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In late-October, Michelle Forsyth had just had separate meetings with Ron Moore and Alice McIntyre. Both Ron and Alice were undergraduate HBA students in their fourth and final year at the Ivey Business School (Ivey), but more significantly, they were members of the same Ivey Field Project (IFP) student team; Michelle was their faculty supervisor (FS). Ron and Alice’s team appeared to be experiencing significant problems and their interim review materials were due tomorrow. Michelle wondered what, if anything, should be done to help this team.

The IFP course required a team of students to help an established enterprise address a significant problem or opportunity. This process began towards the end of the HBA1 academic year when students self-selected into six-person teams.[[1]](#footnote-1) During the summer between HBA1 and HBA2, the teams secured a client, but the process began in earnest when students returned in September for their HBA2 year. During their first week back, the student teams communicated with their clients to clarify the problem or opportunity, formulate a clear statement of the project’s objective (i.e., what it would do for and deliver to the client), and define the project’s scope (i.e., the evidence and analysis required to achieve the objective). This phase also included a detailed work plan that laid out how, when, and who would be collecting the data and doing the analysis to develop the client deliverables. A written submission outlining all of these elements was due in late September. An interim report documenting progress was due towards the end of October, followed by a meeting with the FS and an executive-in-residence (EIR) mentor in early November. The final report[[2]](#footnote-2) was due in late November followed by a final review meeting a week later (see Exhibit 1 for the IFP timeline.)

The IFP process mirrored the tight timeframe and pressures of a real-world consulting engagement. Successful completion of this complex assignment necessitated long hours of hard work—over 120 hours from each team member—and significant cooperation and teamwork within the group.

Forming the IFP team

Ron and Alice’s IFP team was made up of them and four other individuals from the same first year HBA1 section. Three of the men, Stan, Joe and Ian, had lived together since their second year of university. Stan, Joe, Ian and Alice had been part of the same learning team throughout most of their HBA1 year. Alice and Stan began dating during that year.

Alice was outgoing and involved in extra-curricular activities, both in and out of the school. She had more business experience than the other group members, was a take-charge kind of person, and rarely hesitated to speak her mind. She seemed happy dating Stan. Stan was the brawny, football player type who was well liked by his classmates and respected by the faculty. He had set high career goals and was working as a campus representative for a local micro-brewery while attending university. Ian was outgoing and outspoken. He was often looked upon as being a bit of a show-off and overly frank. Ian liked to party. Joe, a dual-degree with engineering student, was more quiet and conservative. His social life centred around his girlfriend, a recent university graduate who resided in Toronto. He was well liked and relatively soft-spoken. Both Ian and Joe had job offers from their HBA1 summer internships, and Ian was going away on exchange to Thailand in the next HBA2 term. This core IFP group of four formed spontaneously in March after the introductory HBA1 IFP session.

Ron had entrepreneurial ambitions, and while working in a learning team with Jessie Zhang, had learnt other interesting new venture ideas. These two had originally attempted to pursue the new venture alternative of the IFP.[[3]](#footnote-3) However, Jessie and Ron were unable to form a six-person team and by early April abandoned Jessie’s idea and opted for the client version of the IFP. Meanwhile Alice, Stan, Joe and Ian were still looking for two more team members to round out their IFP team. In conversation with Jessie, Alice learnt about Jessie and Ron’s availability. After a brief discussion with her other teammates, Alice invited Jessie and Ron to join their team. Both had accepted, relieved to be part of an IFP team.

Originally from the West Indies, Ron was friendly and generally well liked. He enjoyed most things he did and viewed himself as an opinion leader. He was constantly busy with his course work and his girlfriend in Montreal. Jessie had come to university in Canada from Hong Kong. Perceived by her classmates as quiet but smart, she planned to work in Canada for a few years after graduation before returning to Hong Kong or China to become an entrepreneur. Jessie spoke fluent Cantonese and English, and passable Mandarin.

finding aN ICFP CLIENT company

IFP teams could bring in their own client or access one provided by Ivey. Stan had been in discussions since March with the brewery who was his part-time employer. Stan’s key contact was the brewery’s marketing and salesperson who seemed interested in having an IFP study done and ready to cooperate. Before leaving for his summer internship at a consulting company in Toronto, Stan had helped his contact complete the required IFP forms online.[[4]](#footnote-4) The issue for the project was somewhat vaguely stated as identifying new sales growth opportunities. The team felt everything was in place for a good start when they returned in September.

