



November 2016 Board of Directors Meeting

Meeting called to order at 6:13PM.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Seconded by Muskan.

Motion carried.

2. Reports

2.1. President – Milan Maljkovic

Aron: Is there any update on the fall reading week for engineering students?

Milan: Fall reading week was never a sure thing. A fall 2-day break was the topic of referendum before. I spoke to Tom Coyle about it, but it is difficult and requires extensive Faculty consultation. It's on the backburner right now.

Twesh: Is the position for 2nd year electrical engineering representative vacant?

Milan: No, there were other candidates.

2.2. Vice President Finance – Andrew Boetto

Absent.

2.3. Vice President Communications – Colin Parker

2.4. Vice President Academic

Billy: Who decided that UTORid would not be used?

Samantha: Myself and a few people in an AAC meeting.

Aron: Feedback from Indy club: deployment of SpeakUp during midterm season interfered with their feedback processes, and the class representatives don't feel like the emoji feedback was useful.

Samantha: It was actually deployed in September, though more promotion would ideally be better in the future. The system is optional and we can discuss the structure of it with discipline clubs more in the future.

Ziad: Is there any consideration of a language filter for SpeakUp? Some student comments may use harsh language that we wouldn't want to pass on to instructors.

Samantha: Profs don't have direct access right now, though that is a concern for the future.

2.5. Vice President Student Life

Kevin R. entered.

Aron: Will Skule Kup's Cards Against Humanity be reviewed before publication?

Raneem: Yes.

Billy: Can you provide more details on the problems with the pranks?

Raneem: Fire safety was a concern. One prank obstructed a hallway and another was hung from a roof that students should not have access to. People were leaving wood in the Pit. The SF building manager called for it all to be removed, including relatively harmless ones.

Billy: What are the details about rules for future competitions?

Milan: Nadeem wasn't interested in providing them. Coyle is willing to help open up the discussion.

Danja: Will QueerSphere be getting LGBTQase funding from before?

Raneem: LGBTQase got funding from a variety of sources. I've discussed funding options for QueerSphere.

Ryan G.: I was the finance director for LGBTQase and am still on the bank account. I'm trying to transfer existing funding over.

Sam M.: I'm the current finance director for LGBTQout. I've discussed with them options for support.

Billy: What are the noise concerns in 256 McCaul? I heard some complaints.

Raneem: I haven't found anything. It normally materializes as informal requests to keep the noise down. However, for CEIE there will be a music room that is soundproofed.

Oghosa: Are there action items from equity training?

Milan: None. There was some equity 101 and discussion of how to see things from a different perspective.

Colin: We want to tell the future officers to take it earlier. It lost a lot of utility because of how late it happened.

2.6. Orientation Chair – Dareen Kutob

Aron: Evenings had a number of low-energy events, but during the day itself I think catering to low-energy and high-energy frosh created some difficulty.

Billy: Model for many years is head leedurs and many leedurs that don't do much. It might be good to try a smaller-group model in the future. Also, regarding alleged assault, it's important that we refer to it as alleged until it is proven in court.

Swyers: I disagree about head leedur role; leedurs tend to do most of the interaction while as a head leedur I felt that I was mostly delegating to leedurs.

Milan: I would recommend sending feedback to orientation@skule.ca as I don't think this meeting is the best place for this type of feedback.

Apurv: What's one thing that you would really like to see for next year's Orientation?

Dareen: Not really one thing. I would like to see the charity event settle down after being shifted so much this year. I think continuing to focus on Leedurship Development sessions is important.

Billy: The finances went well this year. We always focus on the budget when it goes poorly but not when it goes well. I would like to encourage you to scrutinize this budget as much as you would if it went poorly, to avoid it going poorly in the future.

