



July 2016 Board of Directors Meeting

Meeting called to order at 4:11 PM.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Seconded by Samantha.

Motion carried. Agenda approved.

2. Approval of June 2016 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Seconded by Colin.

Motion carried. Minutes approved.

3. Business Arising from Minutes

Andrew: There was a budgetary matter regarding the CFES from the last meeting.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to postpone the following motion indefinitely:

“MOTION by Andrew Boetto to re-affiliate the University of Toronto Engineering Society to the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (CFES)

WHEREAS the affiliation requires a \$1850 payment to the CFES; and

WHEREAS the affiliation will enable the University of Toronto Engineering Society to send students to the Canadian Engineering Competitions (CEC) on behalf of University of Toronto; and

WHEREAS The CFES aims to provide bilingual opportunities in support of an all-encompassing education for engineering students in Canada to become unparalleled professionals in their field;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Engineering Society allocates \$1850 for CFES in the 2016-2017 Engineering Society Budget to pay CFES such that the Engineering Society is affiliated with the CFES”

Seconded by Colin.

Milan: Andrew and I looked into it. Like we spoke about earlier, we see no benefit except maybe sending a few people to the Canadian Engineering Competition. We can come back to this when we have a better idea of what benefits exist.

Ryan G.: Is there a deadline?

Milan: We passed it. That hasn't mattered in the past though.

Saarthak: I've done some research. I don't see the benefit of working with this either.

No objections or abstentions.

Motion carried. Main motion postponed.

4. Officer Reports

a. President: Milan Maljkovic

July 17, 2016

GB202

Mark: What is the objective of getting the Engineering Career Center budget?

Milan: To ensure transparency and accountability. We don't know where the money is going to right now.

b. VP Finance: Andrew Boetto

VP Finance was absent.

Raneem: The finance committee reviewed project director budgets in detail.

c. VP Communications: Colin Parker

Ryan W.: Who is printing the Frosh Handbook?

Colin: All Solutions Printing.

Kevin: Is there a plan to consolidate booking material?

Colin: I want to consolidate it on skule.ca if I can, since that is where people should be able to go for all EngSoc material. If Google Forms doesn't work, we'll try something else on skule.ca or try a separate booking website similar to engcom.skule.ca but improved.

d. VP Academic: Samantha Stuart

Billy entered.

Gomes: Do you think that the end-of-September deadline for class representatives looking at course feedback might be too early? Many students will not have had midterms yet.

Samantha: That is not the only deadline. Class representatives are able to submit reports at any time.

Mark: If there is a red flag early for a course how do you address it?

Sam: The academic director and class representatives process the feedback and present instructors with actionable results.

Mark: Is there any way to keep the instructor accountable?

Samantha: The feedback is continuous so we can see if it is having an impact.

Peter: I think this debate should focus on how much power we have to hold instructors accountable rather than give feedback which they might not use.

Samantha: I agree, but we can't address everything at once. I think that starting something like this will give us some power and information to hold instructors accountable by getting student engaged and gathering information.

Saarthak left.

e. VP Student Life: Raneem Shammass

Twesh entered.

Saarthak entered.

Billy: EngSoc has a history of discarding websites. Do you think this could happen to the ones you are proposing?

Raneem: For Mental Wellness, the director will care for it going forward so we need to set a strong groundwork. For feedback.skule.ca I will talk to the Ombudsman.

5. MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to elect an Alumni Outreach Director for 1T6-1T7 Skule Year

July 17, 2016

GB202

Seconded by Colin.

No objections or abstentions. Motion carried.

MOTION by Peter Singh to have 4 minutes to speak prior to the election instead of 2

Seconded by Mark.

Ryan G.: It must be 2 minutes according to the bylaws.

Eric Bryce ruled the motion out of order.

Each candidate gave a 2 minute speech, followed by a question period. The candidates were asked to leave the room for discussion among voters. Details were not recorded in order to preserve the anonymity of votes and for brevity.

Edwin was elected.

6. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to approve changes to the Engineering Society Budget for the 2016-2017 year;

WHEREAS current allocations for Project Directors and Ex-Officio Directors in the Engineering Society Budget for the 2016-2017 year had not yet been reviewed by the Finance Committee;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the 2016-2017 Operating Budget of the Engineering Society be amended to reflect the approved amounts outlined in the June Finance Committee Meeting minutes.

Seconded by Colin.

Raneem: Project Director budgets weren't finalized when the main budget was submitted, so we've reviewed them and update the budget.

Kevin: It shouldn't be acceptable for budgets to be set at non-zero.

Aron: The budget for Suds was set with a 5% contingency, but we projected for zero profit.

Billy: Why does the Ombudsman need so much?