In late August, the team had received an email from their IFP professor (i.e., Michelle Forsyth), introducing herself[[5]](#footnote-5) and making the following request: “You should have secured your client company by now. One of your team members should connect with your client contact and arrange for a (skype) conversation with your team during our first week back in September.” Stan was travelling in Europe when this email was sent, but he communicated with Alice who tried to connect with Stan’s brewery contact. Her emails went unanswered. She let Stan know.

Stan arrived back in Canada just before the start of the HBA2 year. He was busy moving back to London and decided to wait until that first week of IFP classes to re-establish contact with the brewery’s marketing and salesperson. IFP HBA2 began the Tuesday after Labour Day. The week was set up for team meetings in the mornings and IFP classes in the afternoons. Teams had required meetings with their FS on Tuesday morning and their EIR[[6]](#footnote-6) on Friday morning.

During the mandatory Tuesday morning meeting between the IFP team and their supervisor, Michelle reviewed the client application with the team. She observed that the issue the team would address needed to be clarified and sharpened but that having a local client would make the logistics for the team a lot easier. Michelle also asked if a call or meeting had been arranged with the brewery contact for later in the week. Stan jumped in and replied that he was going to setup a meeting with the client later that morning.

After leaving that meeting, the team dispersed while Stan called his brewery contact. Stan got bad news. The secretary told him that his brewery contact had unexpectedly left the company, and his replacement had not been appointed. Stan asked if he could speak with the brewery’s general manager but was told she was away on vacation until the following Monday and only reachable for emergencies.

Stan texted his team the basic message and said they would talk about it during their scheduled team meeting the next morning. When that meeting began, Alice was clearly concerned. She noted that during their class the previous day, Michelle had described the IFP process (see Exhibit 1) and stressed how quickly this process moved and how important it was to engage with the client early (i.e., this week), clarify the issue being addressed, and establish a meaningful objective for the project. At this point, Michelle came by the team meeting room, and Alice briefed her on the team’s situation. Michelle explained that the team could not formally register a new client until the existing client was concluded. Therefore, the brewery needed to be contacted and its expectation ascertained before that could be done. After that, and if the brewery project was not viable, the team could be provided with one company from the IFP list. At this point, Ron jumped in and raised another possibility. Ron saw the situation as an opportunity to put forward Caribbean Sugar Machinery Limited (CSM), a company his stepfather had founded 10 years earlier.

As Ron described it, CSM had a revolutionary, patented method for processing sugarcane which resulted in animal feed and versatile fibre by-products which could be used to make building products and pulp and paper, in addition to sugar. At this point, the company had minimal production facilities, top management, market information, and only prototype sales. The firm was starting to move from an early commercialization stage to an international marketing and production stage. CSM had the potential to operate in the sugar, animal feed, pulp and paper, and building products industries in at least 75 tropical countries. Ron believed it was important to assess the potential of these international markets. CSM was located in Winnipeg and Trinidad. Ron asked if he could informally approach his stepfather about CSM during this week. Michelle observed that IFPs were usually done for more established enterprises, and CSM was not yet out of the startup phase. However, given the situation and Ron’s family connection, an approach was acceptable, but no commitment could be made until the situation with the brewery was resolved.

After Michelle left, Alice and Jessie expressed more interest in the CSM possibility than did Stan, Joe, or Ian. Then Alice got the team organized. Stan would call the brewery’s general manager the next Monday to see if the IFP project with them was still viable. Ron would call this stepfather to see if CSM was a possibility. The team spent the rest of the first week developing the brewery proposal even though going forward with it was still uncertain. Meanwhile, Ron emailed his stepfather and discussed the IFP idea. Fortunately, Mr. McEwen,[[7]](#footnote-7) CSM’s owner and president, had already planned a trip to Toronto the following weekend, and Ron arranged to meet him there for dinner to discuss CSM’s involvement in the IFP.