2.7. Policy and Structures Committee

Twesh: We recommend not creating a photography directorship. We would suggest creating a photography.skule.ca. We're looking for feedback and will provide a report by February about the potential creation of a media director. We are also looking into the creation of some kind of advocacy body. The discussion is generally in favour of the creation of this body, and now more about how it would be created, and how it could incorporate existing representatives and help them get on the same page.

Aron: Regarding the photography director, I agree that photography.skule.ca would be useful though I'm not sure if there would be enough demand. I've consulted with Skulebook and Archives. Archivist wants to extend the role to more active material-gathering.

- 3. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to elect the Sponsorship Director for the remainder of the 2016-2017 year;**
WHEREAS the previous Sponsorship Director was recalled at the October Board of Directors meeting and it is stated in the bylaws that the position must be filled at the next occurring Board meeting;
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Sponsorship Director now be elected by the Board of Directors of the Society.

Seconded by Raneem.

In favour: Milan, Raneem, Ryan G., Samantha, Apurv, Sneha, Billy, Oghosa, Twesh, Muskan, Aron, Mahta, Danil, Kevin R.
Abstaining: Colin

Motion carried.

Candidates: Sam M. and Ziad

Speeches, questions, and closed-door voting were not recorded for brevity and for anonymity.

Sam M. was elected as the Sponsorship Director.

- 4. MOTION by Raneem Shammis 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 club affiliation process was advertised to all students including clubs affiliated in the previous year;
WHEREAS applications were reviewed by the Affiliations Committee to determine eligibility and merit under the Policy;
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 provided in the latest revision of the Club Affiliation Report, October and November 2016 be adopted.**

Seconded by Samantha.

Sneha leaves.

AMENDMENT by Raneem Shammis to change "October and November" to "August, October, and November"

Seconded by Samantha.

Motion carried.

Billy: Could you describe clubs that weren't affiliated?

Raneem: A data science club was judged to be redundant. I informed them of the decision and why it was taken, and haven't received any complaints.

In favour: Apurv, Sam, Olivia, Raneem, Mark, Twesh, Aron, Danil, Kevin R., Muskan, Milan, Oghosa, Billy, Ryan G.

Abstaining: Colin

Motion carried.

MOTION by Aron Sankar to recess for 5 minutes

Seconded by Twesh.

Motion carried.

- 5. MOTION by Aron Sankar to allow the creation of temporary commissions to take on responsibility for specific issues that arise throughout the course of Board of Directors meetings
WHEREAS there is not always the time and/or information available to go into the depth needed at Board of Directors meeting to resolve every issue satisfactorily
WHEREAS the practice as of late has been to refer the matter to one of the existing committees, even if the issue at hand falls outside of their mandate.
WHEREAS it would be more beneficial to create a temporary commission of board members and general members of the society who are motivated and**

have the time to pursue a solution to the issue raised.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT whenever a member of the society wishes to delegate an issue that falls outside the scope of any existing standing committees that they motion for the creation of a temporary commission

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the member of society that motioned for creation of that temporary commission shall become the de facto head of that commission unless another member of the society volunteers for the role, and the commission head may recruit interested members from the board or society to participate with the commission as necessary

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Speaker shall place an item on the agenda of the next scheduled Board of Directors Meeting after the officers' reports where a representative from the commission presents their findings to date and recommendations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the temporary commission shall be dissolved at the Board Meeting after presenting their findings, unless a motion passes to renew the commission until the following meeting.

Seconded by Milan.

Aron: This would provide more flexibility to address issues and provides a point of responsibility

Ryan G.: Do you think this could coexist with an equity director?

Aron: Depends on the scope of the directorship. Still plenty of initiatives for the director I think

Billy: Speaking against the motion, as it doesn't actually "do" anything. Current model to strike an "ad-hoc" committee, which are agile and can take members of the community as well. Motion itself only lasts for one month as not "special." Regarding intersections with an equity director or advocacy focused committees -- we are trying to handle this with the advocacy board, which the Policy and Structures Committee (PSC) is talking about. This is perhaps not the way to go about it, as we are currently doing this, and are trying to make the implementation happen with the advocacy board. UTSU has power to get funding for commissions and get stuff done, which we should look into.

