



---

## February Board of Directors Meeting

### **MOTION by Ernesto to add a motion at the end of the meeting:**

MOTION by Ernesto Diaz Lozano to amend Policy\_2002-08-03

WHEREAS Policy\_2002-08-03 lists the Joe Club Award in section 2.1, and

WHEREAS the Joe Club Award does not have a description in Appendix A, and

WHEREAS the Awards Committee cannot award the Joe Club Award if there is no description, and as such it has not been included yet in the nomination form for awards

BE IT RESOLVED the following description be added to Policy\_2002-08-03 Appendix A, and also added immediately to the nomination form for the current Awards Cycle:

#### **Joe Club Award**

Awarded annually to one graduating individual who has demonstrated commitment and dedication to their respective discipline club over the course of their years at Skule

**No objections.**

**Agenda amended. The motion added before the discussion item.**

**MOTION by Maddy to move item 13 to item 9.**

**No objections**

**Agenda amended.**

### **MOTION by Ben L. to add a motion as new item 11:**

MOTION by Ben Leung to amend the Fall Break Referendum prompt

WHEREAS a motion to hold a Fall Break referendum was passed at the January 2016 Board of Directors meeting; and

WHEREAS there is concern regarding the neutrality of the prompt by including the UTSU referendum results, but this was not addressed during the meeting;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the current referendum prompt be amended, shown in the Appendix



**No objections.**

**Agenda amended.**

**MOTION by Anthony to add a motion:**

MOTION by the University of Toronto Baja Team (U of T Baja Team) for the creation of a U of T Baja Team levy.

WHEREAS the U of T Baja team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to the Engineers about the team's needs and their past accomplishments;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the question as stated today be put to a referendum to full time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections.

**No objections.**

**Agenda amended. Motion added as new motion 11.**

**1. Adoption of the Agenda**

**No objections.**

**Agenda adopted (2:23 PM).**

**2. Approval of the January Board of Directors Meeting Minutes (Appendix A)**

**No objections.**

**Minutes approved.**

**3. Approval of the Finance Committee Meeting Minutes (Appendix B)**

**No objections.**

**Minutes approved.**

**4. Approval of the Affiliation Committee Meeting Minutes (Appendix C)**

**No objections.**

**Minutes approved.**

**5. Approval of the Academic Advocacy Committee Meeting Minutes (Appendix D)**



**No objections.**

**Minutes approved.**

6. **Approval** of the Policies and Structures Committee Meeting Minutes (Appendix E)

**No objections.**

**Minutes approved.**

7. **Officer Reports**

- a. President – Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patino (Appendix F)

Milan: With respect to capstone integration, what is the timeline?

Ernesto: It won't be implemented for next year because of the Faculty Council cycle.

Oghosa: Yesterday the Examination Committee met and agreed to have the revision to state that smart watches will be banned.

- b. VP Finance – Rachel Reding (Appendices G)  
c. VP Communications – Reena Cabanilla (Appendix H)

Milan: What kind of updates for skule.ca?

Reena: I want to simplify it. There's a lot of text. I'd like to keep the digest part and banner, and also update the menu.

- d. VP Academic – Oghosa Igbinakenzua (Appendices I)  
e. VP Student Life – Madeleine Santia (Appendices J)

Kevin: It might be difficult to have the transition retreat.

8. **ELECTION** of the Design Team Association Project Manager (recommendation report in Appendix K)

Elected director: Kevin Rupasinghe

9. **MOTION by Madeleine Santia to create the Mental Wellness Director.**

**WHEREAS** over the past few months, since becoming a temporary directorship, steps have been taken to build a plan for upcoming years, run stress relief events geared towards mental wellness that promote services at the University of Toronto, and determine what students want to see in future events for the Mental



Wellness portfolio as a Temporary Internal Director defined stated in bylaw 2, and;

**WHEREAS** this position has filled a need within the Society that is ongoing, and;

**WHEREAS** the goal of this portfolio is to raise mental health awareness and improve mental health in the Skule community

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the following is added to Chapter 1 of Bylaw 2 the Directors Bylaw and the subsequent lines be re-numbered accordingly.

1.22 Mental Wellness Director

1.22.1 There shall be a Mental Wellness Director, who shall be responsible for:

- a) Raising mental health awareness by promoting services provided by affiliated Engineering Society groups, the Faculty and the University of Toronto;
- b) Improving mental health in the Skule community by providing stress relief activities to the members of the Engineering Society;

1.22.2 The Mental Wellness Director shall be overseen by the Vice-President of Student Life.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Mental Wellness Director be included in the 2016 round of Project Director Nominations.

**Milan seconds.**

Maddy: So far this position has done some effective things and this is something we still need. I think it's at that stage to make it permanent.

Peter: Can you go over some things Vinny has done?

Maddy: He released a survey to see what events people want to do, he's put together a pool of resources to be sent out to students, and he did the event with EAA. They had a speaker come in, and he'll be doing another event in March.

Milan: If vinny doesn't take over the position, what structure is in place?

Maddy: He's been working on this himself. When we're choosing someone for next year, we want the candidates to consider what kind of team they want to set up.

**No objections or abstentions.**



**Motion carries.**

*Maddy leaves at 3:00PM.*

**10. MOTION by the University of Toronto Baja Team (U of T Baja Team) for the creation of a U of T Baja Team levy.**

**WHEREAS** the U of T Baja team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to the Engineers about the team's needs and their past accomplishments;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the question as stated today be put to a referendum to full time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the election occur with the following timeline:

Nomination Period: March 1 9:00am to March 3 5:00PM

All Candidates Meeting: March 3 7:00PM

Campaigning Period: March 4 9:00AM to March 7 5:00PM

Voting Period: March 7 5:00PM to March 10 3:00PM

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the referendum be worded:

The Engineering Society is seeking consent from its members to create the levy for the University of Toronto Baja Team. The levy will be \$0.75 per session per student (\$1.50 per Fall & Winter academic sessions). If the levy is approved, it will be charged to all full-time undergraduate Applied Science and Engineering students in fall 2016 and fall 2017. Subsequent referendum approval will be required to continue the fee after the 2017/2018 session. Are you in favour of creating the University of Toronto Baja Team Levy as described above?