Maheyer: The last Ombudsman's budget was approved in January. He dedicated most of his budget for food for the census, and he recommended that the food budget would double. We also budgeted for a substantial cost in perforated paper for Orientation but that could be cut if we don't have room in the budget.

Ryan W.: Can the Mental Wellness Directorship still be able to function as intended with their cut budget?

Raneem: Yes. We can cut the handbook length in half, and may not publish it at all. We also discussed cutting down costs of events.

No objections or abstentions.

Motion carried.

7. MOTION by Raneem Shammass to accept the affiliation of new clubs within the Engineering Society

WHEREAS the Policy on Club Affiliation (the Policy) requires that affiliated clubs within the Engineering Society apply and reapply for Engineering Club Status on an annual basis; and

WHEREAS this year's club affiliation process was advertised to all students, including clubs affiliated in the previous year; and

WHEREAS all applications were reviewed by the Affiliations Committee to determine eligibility and merit in accordance with the Policy; and

July 17, 2016
GB202

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

BE IT RESOLVED that the recommendations in the latest revision of the Club Affiliation Report, June 2016 be adopted.

Seconded by Samantha.

Raneem: There are 35 new clubs. The selection was approved by the Club Affiliations Committee.

Billy: It seems like most clubs were denied because of procedural issues. Is that the case for all denied clubs?

Raneem: Many clubs asked to delay their affiliation. Several clubs gave us member lists where alumni students were counted to reach the number for requirement.

No objections or abstentions.

Motion carried.

8. MOTION by Colin Parker to amend Bylaw 1 to include a procedure by which Engineering Society Board of Directors members may proxy votes

WHEREAS there is no procedure recorded in the Bylaws or Policies for proxying a vote for a Board of Directors meeting;

WHEREAS there is no procedure in practice for determining if a proxy vote was used responsibly in accordance with the expressed wishes of the member who proxied it to another Member of the Engineering Society;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 1 is amended to include the following:

4.3.5. A Board of Directors member intending to proxy his vote (the principal) must communicate to the Speaker via email at least 24 hours before a meeting that he intends to proxy his vote and to whom he intends to proxy it.

4.3.6. The principal may communicate to the Speaker and proxy holder via email at least 24 hours before a meeting how he intends for his proxy vote to be used.

a. The principal may, for each motion on the agenda, specify whether he is abstaining, for, against, or whether the proxy-holder is free to use the proxy vote as he chooses.

b. The principal may direct the proxy-holder to abstain on any motions which are not as circulated on the agenda.

c. If the proxy-holder does not vote according to the specified intention, the Principal may email the speaker 24 hours before the next board meeting, indicating for which motion(s) his intentions were not followed. The Speaker may entertain, with a simple majority, a motion to reconsider any so affected motions.

Seconded by Milan.

Saarthak: It might be good to amend this to ensure that proxy votes are noted.

Billy: To elaborate, there may be situations where a motion to reconsider a motion would require a 2/3rds vote. This only requires simple majority in order to ensure that the vote's result is less likely to be influenced by voters' knowledge of the previous decision.

No objections or abstentions.

Motion carried.

July 17, 2016

GB202

9. MOTION by Colin Parker to amend Bylaw 1 to include direction on how Board of Directors meeting minutes must be taken

WHEREAS it is not recorded in the Bylaws or Policies how minutes are to be taken; and

WHEREAS recording each voting member's position on each motion would improve the transparency of the Board of Directors and accountability of its members to their constituencies;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 1 is amended to include the following:

4.9.3. Minutes shall indicate each voting member's vote on each motion, whether in favour, against, or in abstention

Seconded by Billy.

Ryan G.: Is this what is referred to in the next motion?

Colin: Yes. I didn't want to repeal a resolution's effects and amend a bylaw in the same motion since that could be more complicated to consider, so I split it up.

Ryan G.: Vote counting has been a problem in my experience. It seems like people are voting more unanimously since the change last July which could indicate that the system isn't as effective. Each member should focus on representing their constituents, not appearing to conform to the Board's consensus.

Colin: It seems like people haven't been following the change from last July, so I don't think it was that change that influenced anything if this change has taken place.

Billy: I think that we need this to remain accountable to our constituents and this supports that.

Ryan G.: I think that if you go back and look at the minutes that you will see more unanimous decisions. It might be a result of Board of Directors culture but it seems to me that the July resolution did affect things.

Aron left.

Billy: I think if people are bowing to this pressure than they shouldn't be on the board. I think we do need to invest in more accountability measures and aim for people to act competently.

AMENDMENT by Milan Maljkovic to add the following to the end of the motion:

"Be it further resolved that the PSC be directed to investigate better means of reporting how each director votes to their constituents"

Seconded by Colin.

None opposed. Mahta abstained.

Motion carried.

Ryan G. opposed. Sneha, Mahta, and Olivia abstained.

Motion carried.