Matthew: I'm unsure about Billy's point as to the differences between what already happens; but temporary commissions provide a great opportunity for first year reps to be more involved and contribute.

Milan: There is no reason why we cannot strike ad hoc committees and commissions as they arise. But, we're not doing this as much as we should be doing. I'm hesitant to do something like this as it may lead to getting bogged down by bureaucracy. For example, with the JCM committee, the board said it was worth doing, so did it. I'm wary of formalizing something that doesn't need to be, First year engagement is also key, and issues lie there with making students better aware of the opportunities.

Twesh: I agree that the intent is in the right place, but this methodology may not be suitable. PSC gets content outside of the mandate, but they do try to avoid "echo chambers." For example, for the discussion of external relations, we brought in external relevant parties to provide fresh opinions. There already are the correct mechanisms for doing this, and more may not help. For first year involvement, we need better

advertising. In terms of responsibilities, the standing committees have officers that report to board. It may be more difficult to nail down whether these committees have minutes and such.

Sam M.: We should have members from the larger engineering community. With that we need much more communication. With regard to “action” we would need oversight.

Colin: To provide background on how committees currently work: standing committees are outlined by name in the bylaws. It is understood by officers to strike committees at the beginning of the year. Transitions between officers each year are strong, so it happens, but transition for the board is not. Whether or not we pass it today, it’ll be likely lost next year. I’ll speak against structure of the motion but not its intent. To nitpick, the first “be it resolved” has a general call to action for someone who isn’t in a position. If someone fails to do this, we have no accountability mechanisms. It can also conflict; we could have alumni members as heads of commissions, which is a gray area. Saying the speaker should put it after officer reports doesn’t make sense as officer reports aren’t mandated. There are lots of little wordy things in this that make it less agile and difficult to adapt for different circumstances. I would like to see it be made a more flexible structure in the bylaws.

Aron: I’m more than happy to make amendments or postpone it to a later date when things can be better fleshed out. A point about the advocacy board: it’s so far removed from the board level, what is the board’s position on advocacy? The board is elected to represent what people want to see happen, so advocacy board reporting to the board is redundant. However, commissions allow better board oversight. I think it makes far more sense to do at a level where it matters.

Billy: Sam [Minuter’s note: Sam M.], awesome point about it not being wise to just give the power to do action to these commissions. It needs much more in depth discussion about oversight vs flexibility. Month-long-life also prevents external involvement. Aron, advocacy board structure still being determined. It is being designed to address the same problems as this motion, so we should be having this motion together. This seems like a “band-aid-solution”. I seriously encourage you to come out to AAC meetings from a more informal setting (we can’t get stuff done with Robert’s Rules). Historically, the board has not done well with advocacy.

MOTION WITHDRAWN by Aron Sankar.

6. Motion by Ryan Gomes to create the Equity Director

WHEREAS recent issues both on campus and in the broader community have highlighted systemic inequalities confronting our students; and
WHEREAS the Engineering Society has a duty to represent its students, but in particular those who are marginalized; and
WHEREAS the Society is currently only one of two student governments on campus to not have any position dedicated to tackling equity; and
WHEREAS the Ombudsman’s report for the previous term highlighted student concerns regarding inequity from within the Society; and
WHEREAS presently, there is also a lack of opportunities for engineering students to engage in equity conversations within the Society.

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 Equity Director

1.23.1 There shall be an Equity Director, who shall be responsible for:

- a) The development and promotion of equity programming for the engineering community;***
- b) Educating and informing the community about social issues;***
- c) Working with external organizations to facilitate education and discussion on equity;***

1.23.2 The Equity Director shall be overseen by the President.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Equity Director be nominated for the remainder of the term at the next Board of Directors meeting.

