



November 2013 Board of Directors Meeting

1. Adoption of the Agenda (2:22 PM)

Gabe:

Add motion to the agenda regarding clubs who don't have enrolment. Some clubs who were affiliated did not meet criteria. Correct BIR clause to reduce number clubs affiliated.

Added to agenda

Seconded by Gordon

Agenda Passed

2. Approval of Minutes

- a. October Board of Directors Session – October 26, 2013
 - i. Meeting 1
 - ii. Meeting 2
- b. Officer Meeting: November 8, 2013
- c. Finance Committee Meeting: November 11, 2013
- d. ~~Finance Committee Meeting: November 25, 2013 (To be provided)~~

Seconded: Gordon

Corrections: Item 4.b. should read "The Finance Committee has decided not to grant this request as the purpose of the fund is not to provide research grants."

Correction made

Pierre: Regarding MCI special projects why?

Gordon: Mostly engineering students; use engineering space.

Minutes passed as corrected

3. Officer Reports

- a. President – Mauricio Curbelo

Mauricio: Invited someone from Governing Council to speak at SGRT meeting regarding student commons. Expected that SGRT will have a say in space management to be brought up at summit.

Medsoc wants to get out of UTSU, reaching out to law.



Pierre: Why do you think anything will get done regarding Engineering Career Center?

Mauricio: At EngSoc-faculty meeting, we discussed course syllabi on exam bank and also discussed career bank. Met with Dean and complained about it. The Dean has personally bought into the idea. Her two main priorities are career center and new building. Two reasons: 1. she is the career centers boss. 2. His boss is Lisa who is also responsible for HR. Forming a working group to look at all the groups who offer career services. Working group is made up of two engsoc, 2 alumni, vice dean, and nelly from civ. Working group not going to be polluted by people with vested interest. We are coming down on the Career Center from above. Hose is useless.

Yerusha: I would like to know what your opinion is at the AGM.

Mauricio: Not a good use of my time. Have given statements to Varsity. Does not think participating in their events are useful. AGM was sham. UTM gets money back and can stay back and vote. AGM is proof that you can't work in their process.

Matt: Other question why wasn't there a more active attempt to cause shit at AGM.

Mauricio: Things are very different. Last year the AGM was the only way to get things done. Nothing was on the agenda that could have been done besides getting the agenda shut down.

Tabish: Asked classmates about what they thought about the UTSU AGM. They wanted to push change last year but this year they felt nothing could happen.

Pierre: I was able to waste an hour and a half of everyone's time. Needed 50% or 2/3rds of the vote to do much. Varsity asks how you felt about this. 44000 didn't come to this meeting because it was a waste of their time. UTSU is not worth our time, we have studies.

b. VP Finance – Gordon Tattle

Evan: Regarding Toike, the emailed saying it was alright.

Gordon: Want a legit contract.

Matthew: Regarding cheque reqs any idea for making them handed in.

Gordon: Can't do anything about it.

Tabish: Regarding bursary?

Gordon: Not a requirement.

Pierre: Check with orientation



- c. VP Communications – Thomas Santerre (AWR)
- d. VP Academic – Fady Soliman

Tabish: What is happening with faculty council standing committees?

Mauricio: Some meet more than others. Course evaluations are moving well.

Tabish: What is his opinion about course evaluations?

Mauricio: Department chair now gets comments so they can see issues about stuff. Very high in upper year course. Low in first and second year. Discipline clubs are talking to Profs to get them to send emails to the class about the course. EngSoc is going to get the data.

Matthew: Some ideas were thrown out, such as spam or restricting mark viewability on ROSI. Other idea were put on the table, should give TMRC more ideas on the table.

- e. VP Student Life – Gabriel Stavros

Gabriel: Revamping club affiliation process and making them line-up with funding allocations. Give me any suggestions you have. Adding clubs fair to Godiva Week. 30 Tickets left for Cannonball. At Royal York. Clubs are moving to 256 Mccaul, EAA and music groups will be moved. Club space almost got moved to the basement at site 10.