10. MOTION by Colin Parker to repeal the "Motion by Matthew Lee to ensure transparency at Board meetings" carried by the Engineering Society Board of Directors in July 2015

WHEREAS the resolution in question as amended reads:

MOTION by Matthew Lee to ensure transparency at Board meetings

WHEREAS the Discipline Representatives to the Board of Directors are elected by their members to represent the disciplines' needs

WHEREAS there is currently no method in which discipline members can hold their Board representatives accountable to vote in the manner desired by the discipline members;

WHEREAS to allow the members to view the voting pattern of their representative;

July 17, 2016

GB202

WHEREAS to maintain clearer records of voting abstention;
BE IT RESOLVED THAT, effective immediately, all votes on motions be conducted by a Vote by Roll Call in which the Speaker, or the presiding officer, shall indicate on a voting nominal roll the vote of each present voting member as either Yes, No, or Abstention;
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the vote by roll call shall be conducted on all main and subsidiary motions, including amendments, to allow greater transparency of the actions of the Board of Directors;
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the voting nominal roll be attached and released with the corresponding meeting minutes.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT all votes on motions conducted at Board of Directors meetings be recorded by the minute taker.;

WHEREAS the resolution in question is indefinitely binding and would therefore be more appropriately recorded in the Bylaws or Policies;

WHEREAS the Board of Directors does not consistently follow the direction given by the resolution in question;

WHEREAS it would be prudent to independently consider the value of Vote by Roll Call and the direction to the minute taker to record each vote;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the direction given by the resolution in question be invalid from this point onward.

Seconded by Aron.

None opposed. Olivia abstained.

Motion carried.

11. MOTION by Colin Parker to rename the Engineering Society's "Ombudsman" to "Ombudsperson";

WHEREAS it is prudent to use gender-neutral language wherever it does not significantly impede communication in Engineering Society documentation;

WHEREAS the Ombudsman is currently referred to by name in the bylaws and policies of the Engineering Society only in Bylaw 2 chapter 1.18, Bylaw 3 chapter 7.1.1, and the Policy of Complaints chapter 2;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT all references to "Ombudsman" in Bylaw 2 chapter 1.18, Bylaw 3 chapter 7.1.1, and the Policy of Complaints chapter 2 are changed to "Ombudsperson"

Seconded by Aron.

Billy: "Ombudsperson" isn't a word.

Colin: I think that it not being a word doesn't matter, as long as it is clear and useful. "Ombudsman" is a gendered term to some people, and that may cause problems.

Jason: I think that the motion is a bit of a waste of time.

Maheyar: I think that Ombudsman position should be more inviting. For the general public it isn't relevant if it isn't a word.

Raneem: It may seem small to some people but changes like this in aggregate it will make a difference.

Mark: I think there are more pressing issues.

Milan: It does matter to people who need to access the services of this office.

Milan Maljkovic calls the question

Seconded by Colin.

Mark, Twesh, and Billy opposed. Jason abstained.
Motion carried.

12. Discussion item on effectiveness of the Joint Council Meeting and considerations for alternatives.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to end discussion at 6:30PM.

Seconded by Colin.
Billy opposed. No abstentions.
Motion carried

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to suspend Robert's Rules of Order.

Ryan W. seconded.
Billy and Twesh abstained.
Jason left.
Mark left.

Ryan W.: Could there be some system to refer people to a larger election process based on the recommendation committee's decision?

Billy: I would aim for something more focused on the recommendation report.

Oghosa: I think that it is more of a time issue. The JCM is just extremely long.

Milan: I think that the meeting is not very effective for the resources invested.

Oghosa: I think that it has value for the people being elected and for EngSoc Council to vote for people. Having the in-person meeting is valuable. If we can schedule more appropriately it might be useful.

Kevin: The recommendation report is not a confirmation of being elected. There is a problem with getting people engaged, though. We could parallelize things by creating several parallel meetings.

Raneem: We should stop expecting people to not read the recommendation reports. People come into the meeting without any preparation.

Ryan W.: We should inform people that it is their duty. Also, hiring committees are dangerous because of the risk of cronyism.

Colin: Council as a whole has no duty regarding the meeting. Many of them aren't even told that they're part of Council outside of one email in the summer and a few at the end of the year, and ex-officios don't need to listen to us. We should take this opportunity to reevaluate the composition of Council and what our expectations of it are, because that isn't working right now.

Aron: I think the parallelization issue is interesting but I think that allocating people to different directorships can be awkward – they should be interested in the directorships they vote on. We discuss things at the JCM and dividing that into separate meetings can hinder discussion.

Milan: I wanted to get a sense of if this is something that people are interested in. If so, I'd like to form an ad-hoc committee to address it.

Several Board of Directors members express interest.

Billy: The manner in which we do this should be as transparent as possible.