The next week, Stan managed to meet with the brewery’s general manager on Wednesday. She only vaguely recalled the project being discussed and given the current circumstances did not feel her small business had the time or personnel to devote to an IFP team. Stan said he understood, and his team would move on to another client. He immediately texted the other team members. Alice contacted Michelle who referred the team to Brent Stanfield, Ivey’s IFP client manager.[[8]](#footnote-8) Brent replied to Alice on Friday and made her aware of a potential IFP client, a resort located near Collingwood (150 kilometres north of London) that wanted to look at dynamic or variable pricing for ski lift passes. Alice sent this information to the other team members and by text message they agreed to meet the next Tuesday, September 19, after Ron’s weekend meeting with CSM.

the group makes a (Final) decision on a cLIENT

Ron returned from Toronto with McEwen’s agreement to participate and considerable materials from the company. On Monday, he called Brent who agreed that CSM, as described by Ron, was probably suitable for an IFP, subject to completing the online application form and identifying an acceptable issue for the IFP team to help this client address. He too noted that CSM was still in startup phase and also cautioned that family connections with the client could sometimes be problematic for IFP teams. Convinced his team could do much useful work for this company, Ron did not share Brent’s concern with his teammates.

At the team meeting the next day, five members of the group sat down to decide which one of the two possibilities to pursue. (Joe was unable to attend because of an engineering class conflict.) Ron talked generally about CSM and referred to the company documents he had assembled and sent to them on Sunday. Alice was the only one who had read any of this material. Stan voiced the group’s appreciation for Ron’s efforts in securing CSM’s cooperation. But Ron felt this was Stan’s way of saying, “You’re pushing us to accept CSM.” Although Ron’s preference was clear, he said he would go along with the majority vote. Alice described what was known about the resort project, and Stan noted it had an already well-defined problem and objective.

The team decided to vote. Jessie joined with Ron in favour of CSM. Stan and Ian were for the resort project. Alice wavered but, because of Ron’s connection with the client, came down in favour of CSM. Ron felt that neither Ian nor Stan was set against CSM. The others did express concern that Ron might be overly committed to CSM. But the group had agreed to abide by the majority vote, CSM was chosen, and Ivey’s IFP office was notified by email. (The IFP office replied the next day with a request that the client complete the online application form.)

starting to work

The team had an IFP submission deadline the upcoming Friday—just three days away. This submission asked for a clear statement of the client problem or opportunity being addressed, a 30-word statement of the SMART[[9]](#footnote-9) objective for the project, and a preliminary scoping diagram with components described. With a client identified, Ron and Alice were anxious to start organizing and getting to work.

Ron suggested the others read the feasibility studies and consultants’ reports he had provided earlier. He hoped they would quickly learn as much as possible so that everyone could get down to work. Alice had already met with the Ivey librarian, and he had arranged for them to meet with the head librarian at Guelph.[[10]](#footnote-10) Ron stated this might be redundant since the group had not yet fully considered the information he had already obtained from the company. But the decision had already been made. Joe and Ian were scheduled to go to Guelph the next week.

Given everyone’s schedule getting a meeting before that Friday’s due date proved difficult. Thursday evening, September 27, was the first time the group could meet to discuss CSM and their upcoming submission. During the last summer while working for CSM, Ron had compiled a set of detailed data sheets for a preliminary marketing study of the 75 countries with which the company could be involved. Ron also shared this information with his team just prior to the meeting. After everyone arrived for the meeting Alice spoke up: “Our first submission is due tomorrow and we’ve got nothing written. Ron’s given us a lot of detailed information, but we don’t yet have an objective for our project. We need to figure out how we can really help this client.” Discussion followed and Ron suggested they focus on completing his market assessments. Alice and Stan wanted something more strategic while Jessie and Ian were interested in the technology. Ron felt he was in the best position to direct the project group in the initial stages. (Ron had worked off and on with CSM for several years.) Aside from the fact that he knew most about the company, Ron also felt motivated to do an excellent job. The evening progressed but no consensus emerged. The team had drafted an objective, but Alice observed, “It has a little bit of everything and has no real focus.” The team decided to ask Michelle for an extension on the upcoming submission. Because she had the highest grade of any team member in Michelle’s HBA1 class, Alice took on this task.