Matt: Was that zoning?

Mauricio: Dean of Architecture thinks people should be able to see the roof of Con Hall to establish directions. Decided to propose the building be a floor taller.

Gabe: Meeting next week about whether we have to move out of UTP.

Pierre: UTSU thinks that it's finally being actioned on. Going to lose UTP soon.

Evan: What are we going to do?

Mauricio: Brought it up at the meeting. Faculty is aware of the issue.

Pierre: If they lose student space they have to give back the square-footage. University-wide policy.

4. MOTION by ~~Laura Shen~~ Mauricio Curbelo to strike the Election Rules Committee

WHEREAS Bylaw 3, Chapter 8 specifies an Elections Rules Committee consisting of the President, the CRO, the Speaker of the Board of Directors, and two members of the Board of Directors shall report to the Board in January; and



BE IT RESOLVED that the Election Rules Committee be struck pursuant to Bylaw 3; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board immediately fill the committee's vacancies.

There will be a call for two (2) volunteers from the Board of Directors to the Election Rules Committee immediately following success of this motion.

Seconded by Gordon.

Mauricio: Just housekeeping. To make rules for officer elections. You can't run for officer if you are on the committee.

Pierre: If you are on the committee you should make sure that the rules are clear as possible. Make sure the elections are good so we can criticize UTSU. Look at other student societies to see how they make their rules.

Motion Carried.

Nominated Reza, Evan B and Gordon.

Reza and Gordon Appointed.

5. MOTION by Gabriel Stavros to affiliate a new club with the Engineering Society

WHEREAS all the applications were reviewed by the President and VP Student Life to determine which clubs genuinely benefit the student body; and

WHEREAS only new clubs require approval from the Board of Directors to receive official Engineering Club status; and

BE IT RESOLVED that new student club 'Building Design Club' be affiliated with the Engineering Society for the 2013-2014 year.

Seconded by Stephanie.

Gabriel: They passed all the requirements. Registrar got back to me. Focused on teaching students industry software. Focussed on Revit for now and expanding in the future.

Stephanie: Fulfills the requirements

Motion Carried.



6. MOTION by the Gordon Tattle to allocate Special Projects Funding to Iron Dragons

WHEREAS the Finance Committee has received a special projects request from Iron Dragons for the purchase of two erg machines for their use; and

WHEREAS the Finance Committee is in favour of allocating money to fund the purchase of one erg machine and a storage container (\$3,800); and

WHEREAS at the time of consideration the space to store this equipment had not been confirmed in writing; and

WHEREAS at the time of consideration it was also not clear where Iron Dragons would use the equipment; and

WHEREAS the piece of equipment is too expensive to purchase without a confirmed location;

BE IT RESOLVED that \$3,800.00 from special projects be held for the purpose of purchasing one erg machine and a storage container; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the \$3,800.00 be released by the Officers upon receipt of written confirmation of storage and usage space for the equipment or acceptable equivalent.

Seconded by Gabe.

Gordon: FC in favour. Need a confirmed space.

Gabe: Looking at space at 256 McCaul.

Pierre: What do similar teams at U of T use?

Nikola: We would be the first to have ready access to this equipment. There is a place to rent equipment in Etobicoke. Built a new training program and the talent is far above last year. We are hoping for great improvement

Desmond: For the last four years training has been the same. We have increased training from last year. We don't have the same equipment access as other teams.

Pierre: If you lose the coach next year, would you be unable to use the piece of equipment.

Nikola: Our goal is to educate the team to use the equipment. We have three coaches who are alumni from iron dragons. Minimum of three year program for coaches.

Desmond: 1 year will be sufficient for a veteran to teach a newcomer.

Motion carried.