**Raffi seconds.**

Anthony: The Baja team is an automotive based design club that started in September 2013. There's a lot I learned in this club. Since then, we went to two competitions. We want the club to grow and compete more, and we need more funding. With this new funding, we'll get more members, better parts, and more advertising and promotion. There's also the design presentation and sales presentation. We learn about the finances, challenges that come up with these types of projects.

Milan: How many members?

Anthony: Around 10 members.



Milan: Your proposal is to not to take club funding and rely on a student levy?

Anthony: That's for transportation.

Milan: This year you had \$3000 from engsoc, and are hoping to have more use from the levy?

Anthony: Yes.

Amy: What would you do if you didn't have the levy?

Anthony: We would have to go back to EngSoc, shrink the club because we have a few debts. The levy will help resolve these debts and compete next year.

Rob: Do you currently have a sponsorship director? Was it considered?

Anthony: We have an exec as a treasurer whose job is to get club funding but he couldn't make it today.

Rob: Can you expand on his role?

Anthony: We can't get corporate sponsorship. To get sponsorship you have to be acknowledged as a high functioning team.

Chris: Are there any plans outside of university funding, or is it solely based on this funding?

Anthony: We applied to the UTSU?

Chris: Do you hope to pursue other sources of revenue?

Anthony: Yes.

Aidan: A lot of design teams do get corporate sponsorship. What is the scope of your debts?

Anthony: Around \$3 000.

Aidan: Would the levy immediately be used to settle these debts or incrementally?

Anthony: It would be incremental.

Raffi: Are there any provision for when the election will occur?



Billy: We'll do that at the end.

Ernesto: We need to do that when we do the Skule Nite levy, so we will need some time.

Raffi: Campaigning has already started. Putting it during the Skule Nite levy would be unfair. We could do immediately after, during the EAA motion.

Peter: We had a problem with Iron Dragons where they bought something we didn't budget for. Is this the same thing?

Anthony: To some extent. We didn't get funding we needed last year to compete.

Peter: From past experience, you can't expect us to pay for things we didn't budget.

Anthony: We tried to put it as clear in our budget as we can.

Ernesto: The deadline to institute new fees is March 11. We have to make a decision now and make the referendum soon. They only gave the budget for 2015-2016; I don't know how many of this are actuals. Why next year do you need an extra revenue?

Anthony: There are still some things we need this year. We are hoping next year the debt will be small.

Milan: This isn't us saying the referendum will pass.

Apurv: There's more than double the budget for paint and decal, how will you support budget changes?

Anthony: With more marketing and corporate sponsorships.

Andrew: You mentioned you have more stuff to buy, how come you decided to not pay off your debt?

Anthony: We already registered for the competition.

**Raffi amends:**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the election occur with the following timeline:**

**Nomination Period: March 1 9:00am to March 3 5:00PM**  
**All Candidates Meeting: March 3 7:00PM**



**Campaigning Period: March 4 9:00AM to March 7 5:00PM**  
**Voting Period: March 7 5:00PM to March 10 3:00PM**

**Milan seconds.**

Kevin: Is one day enough?

Rachel: It's fine.

**Twesh opposed, no abstentions, everyone else in favour.**

**Amendment carries.**

Anthony: We still have to buy new parts to be part of the competition. The budget is where the money is going to go.

Oghosa: We're trying to allow the referendum to take place, not if we're giving them money.

Kevin: There's not much additional funding they asked for. The point of why not settling debts, that's how teams die. You have to continue working on things. Resolving things takes a couple of years.

Anthony: We thought about if we stop for debts, but then we'll lose interest and members.

Amy: Is it \$1.50 per semester or per year?

Anthony: We're asking per year.

Ernesto: I think we should word it per year. EngSoc receives them in installments.

Milan: It's broken down per semester.

Rachel: How is your design team different than other design teams we have levies for, in terms of what you do?

Anthony: FASE is different in many ways. Our vehicle is off road racing, it's a different design, more recreational, and an entry level member would want to go to us. We're more about teaching new members, FASE is more competitive. We have very different vehicle designs.

Ernesto: In ROSI, levies are paid in second semester in one lump.





**Anthony amends:**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the referendum be worded:  
The Engineering Society is seeking consent from its members to create the levy for the University of Toronto Baja Team. The levy will be \$0.75 per session per student (\$1.50 per Fall & Winter academic sessions). If the levy is approved, it will be charged to all full-time undergraduate Applied Science and Engineering students in fall 2016 and fall 2017. Subsequent referendum approval will be required to continue the fee after the 2017/2018 session. Are you in favour of creating the University of Toronto Baja Team Levy as described above?**

**Milan seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Amendment approved.**

**Rob moves to call the question.**

**Ernesto seconds.**

**Question called.**

**Rob abstains. Amy, Aidan, Twesh and Chris are opposed. Everyone else is in favour.**

**Motion carries.**

**11. MOTION by Ben Leung to amend the Fall Break Referendum prompt**

**WHEREAS** a motion to hold a Fall Break referendum was passed at the January 2016 Board of Directors meeting; and

**WHEREAS** there is concern regarding the neutrality of the prompt by including the UTSU referendum results, but this was not addressed during the meeting;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the current referendum prompt be amended, shown in the Appendix.

**Milan seconds.**

Ben L.: The question was called, and we didn't get to speak. The only major change is including results from the UTSU referendum. If we say it's not applicable, it's not included.



Milan: The sentence, “UTSU referendum is also not indicative of engineering students’ stance on the matter since they were not able to vote.” is not relevant.

Ben L.: We can take it out. I want it to be informative, but not too long.