Alice dropped by Michelle’s office the next morning. Because the team had lost its first client, Michelle granted an extension (without penalty) until the following Monday morning. The only time the team could meet on the weekend was Sunday afternoon. Unfortunately, not much progress was made. Alice, Stan, Joe and Jessie had read through Ron’s material about the global sugarcane industry. Alice expressed the rest of the group’s growing frustration when she said, “CSM isn’t just in the sugar (cane) industry. They are also in pulp and paper, animal feed, and building products. What does Mr. McEwen want us to do? Until we answer that question, I’m not sure where we should focus our project. We need to speak with Mr. McEwen.” Ron felt many of the questions the group had been asking were answered in the documents he had provided, and a conversation with his stepfather was not really necessary. In any event, McEwen was travelling and not available for a phone call.

After several hours and much back and forth,[[11]](#footnote-11) the team’s objective was still not much different from what they had drafted on Friday—*“To assess the international market potential for CSM’s innovative product technology.”* They emailed this objective along with the rest of their submission to their FS and EIR on Sunday evening. Most team members were happy to set IFP aside and get on with other things.

On October 5, the team received the grade[[12]](#footnote-12) for their initial submission along with the following feedback about their objective from their FS:

Read your submission and a couple of comments. The international sugarcane industry is very large and diverse. Also, an IFP is more than just research. “Assessment” is not sufficient for an IFP; you must help your client take positive action. You’ll need to figure out what will be most helpful to CSM and focus your efforts and analysis to that end. Your scope should reflect that focus. I recognize you got off to a slow start but much remains to done.

When the group met that weekend, both Ron and Alice were clearly upset by their below-the-median grade. Everyone understood that Ron’s higher motivation stemmed from his having more to gain (or to lose) than the others. His stepfather’s approval, plus the possibility of a job depended on the quality of the project. Alice was upset because she aspired to go to graduate school and wanted good grades and a strong academic transcript. Stan and Ian did not seem too perturbed, and Joe and Jessie were hard to read.

Ron volunteered to phone his stepfather and arrange for a conference call. Everyone nodded their agreement; he picked up his phone and dialled the number in Winnipeg. After explaining to his stepfather that the group would like to arrange a conference call with him, McEwen indicated he would be coming back to Toronto for October 19 and 20 to arrange some financing for CSM. He was willing to make a quick side trip to London and have a face-to-face meeting with the group. The other team members were enthusiastic towards this idea and immediately agreed. Ron would arrange the logistics for the meeting. The group then moved on to their work plan and what would be done leading up to the interim submission on October 27.

Mcewen’s visit

McEwen’s trip to London was not without complications. His meetings in Toronto went longer than expected. Instead of the four-hour meeting plus dinner that Ron had planned, only an hour and a half of meeting time was available before Ron had to drive McEwen to the London airport.

Because of this change, Stan could not attend the meeting. Ron felt Stan’s absence was unfortunate. Stan had influence with the other three members, and Ron had a good rapport with him. Ron saw Stan’s support as crucial if later Ron needed to persuade the others to his point of view. By missing that meeting, Stan would probably have to rely on Alice’s interpretations of what went on rather than on what actually transpired. Ron recorded the meeting for Stan’s benefit.

Stan (and his roommates) had the largest apartment and the meeting was held there. McEwen arrived looking tired. From the outset Alice took the lead in asking questions. In describing CSM’s situation, McEwen had touched on many different challenges confronting the company. He indicated no strong preference for where the group should direct its efforts. Indeed, the general impression he left was that he was participating as a favour to Ron. As he had already tried to explain to the group, Ron expressed the view that extending his work on assessing international markets would make for the best project. While his stepfather remained noncommittal, Ron felt his answers supported what he had already told the group.

During the drive to the airport after the meeting, McEwen commented on the quality of Alice’s questions and how well-prepared she was for the meeting. Ron had not noticed anything special but let the observation pass without comment.

drafting the INTERIM REPORT

In the following week, October 25 through 27 were three dedicated IFP workdays. Alice wanted to have a marathon session on the prior weekend. While Jessie and Ian were supportive, Joe was not enthusiastic about long weekend meetings; Stan was ambivalent. Ron had scheduled a trip to Montreal and did not think the team should meet without him. As result the team agreed to meet for the entire afternoon[[13]](#footnote-13) of October 25, thrash out the objective, and pull together the work they had been doing into a clear objective, coherent scope, and set of prospective deliverables. Because of the looming deadline, there was some urgency in getting this completed. As well, Alice had promised McEwen he would receive a copy of the project proposal including a budget within 10 days of their meeting.