7. SPECIAL MOTION by Gordon Tattle to remove the requirement for Council Meetings from Bylaw 1



WHEREAS this part of the Bylaw has not been followed for the past two years; and

WHEREAS the Officers do not believe that these meetings are valuable;

BE IT RESOLVED Section 5.1 be removed entirely from Bylaw 1 and all other sections be renumbered accordingly.

Seconded by Mauricio.

Mauricio: Thought that after council people would silo off. We are still effective. Housekeeping.

Matthew: Concern that slowing off of council has increased. No longer same interaction between directors and the activities of the society. I share their opinion that there is merit in having some form of formal communication.

Praneet: I am in favour. Project directors are able to attend board meeting. There are meetings every month.

Alex: I agree with Praneet.

Pierre: There has been a push this year to send emails to everyone. At the end of the day we don't need this as long as we email this to everyone and keep them in the loop.

Mauricio: I think that some people have misguided notions about what is needed to get work done. Connections are there when we need them to do useful work. Project directors can come to these meetings. There were lots of retreats in David Cheung's year and we didn't get work done.

Matthew: I agree that it should be removed as a requirement. I disagree that it isn't worthwhile to bring these people together. I think that as the board we should aim to facilitate connection between members in the society

Praneet: Does the affect the JCM

Gordon: No.

Tabish: No harm in having informal discussion.

Motion Carried.

8. SPECIAL MOTION by Gordon Tattle to amend a numbering issue in Bylaw 1

WHEREAS Bylaw 1 section 7.1.3 currently does not make sense;

BE IT RESOLVED that Bylaw 1 section 7.1.3 be changed to read:

- 7.1.3. In the case of 7.1.2.b), such amendment must be ratified by a two-thirds vote at:*
a. A General Meeting called for that purpose; or



b. The next Annual General Meeting.

Seconded by Matt.

Gordon: Just an error.

Pierre: I want to call the question

Question called

Motion Carried.

9. MOTION by Gordon Tattle to re-allocate Special Projects Funding to the Cannon Newspaper

WHEREAS the Cannon wishes to publish two newspapers in the winter term; and

WHEREAS their budget does not currently allow them to do so;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Special Projects budget be reduced by \$1,600.00 and the Cannon Newspaper budget be increased by the same amount.

Seconded by Pierre.

Gordon: For two issues, one for Back to School and one for elections.

Pierre: If they can print it they should. A lot less than what we used to pay. Help them find readership.

Alex: I don't see how it will increase readership.

Mauricio: I think it does make a difference if you print it. If you print off the best articles then it will be good for people to read them. I think it would be valuable if we have some kind of filter.

Matt: I agree that we should have a cannon printed. Just because people have computers doesn't mean that they will be on the cannon site. May increase readership overall.

Evan M: Why special projects?

Marissa: We decided to print the best articles and stuff related to Godiva week and elections.

Alex: I think this best-of makes more sense.

Gordon: (To Evan) Only place I could take it from without affecting budget.

Marissa: To increase legitimacy of the Cannon with Faculty.



University of Toronto Engineering Society
November 2013 Board of Directors Meeting Agenda

Nov 30th, 2013
2:00pm
GB202

Pierre: What are we doing with Advertising?

Mauricio: Call the question

Motion Carried.



10. Motion by Gordon Tattle to authorize the Finance Committee to make deductions from the final amounts given to each department from the Levy Fund

WHEREAS after receiving project updates from the departments it is clear that in some cases departments have not completed projects and overestimated project cost; and

WHEREAS the Levy Fund does not operate on a cheque requisition basis; and

WHEREAS it is not clear that the Finance Committee currently has the authority to make reductions in cases where the Levy Fund is being taken advantage of;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Finance Committee may chose to reduce the final amount given to each department in cases where project costs from previous years were overestimated or projects were canceled; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such decisions shall be subject to approval by the Officers.

Seconded Mauricio

Mauricio: Some departments get money and don't spend it on the project. Departments just get a cheque. Email this to departments to say that they a

Evan: Is this an issue?

