b>	Board Meeting	<b>Type</b>	Regular
<b>Meeting Chair</b>	E. Berry	<b>Location</b>	UCC 301
<b>Recording Secretary</b>	J. Higgins	<b>Call to Order</b>	1:04pm

<b>Attendees</b>		<b>Regrets</b>
<b>Board</b>	E. Berry, Board Chair E. Kalaydjian, USC President G. Wu, Vice Chair & Finance Committee Chair A. Vafaei, Governance Committee Chair K. Hyles, HR Committee Chair M. Haas J. Liu	B. Yu
<b>Management</b>	J. Oware, Finance Manager G. Pimlatt, Senior Manager Information Systems K. Pacheco, Senior Manager, People & Development J. Armour, Chief Operating Officer	
<b>Guests</b>	K. George S. Summer S. Nar H. Yang D. Khandelwal	

**2. Land Acknowledgement**

**3. Disclosures of Conflict of Interest**

There were no conflicts of interest.

**4. Adoption of Agenda**

**MOTION** – M. Haas motioned to adopt the agenda. A. Vafaei seconded the motion. The agenda was approved.

**5. Comments from the Chair:** E. Berry stated the bittersweet moment for the outgoing directors, but thank you to everyone around the table for sticking this out with us and being so dependable all year. He was so happy with the level of attendance and care put into the role. Huge thank you to senior management, this position doesn't exist without you all.

6. **USC Mission Moment:** No mission moment was provided.

7. **Approval of Minutes:**

<b>7.1.</b>	<b>February 28, 2025</b>
<b>Motion to approve the minutes from the February 28th, 2025 meeting.</b> M. Haas motioned to approve. G. Wu seconded the motion. The motion was approved.	

8. **Reports for Information:**

<b>8.1.</b>	<b>Executive Report</b>	<b>E. Kalaydjian</b>
<p>E. Kalaydjian summarized the <a href="#">Executive Report</a>.</p> <p>She began by thanking the group for their attentiveness and support over the year. She highlighted the Tax Clinic, which was successfully run in partnership with student leaders and involved meaningful collaboration with affiliate colleges and law students.</p> <p>She also discussed student advocacy work related to the international college partnership with Navitas, a private, for-profit organization. This program provides alternative academic pathways for international students. For instance, in some Indian states, students do not study math beyond Grade 11, making them ineligible for certain programs. Navitas also supports English language development, with most students completing four semesters in the pathway program before transitioning into undergraduate studies. Although this partnership has sparked some debate due to its for-profit nature, other universities like the University of Manitoba and Simon Fraser University have implemented similar models. Western has not been significantly impacted by the international enrollment cap due to its relatively low numbers, but this initiative could have future implications for the student health plan and the clubs system. It is expected to go to Senate for approval in June and may affect future boards.</p> <p>She also mentioned LinkedUp, an initiative from her platform led by D. Klapper this year, which brought together community members, alumni, and Western students. The program engaged 145 students and received positive feedback.</p> <p>The USC President’s Dinner was highlighted as a meaningful part of the leadership transition process. It provides space for outgoing and incoming members to share experiences, stories, and institutional memory, helping the new team understand the unique personalities and dynamics within the USC.</p> <p>She touched on the Loud Luxury concert, noting that sometimes when popular acts are brought in, the university attempts to capitalize on the excitement. In this case, the USC paid a significant fee to secure the artists, only to have Western book competing events featuring the same performers. She emphasized the importance of tighter contract management in the future to prevent such overlap.</p> <p>She also commended full-time staff for their efforts in transforming the Mustang Lounge into a beautiful space for Grad Ball, which turned out to be a charming and successful event. Lastly, she shared that the USC Open golf tournament raised \$17,000 for the Early Outreach program, a major fundraising success.</p>		

8.2.	COO Report	J. Armour
<p>J. Armour summarized the <a href="#">COO Report</a>.</p> <p>He began by thanking E. Kalaydjian for her strong support during the transition process. She highlighted that while progress has been made in election reform, the process still needs improvement. The goal is for elections to feel student-led rather than entirely student-run, as there are currently gaps that make execution difficult.</p> <p>On a positive note, planning is already well underway for Orientation Week, with an offer out to a headlining artist three months earlier than in previous years—a first for the USC. This proactive approach is expected to significantly benefit students.</p> <p>In terms of advocacy, there is a need for reimagining the strategy, especially in light of the failed CASA referendum. The USC currently has no federal representation and did not hire a Government Relations (GR) staff member this year. Despite this, there are still opportunities to build influence. The focus now is on exploring alternative avenues to raise the USC’s profile and ensure it has a seat at important tables.</p> <p>Capital improvements were also mentioned, including plans for a new, more environmentally sustainable dishwasher and increased use of reusable materials. The Wave to Go initiative, which is based out of the McKellar Theatre concession, recently overcame its final hurdle, despite some pushback from Western regarding the seating area.</p> <p>Preparations are underway for the USC’s 60th anniversary, with events planned for both Toronto in the spring and Homecoming in the fall. These celebrations aim to not only recognize the organization's legacy but also highlight its ongoing impact through stories, publications, and features. The intent is to connect various facets of student life—clubs, events, advocacy—and build pride in the USC’s role on campus, especially at a time when student voices are more important than ever.</p> <p>Another important initiative is Free the Dot, which E. Kalaydjian took on this year to develop a sustainable model. A review of all installations took place last week, alongside financial forecasting to understand when funding may run out. This analysis will help K. Henricus’ team determine the necessary steps to keep the program alive.</p> <p>During the discussion, K. George asked what type of support was needed for Government Relations. J. Armour explained that the ultimate goal is to secure a seat at every possible decision-making table. Unfortunately, affiliations can sometimes preclude the USC from even being considered, so establishing values-based credibility is essential. E. Kalaydjian added that in the past, when a former USC alum led GR at Western, the USC was included in key visits from government ministers. That dynamic has changed, and the USC is now struggling to maintain visibility in those spaces. The solution lies in strong, on-the-ground representation from Executive members and, over time, the hiring of full-time staff. J. Armour also suggested exploring partnerships outside traditional advocacy groups, possibly working with consultants to build frameworks that ensure the USC remains part of important conversations.</p>		