**Ben L. amends to remove the sentence: The UTSU referendum is also not indicative of engineering students’ stance on the matter since they were not able to vote.**

**Kevin opposed. No abstentions.**

**Amendment passes.**

**No objections or abstentions.**

**Motion carries.**

**12. MOTION by Kirk Regan and Andrew Mwangi to hold Engineering Athletics Association (EAA) Elections with the timeline outlined in appendix L**

**WHEREAS** with the current timeline, EAA executives would not be elected until after S-dance

**WHEREAS** having the EAA executives elected before S-dance would be an ancillary benefit to the Engineering Athletic community because it would provide opportunity for new execs to transition and perform outreach

**WHEREAS** every year with the exception of the 1T5 year, EAA executives were elected before S-dance

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Chief Returning Officer holds elections for EAA executives according to the timeline outlined in appendix L

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Chief Returning Officer merges this election with the officer when writing his transition report

Kirk: In the past, EAA had elections the same time as EngSoc officers except last year. We do this to aid in our transition. After elections we have our AGM, and S-dance serves as a formal transition. It’s easy for us to coordinate. I don’t see this being too much of an issue. It was adjusted in our bylaws in 2013 but failed to be put in EngSoc bylaws. I want to put this forward to allow us to do our EAA elections in March.



**Raffi seconds**

**Kevin amends: correct 2b and 5 in Appendix L.**

**No objections.**

**Amendment passes.**

Raffi: Should we look into having PSC make a formal bylaw amendment?

Ernesto: EAA is an Ex-officio. I don't think we need to put their elections in ours. Maybe put it in your transition report. I think current motion should be fine.

Milan: Does EAA have its own constitution?

Kirk: Yes.

**No objections or abstentions.**

**Motion carries.**

**13. MOTION by Rachel Reding to increase the Engineering Society fee to account for cost of living**

**WHEREAS** the Society's constitution and mandate allow for the membership fee to increase without referendum to reflect an increase in the cost-of-living, as determined by Government of Canada; and

**WHEREAS** the Government of Canada has set the Consumer Price Index increase at ~~±~~ 1.7% for 2015

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Engineering Society requests that the University of Toronto increase the membership fee levied on its members by ~~±~~ 1.7%, effective beginning in the Fall 2016 session, pending Governing Council approval.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Policy and Structures Committee look into editing Bylaw 1, section 1.2.

*Aidan leaves at 3:32 PM to throw up.*

Rachel: Usually VP Finance does this every year to increase fees by a percentage that reflects the CPI.

**Milan seconds.**



Ernesto: Looking through the memo from the Vice Provost, it has a table of what cost of living we may seek and it says 1.7%. Do we want to go with 1.7% or 1.6%?

**Ernesto amends 1.6% to 1.7%.**

**Milan seconds.**

Milan: The bylaws say that can increase by percentage approved by Governing Council.

Ernesto: The document is coming from the Vice Provost, not necessarily Governing Council. It's safe to say we're good.

Milan: What does Governing Council say?

Raffi: Is this motion out of order? because it's contrary to our bylaws?

*Aidan returns at 3:37 PM.*

Ernesto: I don't think there's a Governing Council number. Who will approve this increase is Governing Council. We'll submit this request and they will approve it. Governing Council is telling us through the Vice Provost that the maximum is 1.7%.

Saarthak: Just because we can increase it to 1.7%, I don't think that means we should increase it. Our tuition increases; just because they can increase it doesn't mean we should.

Milan: In this case, 1.6% is arbitrary, 1.7% is given by the Vice Provost.

Ernesto: Both come from the CPI.

Saarthak: We're trying to decide which one makes more sense.

Milan: Nothing we decide is going to be effective until Fall 2016. I think it's clear we are going to be compliant and Governing Council is going to vet anything we approve.

Ben L.: The .1% difference will result in \$0.05 difference per student.

**Rob, Amy, and Twesh are opposed. Milan and Aidan abstain.  
Everyone else in favour.**

**Amendment carries.**



**Raffi amends the BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED clause: add “pending governing council approval.”**

**Milan seconds.**

Ernesto: To get a fee increase, we have to submit a request to the Vice Provost, then to Affairs Board. I think we should amend Bylaw 1 wording. Last year Mehran did same thing.

**No objections.**

**Amendment carries.**

**Raffi amends: BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Policy and Structures Committee look into editing Bylaw 1, section 1.2.**

**Milan seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Amendment carries.**

**Ernesto moves to call the question.**

**Amy seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Question called.**

**Ogi abstains. Everyone else in favour.**

**Motion carries.**

**14. MOTION by Rachel Reding to approve Levy Fund allocations**

**WHEREAS** the undergraduate student levy voted three years ago to establish a levy fund whose purpose is to improve the undergraduate student experience; and

**WHEREAS** the Finance Committee believes these projects will improve the academic and extra-curricular experience of the student body and help our facilities to grow and develop; and

**WHEREAS** additional documentation and individual applications will be hosted



online; and

**WHEREAS** the Vice-President Finance is now in the process of contacting departments to ensure these projects have not already been funded;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Engineering Society Board of Directors approves the disbursement of funds as indicated in Appendix M;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Vice-President Finance may lower any disbursement should the costs of the projects have fallen throughout this process.

Rachel: I also sent the recommendations to Discipline Club chairs. They want it to be more fair with equal amount of money to disciplines. We changed it this year where the projects have to be available outside of school hours so it's hard to say if it will be open to clubs. The student space project we rejected because we followed up with Steve. He wanted to add desks and chairs around area looking into pit. We had visibility issues and safety issues. The desks are close to an open areas, we don't want people thinking they can stand on the table or chair.

**Apurv seconds.**

Apurv: I saw a lot of repeated requests, I was thinking why don't we combine these proposals into one? A lot of these projects for BME and MIE are not going to be at the same time.

Rachel: I'm not sure if that's logistically possible because they are different disciplines.