Gordon: Can't track from Jon's year. Civ over-estimated project cost and cancelled a project. ECE cancelled a project

Tabish: What do discipline clubs think about this?

Pierre: Our idea of levy fund is different from faculty. Levy fund is supposed to be an upgrade fund. If the students want a computer lab and civ thinks it isn't necessary they can't just cancel it. Broader discussion needs to be had with the departments so they know that the fund isn't extra tuition.

Anamjit: Why isn't it cheque req?

Gordon: For our books.

Matthew: I am upset at the news regarding civil engineering. I think we need to approach the departments and talk to them. I think we should look at a contractual requirement regarding these disbursements.

Motion Carried.

11. MOTION by Anamjit Singh Sivia to allocate additional funds to Social Spark – Toronto Hub from the Affiliated Club Funding Pool



WHEREAS Social Spark – Toronto Hub is a student run club at the University of Toronto that works to educate students about social entrepreneurship and provide opportunities for growth; and

WHEREAS Social Spark applied to the Engineering Society's Fall Club Funding round and \$150 in funding was approved by the Finance Committee; and

WHEREAS with the club's primary source of funding (\$1,000), the Munk School of Global Affairs, having rescinded its commitment, presents a major change in financial circumstances; and

WHEREAS in wake of this change, budget cuts have been made to compensate; however, further cuts will severely reduce the amount of services offered and additional funding is required to sustain services; and

WHEREAS a majority of Social Spark's participation comes from undergraduate engineering students with a high level of satisfaction; and

WHEREAS the time period for appeals to the Finance Committee has now passed;

BE IT RESOLVED that Social Spark Toronto Hub be allocated an additional \$500 from the Affiliated Club Funding Pool.

Seconded by Pierre.

Anamjit: Goal of the club to teach students about entrepreneurship. Munk School gave us \$1,000 in a reimbursement basis. This year they withdrew funding. The \$500 does not cover the funding requirements.

Praneet: Have you spoken to sponsorship director to look at other revenue streams

Anamjit: Not aware of sponsorship director. Looking at UTSU.

Gordon: Amendment to add a further be it resolved that if they are no longer an affiliated club that the funding be withdrawn.

Seconded by Pierre.

Pierre: Should add be also added to finance policy.

Amendment Carried.

Anamjit: Does this mean that if we are removed we will lose the funding.

Mauricio: You would be able to resubmit.

Call the question.

Motion Carried as amended.



12. SPECIAL MOTION by Mauricio Curbelo to limit the membership of the Engineering Society to the St. George campus

WHEREAS a proposal has been made before Faculty Council to create an engineering undergraduate degree pathway whereby students would be required to complete 2 years of study at the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM), followed by 3 years of study at the St. George campus; and

WHEREAS it is not feasible for the Engineering Society to provide services and representation to students at a distant campus; and

WHEREAS the Society believes that the consultative process undertaken by the Faculty to determine the feasibility of implementing such a program was deeply flawed, and posed misleading questions to too small a sample of students in order to indicate false support for this program; and

WHEREAS students enrolled in an engineering program at a distant campus will have severely reduced access to the Society's 80+ Affiliated Clubs during their two years at UTM; and

WHEREAS it has been proposed that this program would necessarily result in the reduction of Track One spaces at the St. George campus;

BE IT RESOLVED that Bylaw 1, Sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 be amended as follows:

*1.1.1 Full Time Members must be students enrolled in full time undergraduate studies as defined by the Faculty, **at the St. George campus***

*1.1.2 Part Time Members must be students enrolled in part time undergraduate studies as defined by the Faculty, **at the St. George campus***

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Bylaw 1, Section 1.2.1, be amended as follows:

1.2.1 The Membership Fee shall be \$47.04 for Full Time Members and \$44.22 for Part Time Members in the year 2012-2013.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board directs the Officers, Discipline Clubs, Faculty Council Standing Committee student representatives, and Class Representatives to oppose the creation of any Faculty program which would require engineering students to complete courses at UTM.