Seconded by Apurv.

Ryan G.: This role would be focused on education and support.

Colin: Why did you choose to make this a regular project director instead of a temporary project director? Also, could you provide the specifics of this director's portfolio as you see it?

Ryan: I don't think this issue is temporary, and we have a history of just making directorships. I think it is a position to hold events and to provide consultation and education about issues.

Billy: I'm concerned about vagueness of the description. I don't want to give this director the authority to endorse or condemn anything on EngSoc's behalf. As a former Ombudsperson I don't think that we have a lot of equity problems, and based on the last census I don't think we've encountered many recently. A lot of our problems center around alcohol culture and shyness that aren't necessarily equity-based.

Danja: I don't think a lot of the training and feedback we get is followed through on. I think that the frosh are becoming increasingly educated about equity issues. I think that the lack of education masked some equity issues.

Mark: I think our neutrality is a great asset. The livability of the undergraduate experience should be our primary goal.

Twesh: We are a successful student government and we should not say that just because other unions have something we should as well. Also, I think that having another discussion in ~4 months would be useful and is a good part of temporary internal directorships.

Sam M.: We should look for problems, as they do exist. I don't think that a single person responsible for equity issues is reasonable. I think education should be more part of EngSoc in general.

Ryan W.: I like the programming topic. This topic is being politicized in this meeting but it sounds mainly informational and for the purpose of facilitating discussion. I agree that we should be searching for problems. I also agree that the creation of yet another directorship could create some problems -- in particular, this overlaps a lot with Skule Community Outreach.

Samantha: I think that putting equity on the label has the potential to divide people, and we don't want to make a very political position. I would suggest using an inclusivity lens instead of an equity lens.

August 24, 2016

6:00PM

GB 202

Gomes: Would recommend not sending this to a committee to die. In the past, a lot has gone to the PSC and other committees and been torn apart. I also don't think this needs to be political.

Colin: I think the motion is well-structured, and sufficiently specific for a project director description.

Danja: I agree that it should be called equity director and we shouldn't treat the term as politicized.

Matthew: I agree. It would be to have a central point of information and contact about this.

Twesh: I think that the PSC shouldn't be judged by what it used to be. I think putting this through a committee and subjecting it to more discussion would be meaningful, and the purpose of the Board of Directors is to rubber stamp after due consideration and consultation.

MOTION by Aron Sankar to have a 2 minute recess

Seconded by Sam M.

In favour: Ryan G., Muskan, Danil, Mahta, Mark, Aron, Ryan W., Twesh, Samantha, Raneem, Colin

Motion carried.

Apurv: I agree that it isn't good to look over your shoulder about being unequitable

Muskan: I like the educational aspect. We can't ignore issues that are present, so we should learn about them

Sam M.: An understanding of equity is an understanding of empathy. The scope of this goal might change, but it doesn't change that it's important. I think that the word 'equity' is political to many people and we might want to change it. I don't think that it's reasonable to establish one person as responsible for this.

Matthew: I think having some confidence or awareness of the resources available to groups is important and falls under EngSoc.

Ryan G,: This would not have any authority over others. This is about giving people an option.

Billy: I think that this is a public relations issue. Blanket neutrality is a good policy.

MOTION by Billy Graydon to refer the topic to an ad-hoc committee to report back at the first Board of Directors meeting to meet after January 23rd. The committee shall be composed of anyone who expresses their interest within a week. Board of Directors members will have voting rights and everyone will have speaking rights. The opportunity shall be advertised on the Skule Digest.

Seconded by Twesh.

AMENDMENT by Sam M. to amend to allow non-BoD members to chair the committee.

Seconded by Apurv.

August 24, 2016

6:00PM

GB 202

In favour: Raneem, Aron, Samantha, Mark, Billy, Apurv, Oghosa, Danil, Muskan, Kevin R., Colin

Amendment carried.