**9. Reports from Committees:**

9.1.	Governance Committee	A. Vafaei
<p>A. Vafaei summarized the <a href="#">Governance Committee Report</a>. K. Henricus spoke to her experience with the election and the gamification of complaints and volitions that were submitted, which puts the CRO, DRO, FT Staff, Executives and Candidates in bad positions. She stated that her team put in a few complaints, which were never addressed as they couldn't get through all the violations. A. Vafaei stated the importance of putting the right guardrails in place to protect students, but also allow the freedom for a democratic election. He said it's essentially outlined to take place leading into summer with a more comprehensive discussion at BOCO.</p> <p>S. Sunner inquired who was responsible for responding to complaints. E. Kalaydjian stated is it he CRO. This model would have a professional do this at a professional, diplomatic rate, and has training to respond to more serious issues. K. Pacheco stated that we have a model like this for clubs that has lots of complaints, and has an Appeals Board which is led by a practicing lawyer.</p> <p>M. Haas inquired if there is a list of how many faculty sophs are also councillors? K. Pacheco stated that there are around 10, but we're still trying to determine the exact number.</p>		

9.2.	HR Committee	K. Hyles
<p>K. Hyles summarized the <a href="#">HR Committee Report</a>.</p>		
<p>K. Pacheco clarified that while Leadership Support Team (LST) members are paid, general sophs are not. Current policy states individuals cannot serve as both a councillor and a soph, but this year, a temporary solution is being proposed: councillors would be permitted to act as sophs for just Orientation Week, not the entire year. She emphasized that the complication stems from Orientation being a joint initiative with Western University, which holds that a student’s conduct is relevant regardless of where or when it happens. This creates governance concerns for the USC when councillors are involved, especially because expectations weren’t clearly communicated to candidates during elections.</p>		
<p>K. Henricus provided context, noting that this issue was flagged by the incoming Vice-President of Orientation &amp; Programming, R. Whelpley, whose portfolio includes managing faculty sophs. K. Henricus explained that in practice, even after their contracts end, many faculty sophs continue to act in that role by maintaining contact with students, running social media, and programming informally. This creates a grey area if councillors continue acting as sophs unofficially and later face conduct complaints—what appears on paper may not reflect what’s happening in reality. K. Pacheco responded that if someone is no longer under contract, any conduct issues would fall to Western’s student code rather than USC liability. However, she expressed disappointment that Western has not taken full responsibility for faculty soph conduct.</p>		
<p>M. Haas asked why the USC is responsible for faculty sophs at all. K. Pacheco explained that this role gives the USC influence and a seat at the table in orientation planning. While Western contributes minimal resources, the faculty side of Orientation is significant, and stepping away from it would drastically reduce USC’s decision-making power. E. Kalaydjian added that faculties are generally more focused on research than student experience and rarely invest time in Orientation beyond hiring LSTs and head sophs.</p>		
<p>K. Pacheco emphasized the need to monitor how this situation plays out, especially since mixing roles complicates governance. She reiterated that Council must remain untouchable and objective. The current proposal—limiting councillors to one week of sophing—is the best compromise for those already elected without knowing the conflict in advance.</p>		
<p>E. Berry asked if the restriction applied to all faculty sophs. K. Henricus clarified that this is an interim, one-week solution, and future election candidates will be informed they can only choose one role. It does not restrict participation in other sophing streams like through Residence, Charity or Off-Campus. A. Vafaei noted that this issue is more complex than it appears, referencing a past conflict during CGB hiring when a candidate led a club. He suggested future briefings to clarify role conflicts. K. Henricus agreed that this can be managed, and K. Pacheco emphasized the importance of directly communicating with affected students to explain the reasoning behind the decision and maintain student involvement.</p>		
<p>The group acknowledged that conversations will arise about broader conduct expectations, such as rules prohibiting drinking, drug use, or relationships during OWeek, and whether those expectations extend through the year. Ultimately, the goal is to preserve Council’s integrity and objectivity. M. Haas concluded by stating there was general agreement on the path forward.</p>		