Ernesto: I think each proposal on its own justifies the need for students. I can foresee 3d printing being in demand, in courses such as ESP and Praxis.

Rachel: I think one of the big differences between EngSci and MIE printers is that the BME one is much lower quality and a lot cheaper. I think they're for different purposes. Access to 3d printers for us was quite low.

Milan: Not every student has access to everywhere at one point of time, we want to make it available outside of class hours. For example I can't get into MC outside of class hours. Having uses for different Disciplines is valid.

**Sourabh amends to strike item 26 SW Defined Radio Kits in Appendix M and transfer funds to Control Systems.**

**Ben L. seconds.**

Amy: Why do we want to strike it?



Sourabh: The number says 119, the life span is 1 year and given the cost \$3600, I didn't think it was proportional.

Amy: Will you allocate that money?

Sourabh: Yes.

Andrew: How?

Sourabh: ECE has another big project for Control Systems. We could add more to that.

**No objections. Chris abstains.**

**Amendment carries.**

**No objections. Kevin abstains.**

**Motion carries.**

**15. MOTION by Rachel Reding to approve the changes to the Operating Budget of the Engineering Society.**

**WHEREAS** it is prudent to update the budget throughout the year based on actual expenditures and changing circumstances; and

**WHEREAS** there is \$5000 leftover in the club funding pool that will not be allocated otherwise; and

**WHEREAS** the Finance Committee has had several conference funding applications in the 2015-2016 academic year;

~~**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** \$5000 be moved from the club funding pool to conference funding~~

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** \$2500 be moved from the club funding pool to conference funding and \$2000 be moved from the club funding pool to Gradball

Rachel: We had \$5 000 leftover. If we don't allocate it somewhere else it'll just sit there. Conference funding is used a lot this year. The Finance Committee decided this would be a great place to put that \$5000. I want to change the amount to \$4 500. We received an appeal from a club that missed the deadline due to other circumstances. I want to have enough money in case their appeal goes through.

**Rob seconds.**



Milan: Are there still going to be conferences to warrant this much conference funding? If not conference funding what other options do you have for this money?

Rachel: They can still retroactively file for conference funding. There is still a possibility that there will be conferences. I had 2 inquiries in last week. There are other options. I don't recommend leaving it in club funding. We could put it anywhere else in the operating budget, such as directors. I don't recommend doing this because we gave them a lot of money. We could put it towards the endowment fund and invest it, or special projects, but that fund already has a lot of money yet to be used.

Kevin: I don't want this to set a precedent going forward. Normally conference funding is \$5000 and the UTSU gave us another \$10000. That budget has quadrupled and it's been used well. Is quadrupling the best use of that amount?

Rachel: There have been discussions of whether conference funding is something we should be providing. I've seen people attend a lot of great conferences in the past. I think we should still give them a way to attend those things. If people don't agree, we could give it to something else.

Rob: The max amount a club can request is \$2000.

Kevin: Is it only for clubs or teams?

Rob: I believe students can apply for conference funding as well.

Kevin: It's a lot of people that can take advantage of the conference funding. What if all \$5000 is not used?

Rachel: We'll be in a similar situation if we left it in club funding

Milan: Putting this much money into conference funding is not the best place to use it. Some of the other options sound best to use it.

Ernesto: Why don't we split it?

**Ernesto moves for a 5 minutes recess (4:10 PM)**

**Recess ends (4:19 PM)**

Rachel: We had two special project requests this month and one for March. The total is \$7000. We have \$26500 left. I expect we will have more in March. we





have a conference funding application from NSBE for \$2000, and we have \$5000 left. We should put some of it in conference funding.

Ernesto: we might have a loss for Gradball. If I remember correctly we're looking at a \$1000 - \$2000 lost.

Rachel: I think that's a good point, but I want to be careful because I don't want to have a bailout mentality. She's been too fluid and too loose with the budget. I don't know if \$1000 - \$2000 loss is real.

Ernesto: I agree with that mentality. For now, I think it's prudent that we plan for contingency. I suggest splitting it to \$2000 for Gradball and \$2500 for conference funding. I don't think special projects need more money.

**Ernesto amends:**

**WHEREAS there is \$4500 leftover in the club funding pool that will not be allocated otherwise; and**

....

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT \$2500 be moved from the club funding pool to conference funding and \$2000 be moved from the club funding pool to Gradball**

**Kevin seconds.**

Milan: Does it make more sense to put \$2000 in the Project Director pool? This does feel like a bailout, other Project Directors are losing money this year.

Rob: I say hold off on giving Gradball \$2000.

Ernesto: If Gradball loses money, we have to pay. In this case, we're amending the budget so that it reflects we're allocating an extra \$2000 to Gradball. There's no line for general Project Directors. If the Board is not comfortable with that, we can leave it in the club funding pool.

Milan: I think we shouldn't leave it where it is. Is \$2000 to Gradball the most pertinent use?

Rachel: I'm trying to work to get Hi-Skule a bit more money. They asked for another \$600. On the Director level, everyone else is under-spending.

Kevin: The concerns are valid about allocating to Gradball, we're just reflecting on the budget on what we know now.

**No objections. No abstentions.**



**Amendment carries.**

**No objections. No abstentions.**

**Motion carries.**

**16. MOTION by Liz White and Trevor Gauthier to reinstate the National Engineering Month Director**

**WHEREAS** this position existed in the past; and

**WHEREAS** the duties thereof were given to B&G this year; and

**WHEREAS** B&G cannot sustain the responsibilities of this position on top of their current portfolio

~~**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the following is added to Chapter 1 of Bylaw 2 the Directors Bylaw and the subsequent lines be re-numbered accordingly.~~

- ~~1.23 National Engineering Month (NEM) Director~~
- ~~1.23.1 There shall be a National Engineering Month Director, who shall be responsible for:~~
  - ~~a) Organizing NEM events in collaboration with other directorships and the ESSCO NEM director; and~~
  - ~~b) Coordinating the construction of a badass Rube Goldberg machine that is better than that of all other ESSCO schools for the NEM CN tower lighting;~~
- ~~1.23.2 The National Engineering Month Director shall be overseen by the Vice-President of Student Life.~~

~~**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the National Engineering Month Director becomes a project directorship immediately to be elected with the 2016 round of Project Director Elections.~~

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Policy and Structures Committee consider matters on external relations with a recommendation to be returned to the Board at the April Board Meeting.