This meeting marked the first major confrontation between Ron and other members of the group. Alice assumed the role of discussion leader by copying down the main points for the interim report (see Exhibit 2); Ron started to get annoyed. She wanted to get a framework up on the whiteboard in order to discuss the company’s entire operations; Ron wanted to focus on international markets. As the discussion progressed, Ron saw that the direction the others were taking was different from where he wanted to go. “This won’t do,” he thought. “I know more about CSM than all of them put together.” Each time the other four agreed on a point that Ron disputed, he tried to convince them it was the wrong approach. He raised his voice and used every bit of logic available to him. But he felt as if he were hitting his head against a wall—they refused to go along. When the meeting came to an end, everyone left feeling frustrated and unhappy. Definition of the project’s scope and key deliverables remained unresolved.

Ron’s Apology—Alice’s Reaction

Recollecting this meeting, Ron said: “Needless to say, I got angry, even though I tried to hide it. The others were annoyed and probably surprised at the way I acted. Normally I contain my emotions quite well and give others the impression that I have everything under control.” Upon reflection, Ron felt a little embarrassed by the way he had acted. After cooling down and thinking things over, Ron decided that he owed Alice, in particular, an apology.

That night, October 25, Ron approached Alice at a HBA student party. He told her how seriously he was taking the project and apologized to her for his actions that morning. He added that he realized that she enjoyed being the leader and was the type who put all her energy into her efforts. “But,” he cautioned, “I’ll still continue to oppose anyone who tries to lead the project in a direction that I think is wrong.” Alice appeared uneasy when she replied: “Ron, you can’t lead unless others are prepared to follow. Furthermore, you shouldn’t talk to me alone. If you feel this way, tell the whole group.”

meetings WITH THEIR FACULTY SUPERVISOR (FS)

The following day, October 26, Ron and Alice, independently, and without consulting their other team members, went to see Michelle. Both had suggested the team was having difficulty agreeing on the objective but neither had been specific about the major points of contention, or why the group had not even reached agreement on a satisfactory objective. Michelle knew having a good objective for the IFP was crucial and was worried for this team. She had re-iterated to both Alice and Ron what she had communicated in her prior written feedback.

Respecting confidentiality, Michelle had not revealed to Ron or Alice that the other had also come by to discuss the project. She had asked both if the team was meeting that day or the next and had been told there was an all-afternoon meeting scheduled. She had some time free later that day and said she would be willing to drop by and speak with the team if they thought that would be helpful. Michelle wondered what more she might do to help.

Exhibit 1: ifp step-by-step

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STEPS** | **DEADLINE** |
| 1. **ATTEND HBA1 IFP CLASS SESSION**—Form teams of six and if doing new venture option prepare a proposal. | **March 18** |
| 1. **FORM YOUR TEAM**—List of team members must be submitted on Team Confirmation Form to IFP coordinator by e-mail or in person. | **April 30** |
| 1. **SELECT YOUR CLIENT**—Students search for a suitable client (IFP leads or your own prospects). | Before doing anything else |
| 1. **YOUR CLIENT SUBMITS AN APPLICATION**—Client Application Form to be submitted online at www.ivey.uwo.ca/icfp for approval by the IFP office. | Any time before **August 20** |
| 1. **IFP OFFICE APPROVES YOUR CLIENT**—based on the information they submitted online. Once notified of approval, the client must sign and mail the Client Letter of Agreement to the IFP office. | Within 7 days of submission. No later than **August 30** |
| 1. **IFP HBA2 FIRST WEEK OF CLASSES AND TEAM MEETINGS**—Teams will meet in the morning to develop project proposal; faculty supervisor (FS) will be available to provide guidance. Classes will be held in the afternoon, mandatory meetings with your FS on Tuesday morning, and your executive-in-residence (EIR) on Friday | **September 5, 6, 7 and 8** |
| 1. **SUBMIT YOUR UPDATE MEMO** (template available on LEARN) email to FS and EIR—Describe client issue, project objective, and initial scoping diagram, and your team’s work plan. | **September 28** |