13. Other Business

Milan administered the Oath of Office to Edwin.

July 17, 2016

GB202

Saarthak: People in the Bahen Center are supposed to go to a fire room on the eighth floor, which is a glass room with only stair access to an exit. I think that EngSoc should attempt to address this but I've noticed that the Board of Directors is not good at dealing with issues at equity. We should be more accommodating.

Twesh: I would recommend that we integrate equity training with the Leadership Development sessions in Orientation Week. Regarding the accessibility issue: if this is a legal issue we should talk to people about it.

Billy: As someone who was confined to a wheelchair I don't think that Bahen's accessibility is an issue. Sandford Fleming's accessibility is. Regarding accommodation, I think that we should be careful not to do what the University of Toronto Student Union does, which is a series of rituals that cost a lot and don't address much.

Milan: [To Saarthak] Do you have anything that we should specifically address or an angle that we should attack this from?

Saarthak: I'm not trying to address something specific. I just think that this isn't one issue.

Oghosa left.

Ryan W.: Leadership Development training will be good for this if you want people to get involved. We are requiring all leedurs to attend Joint Orientation Leader Training, which we could inform Council about.

Raneem: Students for Very Free Access and Tetra are also useful clubs to reach out to for accessibility matters. We should use their resources as best we can rather than duplicating services.

Kevin: Are there any actionable matters for the next board meeting?

Raneem: I can reach out to these clubs and can meet up with any interested members of the Board

Kevin: Further area to discuss things like this could be regarding the ethics course.

Billy: I would invite people to talk to me where our opinions are different in a matter regarding accessibility or anything else. Also, I disagree that we should make people understand anything – there are many psychological factors preventing it. In a well-known event, Oxford had a session on "privilege checking" and it divided the community. Making sessions mandatory would just encourage people not to participate at large.

Maheyar: You should definitely approach people who you disagree with, but also I'm here as the Ombudsperson to help ease conflict.

Aron: Who can access JOLT training?

Milan: Anyone.

Aron: I think we can weigh the costs and benefits of each change and we don't need to fall into the issues that Billy sees with us adopting the flaws of the UTSU's approach.

Twesh: I think it important that people feel comfortable, but we are service-based. We should focus on providing accessibility services but I think that significant advocating is beyond our scope.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to end discussion

Aron seconded.

Billy, Kevin, and Aron abstained

Motion carried.

MOTION by Twesh Upadhyaya to discuss snapping

Colin seconded.

Twesh: People should express their approval verbally in the Speaker's list, rather than by snapping.

July 17, 2016

GB202

Ryan: I think how people read the room does affect their presentation of an idea, and snapping does this and isn't disruptive.

Billy: By snapping you are conveying an opinion without getting on the Speaker's list and you are drawing attention to yourself. The obstructive majority can bully the minority with this kind of tactic.

Twesh: Nodding, eye contact, and body language would be appropriate ways to show that you're listening but showing your opinion isn't necessary.

Aron: EngSoc does have a problem with groupthink and I think that snapping could impact that.

Ryan W.: I think that most of the things discussed are the worst case scenario, but I do think it provides value.

MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to adjourn

Milan seconded.

None opposed. Oghosa abstained.

Motion carried. Meeting adjourned.

Attendance

| Officers | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------|
| President | Milan Maljkovic | |
| VP Finance | Andrew Boetto | Absent with Regrets |
| VP Communication | Colin Parker | |
| VP Academic | Samantha Stuart | |
| VP Student Life | Raneem Shammass | |
| Directors of the Board | | |
| At-Large | Ryan Williams | |
| At-Large | Oghosa Igbinakenzua | |
| At-Large | Kevin Rupasinghe | |
| At-Large | Twesh Upadhyaya | |
| Chemical Representative | Jason Tang | |
| Civil Representative | Sneha Adhikari | |
| Computer Representative | Billy Graydon | |
| Electrical Representative | <i>Vacant</i> | <i>Vacant</i> |
| Engineering Science Representative | Apurv Bharadwaj | |
| Industrial Representative | Aron Sankar | |
| Materials Science Representative | Mahta Massoud | Proxy to Samantha Stuart |
| Mechanical Representative | Mark Chaboryk | |
| <i>Mineral Representative</i> | Olivia Mogielnicki | <i>Vacant</i> |
| First Year | <i>Vacant</i> | <i>Vacant</i> |
| First Year | <i>Vacant</i> | <i>Vacant</i> |
| First Year | <i>Vacant</i> | |
| UTSU Representative | Ryan Gomes | Non-voting |
| Non-Voting Members | | |
| Speaker | Eric Bryce | |
| Chair, Matured Students in Engineering Association | Pankaj Singh ("Peter") | |

A – Absent

AwR – Absent with Regrets

P – Proxy