Liz: We're changing it to create a director. In the past it was a committee under VP External. Blue and Gold took on the rube goldberg project. ESSCO was looking for several projects throughout the month. We reached out to other Directors. I don't think Blue and Gold should take on task of building the rube goldberg machine. Professional Outreach was holding a competition and they had to go through us and ESSCO for funding. This one Director can collect all those resources and grow National Engineering Month in UofT.



**Ogi seconds.**

Rob: What were some of the other events?

Liz: An event in March targeted to middle and high school students. Hi-Skule holds Designapalooza.

Ernesto: Would this person do any work in the summer or fall?

Liz: As far as I know, the deliverable dates are in March. Depending on who takes over this position, they can do whatever they want with this e.g. hold a competition for NEM.

Kevin: It is a very particular point in time. almost all other Directors have work throughout the year. I realize you were given shorter notice. If it's known that it's part of the portfolio, I don't think that Blue and Gold would be an inappropriate group to lead NEM.

Liz: I don't think Blue and Gold can take on the entirety of NEM. Something I talked about with Reena was the Gradball Director and Cannonball. They're delivering one thing in one day. Depending on what you do, all these events are in March. The period before then, you can do whatever you want to do.

Milan: It feels that the scope is small. What comes to mind is Blue and Gold is using Project Managers. Is that feasible? Would it make sense for Blue and Gold to instate Project Managers for these things? We're the running risk of expanding Council to be too big. Maybe if we expand the role to do more things throughout the year.

Liz: I put in this motion so that there's someone to take on NEM. I can't guarantee that Blue and Gold will take this on. If there's another way to take on the responsibilities ESSCO is asking, that's fine with us.

Peter: We talked about someone doing external things for us.

Liz: At a lot of other schools, it falls under VP External. Someone who takes on that capacity would be ideal. We didn't get through the responsibilities for NEM.

Peter: Can we make VP External a Director?

Billy: Three years ago we had an External Projects Director, but that was cut because we cut affiliation with ESSCO. Now we have affiliation and they can take on NEM and any other external stuff.

John: It seems strange to have a Director for something that is not a large task.



Kevin: I disagree. I know we're affiliating Blue and Gold with it because they took it on, but what that position should be is engaging different groups like Hi-Skule, etc. I don't think it should be necessarily Blue and Gold. I disagree to make a Director. Do we have any obligations to ESSCO?

Billy: The only thing is to bid for OEC every five years.

Kevin: It's good to do it, but it seems we don't have the infrastructure.

Liz: Doing the rube goldberg machine is a good way to connect to other schools. For other schools we don't see often, we don't have channels of communications and we'd like to connect with them. Also it's a good avenue to get funding. Professional Outreach was reaching out to ESSCO and NEM to get funding. Hi-Skule got funding from NEM.

Kevin: I think it highlights a more fundamental thing when we axed VP External. If we do want to develop those sort of things again, maybe we do have to bring back VP External. I'm not too sure what to do.

Aidan: We do need to revisit external relations. If there's a directorship responsible for NEM, they're responsible for external relations. I think a gap that was needed was someone to oversee overarching NEM events.

Milan: We're trying to get in touch with Waterloo, but we don't know how. We could potentially have an external director.

Saarthak: If there is no Board meeting from now until JCM, if we're considering an external Project Director, sooner is better than later. Other campuses and colleges have been doing more inter-collaborating work.

Billy: It looks like we have three options: Do nothing and fail the motion; Pass the motion as it is, create an NEM director; Amend the motion to create an External Relations Director to handle NEM and other external things.

Oghosa: The problem is what this year's process was. Ernesto was contacted by ESSCO. He forwarded it to Blue and Gold and they took it on. It's going to be the role of president who sees all this information. Given Blue and Gold took it this year, next year can be same process where President asks if they want to take it on. Leaving as it is may be a good option.

Ben L.: If go with option 3, do we have to create it now?

Billy: We could create a permanent position and vote the person in at a Board meeting.

Rob: Why was VP External abolished? Is it an option to bring it back?



Billy: When we were affiliated with ESSCO and CFES, it was deemed that we needed a VP at that role to communicate EngSoc's core motivations. We unfederated with them in Rishi's and Mauricio's year. It does not warrant an officer position at this time.

Kevin: What Directors would be under VP External?

Ernesto: SCOrE.

Ben L.: Hi-Skule, NEM.

Ernesto: I think real question is: what is the role of external relations and what was the value added of participating with ESSCO and CFES? From being with ESSCO for a year, most of what I've gotten are invitations to conferences, agendas to meetings. If we wanted option 3, I don't know if we can do with that today. We need to think about what we want out of our relationship with ESSCO. Technically my job is to do external relationships. It's tricky where a director should do this type of liaising. We should define what this person would do. With respect to this motion, I like the idea of an NEM director. Having positions does not cost the Society. Sometimes it is a struggle to have people run for positions. I'm not against creating it, but I question if people will run.

Milan: I don't think this should be a role at an executive level. I'm not a fan of implementing directorships for the sake of blanket solutions. I'm hesitant to keep doing that. I want to take a look at it more closely.

Raffi: I think this motion is out of the scope of the Board and Officer team. I think this motion addresses a bigger issue about EngSoc's external relations, which should be answered by the next Officer team and Board.

Kevin: I was in favour of option 1, but I think the extension of option 1 is the President looking at groups we have. I'm not suggesting that the President should coordinate details of the event, but it might make more sense instead of Blue and Gold, but something under the President's portfolio. It gives them the responsibility of delegating to different groups for NEM.