Seconded by Matthew

Mauricio: If you agree just vote for it. Changes to charge just the members. Good housekeeping item to restrict to St. George campus. In mikas letter he claims things that are not true. Number 1 is false, read emails. Number 2 is false, he stated this at faculty council and said they would be no different from commutes. Does not think arts and science major is valuable. There is not a single person in engineering in engineering who is enrolled in an A&S major. I think it should happen downtown in the upper-years. Does not think that there are students out there who want to. I think that associating ourselves with UTM will reduce our reputation. You can't have a



school in the forest and think that it is equivalent to St. George. Ever discipline club who was consulted said it was a bad idea. The president of the alumni association is also in favour.

Matthew: Received 5 or 6 emails regarding this. All of them were strongly opposed to the idea. Felt that an integral part of the first year experience was being downtown with other engineering students.

Sean: My understanding is that this is a pre-emptive removal of UTM engineers from EngSoc. What would they be restricted to if this went forward?

Stephanie: Argument I have heard. First years don't participate in design clubs, second reduce transfer into engineering (ultra major track one), third difficult to get into courses at St George. Counter argument is that you have 9 years to complete your degree and get all these courses. Putting a name to something that already exists and limiting it. We are shutting ourselves off from these students if they are passed.

Anamjit: Regarding point 4. Transfers from engineering science is easy because they are already downtown.

Pierre: This other program would likely cost less than spending a 6th year. To say that the average student can take this is false because they would still be paying engineering fees. To say UTM would be sub-par is false in terms of curriculum. The ability for mentorship for first to second years will not be there. You won't be able to meet anyone who can help you. The issue is the subpar student experience not education. We should not stop the idea that is wrong because we think they are going to do it. If you bring lots of students to faculty council then the Profs will oppose this. The Profs have no vested interest.

Propose amendment to make the board encourage that the officers, class reps and discipline clubs speak against it.

Pierre: This allows people to speak against it

Seconded by Stephanie

Amendment carries

Mauricio: If this is passed, I will draft a letter that says: we passed this motion and we are opposed to this. To be signed by directors and disciplines clubs. I think we stand a good chance of getting this killed.

Praneet: You can still be part-time and take courses at UTM now. You can already do this, why would you let this pass.

Daren: Even if this is passed we should make sure they aren't completely cut off.

Mauricio: I think that for user fee events we should let them pay into it.



Matthew: When I was first introduced to this project they would still pay full artsci tuition for an extra year to take this (not UTM rates). Based on my understanding there would be zero benefit to students. I suggest we create a lower cost partnership with colleges in arts and science.

Stephanie: I think this might be a segway into a larger UTM engineering. We should consider that they would think this is premature and hasty. We should provide multiple option.

Sean: I think this motion could be detrimental if the UTM project is passed. This could be seen as a reactionary measure.

Alex: I think this is premature and a bit rash. We don't know what might happen.

Marissa: I think that we are more opposed to UTM as the location, not the idea itself. I think it is a good idea just that it is bad that it is at UTM.

Tabish: Create a working group to state an alternate proposal and counter their point. The task force for this project only reviews.

Mauricio: I want to address the scope of this motion. This motion is deliberate in its wording. Opposes a very specific thing, just UTM. Opposes requiring students to take courses at utm. You can't meet someone halfway if you disagree about something fundamental. What they do know for sure is that they will require students to take courses at UTM. We are just voting about whether we propose courses at UTM. We are not responding to the details.

Pierre: This motion specifically says require students to take courses at UTM. Could say that we just specifically oppose the program at UTM. How is anyone supposed to leave first year with any actual skills?

Stephanie: If it's strictly not UTM then I am in favour.