Exhibit 1 (continued)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **IFP DEDICATED WORKDAYS** | **October 25, 26 and 27** |
| 1. **SUBMIT YOUR INTERIM REVIEW MATERIALS**—E-mail updated document and draft slide deck to FS and EIR. | **By October 27** |
| 1. **INTERIM REVIEW MEETING WITH FS AND EIR**—Attendance at this meeting is mandatory. | **November 2 or 3** |
| 1. **IFP DEDICATED WORKDAYS** | **November 15, 16 and 17** |
| 1. **SUBMIT YOUR FINAL SLIDE DECK**—Deck must be no more than 25 slides (plus appendices). Email it to your FS and EIR; upload to LEARN. | **December 1** |
| 1. **FINAL REVIEW MEETING WITH FS AND EIR**—Attendance at this meeting is mandatory. | **December 7 (evening) or 8 (day)** |

Exhibit 2: Faculty Supervisor (FS) Email Communication to IFP Teams

Hi Teams

Your interim submission is due October 27 by 1:00 p.m. You have 3 IFP workdays prior to this submission. Your team, your EIR, and I will be meeting you during the November 2–3 timeframe to review your submission and the status of your IFP, and provide you with feedback. To help you better prepare your submission and get the most out of that meeting, your submission should include the following components:

**Update of your Objective and Scope:** Your team will have learnt a lot since the initial formulation of your project’s objective and scope. It is normal for modifications to be made. Update your project’s objective and scope. Please highlight any changes and explain why they were made. It is expected your scoping diagram and explanation will have more depth than provided in your original September submission. If you have added or deleted major elements to your scope explain what and why. Changes to your scope will affect your work plan, but you are not required to report work plan modifications.

**Report on Data/Evidence Collection:** The final recommendations you make to your client will be based upon analysis, and that analysis will be grounded in data/evidence. Most IFPs utilize both primary and secondary/public data. Identify the data needed to support your analysis/working hypotheses, the source of that data, and, if it has not yet been collected, your plans to acquire that data. All data sources should be fully cited on the relevant PPT slides.

**Draft PowerPoint Deck:** The final deliverable to your client will be a 25-slide PowerPoint deck (plus appendices). At this point in your project, you are far enough along to ‘dummy-up’ this deck. There will be slides that require further analysis and evidence to complete. However, you should be able to create placeholders for these slides in your deck. Essentially this is a rough and incomplete draft of what you currently anticipate your final presentation deck will contain. It is fully expected you will make changes based upon feedback received, additional insights, and further data collection and analysis before you submit your final deck.

McKinsey representatives will be doing a session at Ivey during the afternoon of October 26. The topic is how to present a major consulting project as a PowerPoint deck. At least two members from each team should attend this session, but all team members are welcome. A few thoughts on the use of PPT for this project—there is no expectation you will do a stand-up presentation using your final deck. It will be provided to your EIR and me prior to our final meeting. Your deck should stand alone. It should be structured to communicate your findings, analysis, and evidence without having to be presented. Consequently, your slides may be denser than is typical for stand-up presentation slides. But take care not to overly complicate your slides. The reader should be able to easily and quickly grasp the key message from each slide. Also, do not use animations. Your deck will be printed and read. It will not be presented.

**Ethics Approval:** Quick reminder; if you are collecting data from or interviewing human subjects you need to complete the ethics forms and get my approval beforehand.

I’ll be around next week. Give me a call or drop by if you have questions. Also reach out to your EIR. They’re there to help.

1. Ivey’s undergraduate program admitted students after they had completed two years in any other university program. Thus, HBA1 students were in their 3rd year of university and HBA2 students in their 4th year. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Consistent with standard consulting practice the report was a 25-slide PowerPoint deck (plus appendices). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The IFP had two options: the client version and the new venture version. For the new venture option, the student team developed a proposal or plan for how to pursue a new business idea. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. “Apply to the Ivey Field Project,” Ivey Business School, accessed December 18, 2017, https://www.ivey.uwo.ca/ifp/apply-now/. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Michelle had taught HBA1 strategy to this team’s section, so she already knew these individuals. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Executives-in-residence served as mentors for IFP teams. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Ron’s mother had married his stepfather when Ron was 14 years old. Ron had kept the name of his biological father. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. This person handled all direct interactions with prospective clients. FSs and EIRs did not directly engage with clients. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. This acronym stands for specific, measureable, agreed to, realistic, and timely. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. This library specialized in agricultural information. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Ian had to leave the meeting early. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. This grade accounts for only 10 per cent of the final grade. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Jessie and Ian had dual degree class conflicts that morning. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)