Ernesto: I propose that we do not create a position now. We refer this to the Policy and Structures Committee with a clear question of what we're trying to answer: what's the benefit of external relations and how to maximize it. As a liaison, you're receiving information from external parties. For example, QESCO is reviewing how ethics in engineering curriculum is being taught. It's a good level of academic advocacy beyond the Faculty. Leveraging connections with ESSCO could be doing a type of academic advocacy. I see this person as a facilitator. I don't think the President could do it all.



**Milan moves to suspend Robert's Rules.**

**Peter opposed.**

**Motion carries.**

Milan: Do we need next year's Board to have this? I think Raffi's point makes sense. We could have PSC look at this.

John: Can we mandate the next Board to discuss this?

Saarthak: You are elected until April. It has come up now, it is your job to deal with it. In April, you will have the chance to choose a person.

Ernesto: We always make decisions about the future.

Raffi: There's an option to cancel it if mandate to have an election in April

Ernesto: They cannot ratify the election and amend to change the bylaw.

Milan: I don't think it's that controversial

Raffi: It's a blanket solution for a bigger problem.

Milan: PSC is not delivering a decision, but a framework. They can look at what students think about external relations.

Ernesto: PSC will sit down, answer the question, and bring it to the March meeting. It's hard to draw the line and say we only make decisions for this year. If the next Board is against it, they can get rid of it. If we can find a solution, implement it. If not, we can ignore it.

Milan: We have to consider the level of this position in EngSoc.

Ernesto: That's what PSC will work on.

Milan: PSC can look into what this role would do, but we should not decide if we need an external relations director.

Oghosa: I think PSC should look at idea of external relations, and outline what the points are for that topic. PSC can review role of external relations.

Raffi: There needs to be a major discussion on whether the new Officer team or new Board wants to pursue external relations. This Board has taken small steps against Rishi's and Mauricio's vision.



Ernesto: I would like to find a proposal for this. The whole of understanding of what it entails. The first step is scoping.

Kevin: I'm not comfortable of absolving that responsibility. The size of the discussion is not proportional to magnitude of it.

Milan: PSC could look into the bylaws and see where external relations fit and produce a report.

Kevin: I don't think one month is enough time.

Ernesto: I don't think the idea about small committees is valid. Decisions are made from small committees e.g. Faculty Council. I want to push PSC to find a solution.

Rob: If PSC were to discuss this, we should mandate that the Officer team sits in on this.

Ernesto: Should PSC bring a report by April?

*Robert's Rules Resume*

**Milan amends to strike creating a new position and add:**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Policy and Structures Committee consider matters on external relations with a recommendation to be returned to the Board at the April Board Meeting.**

**Rob seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Amendment carries.**

**Milan moves to call the question.**

**Rob seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Question called.**

**No objections. No abstentions.**

**Motion carries.**



17. **MOTION by Christopher Choquette to allow posters in the 2016 elections**

**WHEREAS** currently campaigners are not allowed to use any posters or banners and amending the election rules would make a more controlled system for the elections committee to monitor.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the official 2016 Election Rules, 1.34 and 2.33, which currently read:

- a) Posters are not permitted

Be amended to read:

- a) Posters are limited to one (1) with outside dimensions 8.5" by 11"
- b) Posters shall follow University of Toronto guidelines for displayed advertisements. Inquire at the Society office for more information.
- c) Posters shall be stamped by the CRO; posters that are not stamped shall be removed immediately.
- d) ~~Campaigns shall not leave posters for longer than one week after the election or referendum; else each poster will be fined \$1/0.65m<sup>2</sup> each day.~~
- e) The poster shall be placed in a designated area outside of the Engineering Society's office

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the CRO set up a designated area for posters outside the Engineering Society office

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the table of contents, section 1 be amended to read "Officers and Board of Directors"

**Ogi seconds.**

Chris: Allowing posters is vital for candidates to express thoughts and ideas. Allowing posters in a single area allows for that expression and control of those posters. Some people don't use Facebook very much. I had a lot of trouble connecting with people because they don't use Facebook.

Saarthak: Should we put rules in the wording? If it's to be stamped by the CRO, the CRO has to stamp them. If posters are put up elsewhere, it would be dealt with. If something of putting up posters incorrectly, there should be consequences. There's work needed on wording.

Ernesto: Ryan says it doesn't make sense to allow posters for Board election if we don't allow them for Officers. The reason we took them out was sustainability





concerns. For an election of five positions, it looks foolish to allow them for thirteen positions. I vote against this if it's not fixed for Officers.

Milan: On sustainability, if it's not being used it's left there. I think it makes sense. There's not much engagement on Facebook. There is benefit in posters. Putting it in one area is a happy medium.

John: What elections would this apply to?

Billy: As proposed, both chapters.

Kevin: I don't think it's a concern if you have one poster in one area. If they're posting wherever they want, they'll print 200. At my work, there's memos emailed but a printed copy posted in one area. A lot of info is disseminated by people reading these bulletin boards. With Facebook campaigning, they can edit things, but posters are static. I'm not sure how that goes.

*Aidan leaves at 5:24PM.*

Rob: Is there any merit to make this a central board?

Reena: There are bulletin boards around Skule, but they haven't been updated since Maegan's year.

Chris: I do see consequences of this motion. I expected the consequences to be same as the 2015 elections. With respect to sustainability, I didn't see that being an issue since they're printing one page. To taking it done, they should be able to take down one page.

Raffi: Initially I was against this motion, but it does make sense. I think there's a outstanding clause in the rules. Consequences would follow the standard procedure. Where would we put these posters? Do we decide as whole or do I decide?

Chris: Originally I said to put a bulletin board outside the Pit. I could see it be anywhere in SF.

Sourabh: The sustainability issue is not really an issue. We could have a plasma.