Gordon: In favour

Calling the question

Motion carried unanimously

13. SPECIAL MOTION by Gordon Tattle to update the section on fees in Bylaw 1

WHEREAS our fees have been increased due to a cost of living adjustment

BE IT RESOLVED Bylaw 1 section 1.2.1 be changed to read:

1.2.1. The Membership Fee shall be \$47.42 for full-time students and \$44.58 for part-time students in the year 2013-2014.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 1 section 1.2.1 be changed as follows:

- The amount \$47.04 be replaced with \$47.42;



- The amount \$44.22 be replaced with \$44.58; and
- The year 2012-2013 be replaced with 2013-2014.

Seconded by Praneet

Motion Carried.

14. SPECIAL MOTION by Mauricio Curbelo to formalize Discipline Club election procedures

WHEREAS Discipline Clubs play a key role in the academic advocacy process by representing students to Departments; and

WHEREAS Discipline Clubs are annually allocated approximately the same amount of funding as the total amount distributed to all our Affiliated Clubs; and

WHEREAS the Society's bylaws currently do not specify a process for the election of Discipline Club executives, and the process for electing Class Representatives does not mention important details such as the length of a nomination or voting period; and

WHEREAS Discipline Club elections should be held to the same standard of democratic fairness and procedural rigor as all other Engineering Society elections; and

WHEREAS synchronizing Board and Discipline Club elections will reduce voter fatigue and likely increase turnout; and

WHEREAS it is within the jurisdiction of the Board to determine Discipline Club election procedures, since Discipline Clubs are part of the Engineering Society;

BE IT RESOLVED that Bylaw 3, Chapter 6 be eliminated; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a new Chapter 6 be added to Bylaw 3 as follows:

Chapter 6 – Discipline Clubs

6.0 Discipline Club Executives

6.0.1 The nomination and voting periods, and campaigning rules, shall be the same as those for the Board of Directors election.

6.0.2 The constitution of each Discipline Club shall determine the composition of each Discipline Club executive.

6.0.3 Discipline Club executives shall be elected by a single transferrable vote system, with elections taking place electronically on a voting system of the Society's choosing.

6.1 Class Representatives

6.1.1 Class Representatives shall be elected by a vote of the Members of each Constituency

6.1.2 First and second year Class Representative elections shall take place electronically during the first two full weeks of classes in September, with nomination and voting periods to be determined by the Chief Returning Officer, but to be no less than three (3) days in either case.



6.1.3 Discipline Clubs may opt to elect third and fourth year Class Representatives in the fall term, with the same nomination and voting period as first and second year representatives, or in the winter term concurrent with the Board of Directors election.

6.1.5 The job description for Class Representatives shall be determined by each Discipline Club, but must make mention of Faculty Council membership as a key aspect of the role.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Bylaw 7, Section 1.0.3.d be added as follows:

1.0.3. d. The club has not run elections in compliance with the Society's bylaws.

Seconded Dareen

Mauricio: Added not having run a democratic election to reason not having funding. Have been consulting with discipline clubs. Changed it to online this year after consultation with the discipline clubs. Fair to expect the same type of democratic rigor from them as from us. Moves everything to the same period. No brainer to me.

Dareen: More effective and more consistent.

Matt: Does this preclude discipline club execs running for board?

Mauricio: No.

Pierre: Helps increase the relationship between the discipline clubs and EngSoc.

Motion carried

15. MOTION by Gabriel Stavros to update the status of Engineering Society Affiliated clubs approved at the previous Board of Directors Meeting

WHEREAS at a Board of Directors Meeting on October 26th, 2013 the following motion was passed:

WHEREAS the club affiliation process was advertised to all students, especially affiliated clubs from the previous year; and

WHEREAS all the applications were reviewed by the President and VP Student Life to determine which clubs genuinely benefit the student body; and

WHEREAS only new clubs require approval from the Board of Directors to receive official Engineering Club status;

BE IT RESOLVED that the following clubs be affiliated with the Engineering Society for the