<b>9.2.1.</b>	<b>Conflict of Interest Policy</b>			<b>K. Hyles</b>	
<b>BIRT</b> the Board of Directors approve the updated Conflict of Interest Policy.					
<b>BIRFT</b> an exception will be made for those currently holding positions as both faculty sophs and councillors for the 2025-2026 academic year, where they will remain eligible to act as a Soph for Orientation Week exclusively, and not the full year contract.					
<b>BIFRT</b> we will further review the policy in October 2025.					
<b>Moved</b>	<b>M. Haas</b>	<b>Second</b>	<b>A. Vafaei</b>	<b>Approved</b>	Unanimous
<b>9.2.2.</b>	<b>COO Vacancy Procedure</b>			<b>K. Hyles</b>	
<b>BIRT</b> the Board of Directors approve the COO Vacancy Procedure.					
<b>Moved</b>	<b>G. Wu</b>	<b>Second</b>	<b>M. Haas</b>	<b>Approved</b>	Unanimous
<b>9.2.3.</b>	<b>Whistleblower Policy</b>			<b>K. Hyles</b>	
<b>BIRT</b> the Board of Directors approve the Whistleblower Policy.					
<b>Moved</b>	<b>E. Berry</b>	<b>Second</b>	<b>M. Haas</b>	<b>Approved</b>	Unanimous

<b>9.3.</b>	<b>Gazette Publications Committee</b>			<b>K. Hyles</b>	
K. Hyles summarized the <a href="#">GPC Report</a> .					
E. Berry inquired if there is a specific reason they need to leave the names in published reports. K. Hyles stated it is due to journalistic integrity. E. Berry further inquired if it really has that much added importance to include their names. G. Pimlatt stated that they have asked GPC members and they said once it's published it's a document of record and they don't change it, which is in line with standard protocol in the industry.					
J. Armour inquired who wrote the Strategic Plan. G. Pimlatt stated that it was written by Dan Brown. He further asked for clarification on the process for it's approval. K. Hyles stated the Board must approve it.					
The Board of Directors did not vote to approve the Gazette Strategic Plan as they would like further information and time to review.					

<b>9.4.</b>	<b>Finance Committee</b>			<b>G. Wu</b>	
G. Wu reviewed the <a href="#">Finance Committee Report</a> . There were no questions.					
<b>9.4.1.</b>	<b>F2025 February Financial Statements</b>			<b>G. Wu</b>	
<b>BIRT</b> that the Board of Directors accept the F2025 February Financial Statements.					
<b>Moved</b>	A. Vafaei	<b>Second</b>	M. Haas	<b>Approved</b>	Unanimous
<b>9.4.2.</b>	<b>F2025 Q3 Financial Statements</b>			<b>G. Wu</b>	
<b>BIRT</b> that the Board of Directors accept the F2025 Q3 Financial Statements.					
<b>Moved</b>	J. Liu	<b>Second</b>	M. Haas	<b>Approved</b>	Unanimous

<b>9.5.</b>	<b>PurpleCare Trust Report</b>			<b>G. Wu</b>	
G. Wu summarized the <a href="#">PurpleCare Trust Report</a> .					

K. George inquire if they getting doctors notes from specialty doctors. E. Kalaydjian stated that it can be both. K. George further inquired if there was a reason or a trend for why this is occurring. G. Wu stated that it is to provide an accessible option for people who need notes for things like academic policy exemptions. E. Kalaydjian stated that regular doctors are more accessible, one in twenty might see a specialist as it's very comprehensive.

J. Oware stated that the 1.4 million has yet to be returned, but she will inform the board when we get it. M. Haas inquired if the difference has already been spent. J. Armour stated it has and it has also been audited. He continued to state that instead of the cash flow on our investments we have been collecting the money and not paying it and paying it out of the reserve. He stated that once we get that difference, we will do a subtraction and a motion to move the difference and invest our reserve.

**Motion to accept the reports provided by the Finance Committee, Governance Committee, HR Committee, Gazette Publishing Committee and PurpleCare Trust.**

<b>Moved</b>	A. Vafaei	<b>Second</b>	M. Haas	<b>Approved</b>	Unanimous
--------------	-----------	---------------	---------	-----------------	-----------

**10. Confidential Session**

**Motion to go in camera.**

<b>Time</b>	2:59pm	<b>Return</b>	4:16pm
<b>Moved</b>	M. Haas	<b>Second</b>	E. Kalaydjian

**11. For Decision**

**11.1. COO Performance Appraisal E. Kalaydjian & E. Berry**

BIRT the Board of Directors accept the COO Performance Appraisal as presented in the confidential session.

<b>Moved</b>	A. Vafaei	<b>Second</b>	G. Wu	<b>Approved</b>	Unanimous
--------------	-----------	---------------	-------	-----------------	-----------

**12. Inquiries and Other Business:**

**13. Motion to adjourn at 4:20pm. M. Haas motioned to adjourn. G. Wu seconded the motion. The motion was approved.**