Ernesto: In the election rules, we merged Officer and Board elections. The table of contents in the election rules has a mistake.

**Ernesto amends: BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the table of contents, section 1 be amended to read "Officers and Board of Directors"**



**Raffi seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Amendment carries.**

Ogi: Instead of fining people, we should encourage them.

Billy: That's for breaking the rules.

**Kevin amends to strike d)**

**Raffi seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Amendment carries.**

**Kevin moves to call the question.**

**No objections.**

**Question called.**

**Ryan, Ernesto, Amy, and John are opposed. Jason abstains. Everyone else in favour.**

**Motion carries.**

**18. MOTION by Madeleine Santia to accept the affiliation of new clubs within the Engineering Society**

**WHEREAS** the Policy on Club Affiliation requires that Trial Status clubs within the Engineering Society apply and for Full Status Engineering Club designation after a 4 month period; and

**WHEREAS** this round of Trial to Full Status club affiliation was advertised to all Trial Status clubs; and

**WHEREAS** all applications were reviewed by the Affiliation Committee to determine eligibility and merit with respect to the Policy; and

**WHEREAS** only Trial to Full Status student clubs recommended for affiliation require approval from the Board of Directors to receive official Engineering Club Status;



**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the recommendations provided in the latest revision of the Club Affiliation Report, February 2016 as presented in Appendix N be adopted.

**Rob seconds.**

John: I wasn't at this meeting. It's not anything controversial. One club is going into trail affiliation, some going into full. A bunch are getting renewed.

Ernesto: I recommend that in the future the appendices have justification of why clubs get full status.

Milan: We can give an idea of what these clubs do.

John: The Stem Cell Club is going into trial.

**Milan moves to call the question.**

**Kevin seconds.**

**Amy is opposed.**

**Question called.**

**Amy and Ogi abstain. No objections. Everyone else in favour.**

**Motion carries.**

**19. SPECIAL MOTION by Reena Cabanilla to amend Bylaw 1, the Constitution**

**WHEREAS** a motion was passed in December that allows Board Members to use audio conferencing to be counted as present; and

**WHEREAS** the specific phrasing of the bylaw was referred to the Policy and Structures Committee;

**WHEREAS** the Policy and Structures Committee has reviewed and revised Chapter 4 of Bylaw 1

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the revised version of Bylaw 1 as presented in Appendix O be adopted.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Policy and Structures Committee look into an automatic recall procedure for Discipline switching.



---

**John seconds**

Amy: If I remember correctly, we had some discussion that we wanted some way to stop people from always teleconferencing in. Was that considered?

Billy: As it stands no. It may be more comfortable putting this in a policy. Do we want PCS to consider this?

Raffi: Over the summer?

Ernesto: Maybe for the next PSC. I would have liked that PSC to address that you can run for position in a discipline you're not in.

Raffi: It's in bylaw 3.

Twesh: Members who are teleconferencing today, are they present?

Billy: Yes.

Ernesto: Bylaw 3 says you have to be in the discipline, no where it says that you have to stay in the discipline. Bylaw 3 only applies for the election. That being said, that should be a change when we look into transitioning into ONCA.

Raffi: Maybe we should have an automatic recall?

Kevin: In Bylaw 1, section 4.12, can we add on to it?

**Ernesto amends to add to the recommendation:**

**4.1.2. Each of the 9 Discipline Representatives must be enrolled in the Disciplines they're representing.**

**a. If a member ceases to be in the Discipline they're representing, then they will be automatically recalled.**

**All opposed.**

**Amendment fails.**

**Raffi amends: BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Policy and Structures Committee look into an automatic recall procedure for Discipline switching.**

**Peter seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Amendment carries.**



**Milan moves to call the question.**

**Kevin seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Question called.**

**No objections.**

**Amy and Victoria abstain. No objections. Everyone else in favour.**

**Motion carries.**

**20. SPECIAL MOTION by Reena Cabanilla to amend Bylaw 7, the Discipline Club Bylaw**

**WHEREAS** the following resolution was passed in December:

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Policy and Structures Committee meet to discuss and define the roles of Class Representatives and these findings be reported at the February Board Meeting.

**WHEREAS** the Policy and Structures Committee has discussed the role of Class Representatives and how to define it

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the revised version of Bylaw 7 as presented in Appendix P be adopted.

**Reena amends Appendix P:**

**4.0.1.b. If the Class Representative is unable to attend a Faculty Council meeting, he shall send regrets to the VP Academic.**

**c. A Class Representative shall be immediately recalled upon:**

**i. Absence without regrets from one Faculty Council meeting**

**ii. Absence from all Faculty Council meetings in one semester**

**Amy seconds.**

Ben L.: Because there are 2 Faculty Council meetings in a semester, and typically at 12-2PM on a weekday. Suppose they have class, would they recall them?

Billy: A student who knows they won't be able to represent their class won't be able to run for this position.



Ben L.: They could still be doing a fantastic job for their class.

Milan: While we can put onus on students to represent their constituency, we can't go out of the way to say they miss class. At the same time, that could be resolved with a "at the discretion of VP Academic". They're supposed to represent the constituency, but there's an issue of forcing students not to focus on studies.

Ernesto: Going to Faculty Council is one thing that EngSoc needs. If they're not going to Faculty Council, in my eyes you're not going for EngSoc. Why are Class Representatives our Faculty Council Reps? It is because the Faculty Council bylaws state they need a representative from each year and discipline. The only elected representatives from each year and discipline are Class Reps. If they are not complying with this, they are not complying with role. If you apply for this position, you need to know that you're going once. It's not a big requirement. If we don't pass this, we're not getting Class Reps to go to Faculty Council.

Kevin: They can't be forced into it. You do get lunch at Faculty Council.

Milan: My concern is not so much the class aspect, but anything that students could have that could be mandatory or extraneous circumstances e.g. emergencies. Something I wanted to add was at the discretion of VP Academic.

Twesh: Is there a pressing reason why Faculty Council meetings are during school day?

