

**WATERLOO ENGINEERING ENDOWMENT FOUNDATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

Tuesday, November 21st, 2006, 5:30 pm (E2-3324)

Attendees: Adel Sedra, Maria Arshad, Kathryn Pomeroy, Ruth-Anne Vanderwater, Jen Carroll, Brandon DeHart, Chris Pieneman, Amanda Hoff, Denis Viens, Timo Vainionpaa, Sebastian Bartnicki

Proxy: Rose Linseman and Elaine Lui (by Sebastian Bartnicki)

Regrets: Bill Pudifin, John Vellinga, Jeremy Taylor, Matthew Stevens, Ellen Kaye-Cheveldayoff

1. Call to order *by Kathryn Pomeroy at 5:35pm*

2. Approval of the agenda

Motion to approve agenda: Denis Viens

second: Dean Sedra

Motion passed (unanimous)

3. Approval of minutes

3.1. Spring '06 (July 20, 2006)

3.2. Winter '06 (March 16, 2006) (minutes were previously incomplete)

3.3. Fall '05 (Nov. 23, 2005) (list of attendees was previously omitted)

Motion to approve minutes: Maria Arsha

second: Amanda Hoff

Motion passed (Denis Viens, Chris Pieneman abstained)

4. Student Nomination:

- Brandon DeHart's position as A-soc student board member is vacated by his ratification as WEEF Director. A replacement for this position has not yet been found and will be filled at either the Winter or Summer 2007 BOD meeting.
- Chris Pieneman noted that a number of the B-soc board member positions will also become vacant in upcoming terms as he and Jeremy Taylor will be graduating.

5. WEEF Director Ratification: Brandon DeHart

- Brandon DeHart is currently in 2B Mechatronics. He has been on the WEEF Funding Council since his first year, has been on the WEEF Board of Directors for a few terms and has been part of FEDS funding decisions. He will be the 'A' society WEEF Director for the Summer 2007 term after which he may run for re-election (in conjunction with the engineering society election).
- The details of the election will be covered in the WEEF Director's Report below.

Motion to approve ratification: Amanda Hoff

second: Ruth-Anne Vanderwater

Motion passed (Brandon DeHart abstained)

6. WEEF Director's Report for Fall 2006

6.1. Orientation Week activities

- As decided in Winter '06 meeting – \$500 paid to FOC out from WEEF operations budget
- Introductory presentation made to first-years during “meet the dean and edcom” on the first day (Tuesday)
- WEEF had table at student teams lunch on Wednesday – didn't have crowds as large as some of the other teams but there was a steady flow of students to talk to.
- Scavenger hunt game (WEEF Price is Right) went well. The files for running the game are saved on the network drive for use in future years.
- Maria Arshad added leaflets to the frosh kits outlining what WEEF is.

6.2. Term participation rates

- Participation this term was 83.7% - fall terms are generally high but this was the highest term for the years with electronic files (back to 2002)
- As expected for a Fall term, most first year students didn't request a refund of their contributions – 98% of first-year students contributed
- Systems and Geo had lowest contribution rates (73% and 74% respectively)
- Architecture and Software had highest contribution rates (98% and 97% respectively)

6.3. By-election report and results

- By-election was held Thursday, November 16th, 2006 from 8:30-4:30 in CPH Foyer
- Candidates were Brandon DeHart (2B Mechatronics) and Chris Metaxas (3B Civil)
- Voter turnout was 4.1% Winner was Brandon (55% of ballots cast)

6.4. Fall 2006 Funding Decision and Approval

- Department/Student teams split of 52:48
- Department proposals were small this term (48% of total requests)
- \$80,000 was allocated
- Nanotech now has sufficient funding to equip electromagnetics lab for NE-141 (needed 6 stations)
- IW received funding for computer equipment and newspaper display stands with the following justifications (answering the question: why fund stands – shouldn't they count as furniture – which WEEF doesn't fund?):
 - IW represents UW as it is sent to other universities
 - The papers are currently displayed in areas such as outside the first year engineering office (where engineering tours begin) and are therefore accessible to potential students and their families. Without stands, the area becomes dishevelled (until papers are disposed of unread). Some areas within engineering do have display stands but as they are not owned by IW, the IW papers are removed when Imprint is distributed two days later (IW comes out on Wednesdays and Imprint is distributed on Fridays).

- o WEEF receives space in each IW issue (printed bi-weekly) for no charge and WEEF uses this space to publish foundation status updates such as participation rates and funding council decisions.