2013-2014 year:

- *Ehappy*
- *Exoskeleton Design Club*
- *Skule Dance Club*
- *Muslim Student Association*
- *Social Spark*
- *Thaqalayn Muslim Association*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following clubs be re-affiliated:

- *Appassionista Music Group*
- *UofT Dev*
- *Supermileage Club*
- *ESA*
- *UofT Destination Imagination*

WHEREAS, the Registrar has confirmed enrollment for the undergraduate club members, and

WHEREAS, a number of clubs did not meet the requirements for affiliation;

BE IT RESOLVED that the 'Be It Resolved' clause in Motion 12, Motion by Gabriel Stavros to affiliate new clubs, passed at a previous meeting of the Board of Directors, be amended to state:

BE IT RESOLVED that new student clubs be affiliated with the Engineering Society for the 2013-2014 year:

- *Muslim Student Association*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following clubs be re-affiliated:

- *Appassionista Music Group*
- *UofT Dev*
- *Supermileage Club*
- *ESA*
- *UofT Destination Imagination*

Seconded by Matt.

Gabe: The registrar only got back to us after. They can re-apply and resend a new list of people. We can't check student numbers.

Anamjit: What would be the status after this motion?

Gabe: as if they are still pending.



Pierre: Do the clubs know?

Gabe: No. I will let them know after this meeting

Motion Carries

16. Item for Information submitted by Gordon Tattle - Policy on Awarding Society Awards - as approved at a meeting of the Officers on November 8, 2013.

17. Other Business

Pierre: Talking about UTSU AGM. They answered questions about their whole year. UTM saying thank you for helping. Pierre started filibustering for an hour and a half. They voted to limit speaking time to 2 minutes and limit number of speakers to 2 for and 2 against. Lots of people lined up regarding questions about the audit. The first person to stand up asked to call the question immediately. Ryan Gomes had a question on the audit that he asked at the start of the meeting and was told to wait until the audit question. However the entire UTSU executive voted to call question without answering the question.

WHEREAS at the UTSU Annual general meeting on November 27 2013, a member called the question on the UTSU audit

And WHEREAS there was pending question by an engineering member, Ryan Gomez,

And WHEREAS the President of the UTSU has previously stated that he would address the question while the audit was being debated

AND WHEREAS when the debate on the audit began, the entire UTSU executive voted unanimously to call the question while Ryan's question was pending

BIRT the Engineering Society strongly condemns the UTSU Executive's blatant disregard for member concerns at the only regularly scheduled meeting of the members

Seconded by Praneet

Praneet: If we have a question here and we don't answer the question it calls into question our democratic legitimacy.

Motion Carried.

Marissa: We should think about writing about the BoD meetings in the Cannon.

Matthew: Hi-Skule has the greatest turnout we have ever had for this event. I also want to have a holiday get-together. Praneet is in charge.

18. ADJOURNMENT



Attendance

Officers		
President	Mauricio Curbelo	
VP Finance	Gordon Tattle	
VP Communication	Thomas Santerre	AwR
VP Academic	Fady Soliman	AwR
VP Student Life	Gabriel Stavros	
Directors of the Board		
At-Large	Yerusha Nuh	
At-Large	Tabish Gilani	
At-Large	Praneet Bagga	
At-Large	Stephanie Gaglione	
Chemical Representative	Sean Hunt	
Civil Representative	Evan Ma	
Computer Representative	Kimberly Shen	
Electrical Representative	Allan Wang	
Engineering Science Representative	Pierre Harfouche	
Industrial Representative	Alexandra Szatan	
Materials Science Representative	Vinson Truong	
Mechanical Representative	Evan Boyce	
Mineral Representative	Ivan Zdravkovic	
First Year	Reza Boushehri	
First Year	Dareen Kutob	
First Year	Marissa Zhang	

A – Absent

AwR – Absent with Regrets

P – Proxy