Billy: It's because it's during the work day and professors don't give a shit about students.

Twesh: I understand the work day, but what about Dean's Town Hall? It's about academic representation, and I couldn't go to that because I had class. I think a professor could stay late one day if it's so infrequent. Students pay a lot of money to go to class. We don't want to push away people who are prioritizing academics. Could we talk to the Faculty to make it easier for students to attend them?

Billy: That is not gonna happen.

Ernesto: We need 32 Class Reps there if we want that to happen. Faculty Council is made up of 200 people. We need the numbers to get something like this.

Raffi: What if someone has extraneous circumstances. What would we do? The way it's amended is automatic recall. What I think will happen is the Board should take into consideration what happened, and any reasonable Board would vote that down.



**Billy calls the question.**

**Amy abstains. No objections.**

**Amendment carries.**

**Raffi amends the recommendation:**

**c. Class reps shall be moved to be recalled at subsequent a meeting of the Board upon:**

**Milan seconds.**

Ernesto: We will most likely get every Class Rep to come to at least one Faculty Council meeting. The only other solution is force them to go to all of them.

Kevin: I was wondering about word “immediately”.

Raffi: We can change it with everyone attending, and motion to have proxies.

Oghosa: A maximum of 40 members attend.

**No objections. Amy abstains.**

**Amendment carries.**

Reena: What about recalling if they don’t fulfill Discipline Club duties?

Milan: There are already provisions for people to bring to the Board to recall elected members.

Ben L.: We need to make it clear.

Ernesto: With this amendment, the only thing we need is Faculty Council from EngSoc. If you get recalled, you can’t get an award. If the Discipline Club still considers you a Class Rep, in their eyes you are the Class Rep. We can’t know all the circumstances.

Milan: We should not be promoting the culture of X responsibilities for Discipline Club and Y for EngSoc, but this responsibility for my constituency.

Ben L.: I foresee greater descent towards EngSoc because we are now enforcing this type of role.

Milan: I think we need to sit down with Discipline Clubs and see what amendments they want to make. We can pass this now and continue the discussion.



**Ben L. opposed. Kevin, Andrew and Amy abstain. Everyone else in favour.**

**Motion carries.**

**21. MOTION by Ernesto Diaz Lozano to amend Policy\_2002-08-03**

**WHEREAS** Policy\_2002-08-03 lists the Joe Club Award in section 2.1, and

**WHEREAS** the Joe Club Award does not have a description in Appendix A, and

**WHEREAS** the Awards Committee cannot award the Joe Club Award if there is no description, and as such it has not been included yet in the nomination form for awards

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the following description be added to Policy\_2002-08-03 Appendix A, and also added immediately to the nomination form for the current Awards Cycle:

**Joe Club Award**

Awarded annually to one graduating individual who has demonstrated commitment and dedication to their respective discipline club over the course of their years at Skule

**Reena seconds.**

Ernesto: The Joe Club award is listed in the policy, but there's no description. We didn't put it in the nomination form. I went back and the original intent is in the motion. I want to amend that so I can put it in the nomination form.

Billy: Isn't it for smaller clubs?

Ernesto: I found it on Skulepedia.

**Milan moves to call the question.**

**No objections.**

**Question called.**

**Chris and Twesh abstain. No objections.**

**Motion carries.**





**22. DISCUSSION ITEM** on scheduling March and April meetings and the JCM

Billy: Generally they run post JCM, and the JCM happens to be at the beginning of April.

Raffi: Why not have two meetings in April?

Ernesto: From a logistical perspective, I don't see a problem. March will be packed. April is the month of transition. Not a lot will happen between beginning of April and May. There was no need to have a Board meeting at the end of April. I'm more comfortable with having a meeting at the end of March, then after the JCM in April.

Milan: There's potentially March 26, and April 2 or 9.

Ernesto: We gave people until March 11 to fill out the doodle for the JCM.

**Billy: There will be an end of March Board Meeting, tentatively on March 26, then an April Post-JCM Meeting. The JCM on the 2nd or 9th.**

Billy: We could call a meeting at the end of April if need be.

**23. DISCUSSION ITEM** on the Policy on Open, Accessible and Democratic Autonomous Student Organizations

Ernesto: I started a conversation via email.

**24. OTHER BUSINESS**

**John moves to adjourn.**

**Rob seconds.**

**Oghosa opposed.**

**25. ADJOURNMENT (6:35 PM)**



## Attendance

<b>Officers</b>		
President	Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patino	
VP Finance	Rachel Reding	T
VP Communication	Reena Cabanilla	
VP Academic	Oghosa Igbinakenzua	
VP Student Life	Madeleine Santia	
<b>Directors of the Board</b>		
At-Large	Kevin Rupasinghe	
At-Large	Ryan Gomes	AwR
At-Large	Aidan Solala	
At-Large	John Sweeney	
Chemical Representative	Jason Tang	
Civil Representative	Peter Luo	
Computer Representative	Milan Maljkovic	
Electrical Representative	Andrew Boetto	
Engineering Science Representative	Apurv Bharadwaj	
Industrial Representative	Benjamin Leung	
Materials Science Representative	Amy Zhao	
Mechanical Representative	Robert Goldberg	
Mineral Representative	Ognjen Kelec	
First Year	Victoria Cheng	
First Year	Christopher Choquette	
First Year	Twesh Upadhyaya	T
UTSU Representative	Benjamin Coleman	A
Speaker (Non-Voting)	Billy Graydon	
<b>Members of the Society (Non-Voting)</b>		
EAA VP Admin	Kirk Regan	
EAA President	Andrew Mwangi	
Chief Returning Officer	Raffi Dergalstianian	
Blue and Gold Chair	Liz White	
Engineering Society Member	Saarthak Saxena	
UofT Baja Team Exec	Anthony Nassif	

**A – Absent; AwR – Absent with Regrets; P – Proxy; T – present via telecom**