Motion to approve funding decision: Chris Pieneman

second: Brandon DeHart

Motion passed (Denis Viens abstained)

7. Financial Status of WEEF (as of April 30, 2006)

\$6,709,157.87	principal at April 30 th , 2006 to earn income
\$110,000	spring '06 donations (estimation)
\$214,000	fall '06 donations (estimation)
<hr/>	
\$7,033,000	predicted principal at November 20 th , 2006
\$286,000	predicted income at 4% (\$95,000 per term)
<hr/>	
\$268,366.31	2006/2007 estimated income at 4%
<hr/>	
\$108,366.31	remains unspent for Winter '06 (\$28,366.31 above \$80,000)
\$180,000.00	approximate buffer fund
<hr/>	
\$149,204.13	expendable carry forward balance at April 30 th , 2006
\$417,570.44	total expendable available in 2006/2007
<hr/>	
\$113,801.20	allocated but unspent
\$ 4,476.41	allocated but expired
<hr/>	

8. Other business

8.1. \$10M milestone spending

- The principal for WEEF should be just over \$7M after this term's donations (Fall 2006)
- The fund will likely reach \$10M in the next 2-3 years and a milestone project is still being considered to mark this occasion
- A student teams building is currently the most likely project for this initiative. It would likely be located in the current parking lot B (near ECH).
- Chris Pieneman noted that it was at one point being considered that the building would be a joint facility between student teams and the systems design department but this is likely no longer the case – but the final design is still to be determined.
- Matthew Stevens has been working on information gathering for this. Kathryn Pomeroy will ask him for an update and will email it to the board when available.
- Dean Sedra said that proceeds (after expenses) from the 50th anniversary event on at the beginning of March in 2007 will be allocated for this project.
- WEEF's contribution will have to be approved by the funding council once the project has been detailed.

8.2. Online proposal submission system

- Maria Arshad has spoken of disliking the online system – Kathryn Pomeroy preferred it to emailed submissions. If concern exists about failure to limit submission lengths,

tool should be fixed, not scrapped. Maria may have assistant next term interested in working with the system.

- Denis Viens received confirmation that WEEF still works on a two-copy submission system (hard copy and electronic copy)
- Sebastian Bartnicki noted that Architecture submitted in pdf format so that they could include images – Kathryn Pomeroy commented that the directors try to create a single file for the proposal package and that pdf submissions are not conducive for this.
- Jen Carroll commented that Midnight Sun apparently didn't know about the presentation meeting – Kathryn Pomeroy said that an email was sent out to the email on their proposal and the team hadn't checked that email address. Also, one of the professors submitting a department proposal was not reached in advance of the presentation meeting because the email on the proposal was incorrect. Both presentations were rescheduled and occurred immediately before the funding council meeting.
- Chris Pieneman commented that in past terms a meeting has been held to review the requirements for submitting WEEF proposals prior to the submission deadline. The meetings have covered topics such as deadlines, proposal formats, and funding guidelines. Maria Arshad and Brandon DeHart will consider this for upcoming terms.

8.3. WEEF office renovations

- When inquiring to Sue Gooding about a smaller room for relocating the WEEF Mary Bland was told that there is no room to move WEEF.
- IW needs new space and Novelties would like to use IW office for inventory storage – they are looking to go online and would therefore require more stock on hand, hence more space. IW could move to current WEEF office which is more conducive for larger layout gatherings than their current office. With a smaller location, any renovations required for WEEF would be decreased – existing office requires minimum of \$4000 to start renovations.
- WEEF does have operating budget that is not significantly used – office renovation should be considered maintenance spending.
- A number of options were discussed:
 - WEEF could move to the IW office and IW could take the WEEF office. This would make WEEF more accessible for refunds but Sebastian Bartnicki suggested that if WEEF is looking to improve its professional image and clarity for operations, we should have an office that is visible. Kathryn Pomeroy noted increased visibility in the form of an office on the main floor of CPH will result in decreased contribution rates for a number of terms immediately following the relocation. The rates might increase after a period of time but the degree of the decrease and the length of time cannot currently be predicted. Also, the office would most often have the door closed due to minimal staff and that this might not be ideal.

- Novelties could purchase storage lockers for their inventories and could share the current WEEF office space. This would leave less space requiring renovations, potentially reducing costs. Also, if storage space were installed it might be less expensive to do renovations at the same time.
- This relocation will be discussed with IW and the Engineering Society and a decision will be made at a later point. Approval from the board is not required for any relocation. An update will be provided at the next BOD meeting.

8.4. Architecture Representation on BOD

- Sebastian Bartnicki represented Architecture at today's meeting
- Architecture is off and on campus every four months (like engineering) except for in third year when they are gone for eight months. This presents challenges for consistent representation and passage of information between streams as groups move back and forth from campus. Representatives are currently elected/appointed each term but communication between Waterloo and Cambridge should be improved.

9. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn meeting: Denis Viens

second: Sebastian Bartnicki

Motion passed (unanimous)