Vote on main motion:

In favour: Samantha, Raneem, Mark, Twesh, Jason, Kevin R., Muskan, Billy, Danil, Oghosa

Against: Ryan G., Apurv, Danja

Abstaining: Aron, Olivia, Colin

Motion carried.

As the motion neglected to specify a temporary chair to organize a meeting, Colin volunteered and will organize the first meeting of the committee.

- 7. MOTION by Billy Graydon to recall class representatives absent without regrets from the 1st Faculty Council meeting**
WHEREAS bylaw 7 item 4.0.1.a requires that "Each Class Representative shall attend all Faculty Council meetings";
WHEREAS bylaw 7 item 4.0.1.b stipulates that "If the Class Representative is unable to attend a Faculty Council meeting, he shall send regrets to the VP Academic";
WHEREAS those representatives listed in the Appendix were absent from the Faculty Council meeting on 25 Oct 2016;
WHEREAS those aforementioned representatives did not send regrets to either VP Academic (as stipulated in by-law 7 item 4.0.1.b), or to the secretary of Faculty Council; and
WHEREAS bylaw 7 item 4.0.1.c mandates that "A Class Representative shall be moved to be recalled at a subsequent meeting of the Board upon: i. Absence without regrets from one Faculty Council meeting [...]"
BE IT RESOLVED THAT those representatives named in the appropriate Appendix be recalled.

Seconded by Kevin R.

Billy: I made the motion because the bylaws specify that it needs to be made. I don't really support recalling class reps, but we should have a discussion about it. I've informed class reps and discipline club chairs where relevant, and the feedback I've received indicated that the class reps are doing good work.

Kevin R.: I think the statement needs to be made to class reps that Faculty Council is important. I don't think that a punitive response is useful. However, I don't want to continue not recalling people if they can't do their job. To Samantha, how is the word getting out to class reps?

Aron: I think that the message is clear, and we should be careful not to get rid of people doing good work.

AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to amend to remove from consideration class representatives that responded to the notice from Billy

Seconded by Mark.

AMENDMENT by Billy to remove from consideration class representatives that responded or whose corresponding discipline club representatives responded on their behalf

Seconded by Colin.

Mark: Katharyn has been doing very well.

Raneem: I think it is important that we recall class reps that don't do what their role entails

In favour: Billy, Samantha, Ryan W., Raneem, Mark, Aron, Muskan, Danil, Apurv

Against: Kevin R.

Amendment carried.

Sam M.: Speaking as a class rep, the requirements are very unclear. I have a hard time punishing someone for doing a job that they were not told about.

Jane: Personally, I did know about the meeting but I was not able to attend. However, we weren't technically reps at that point so the bylaw wouldn't apply to us.

Twesh: I want to clarify: are these positions informed well about these responsibilities?

Samantha: There was an in-person meeting where I described Faculty Council and a follow-up meeting. I would not expect lower years to be adequately informed about this.

Billy: The bylaw may not apply based on ratification, but I think we should still care and we still have the ability to recall them

AMENDMENT by Billy Graydon to make the recall conditional on the consent of Samantha and the discipline club chairs corresponding to each representative

Seconded by Muskan.

Sam M.: Class representatives aren't technically overseen by the VP Academic or discipline clubs

Aron: Even if they technically don't report to them, they do have a lot of relevant expertise

Ryan G. leaves.

Kevin R.: I don't think we're able to do this right now. We just now know the details. I would rather be proactive

In favour: Samantha, Billy, Twesh, Muskan, Ryan W. Mark, Raneem, Aron

Against: Kevin R.

Main motion:

Matthew: Communication from these class reps is important. I recommend that that be part of the consent point for VP Academic and discipline club chairs.

August 24, 2016

6:00PM

GB 202

Noah: I think that the requirements should be made more clear for class reps

Kevin R.: I reiterate that this is ridiculous and this would be altogether negative to pass.

Raneem: Were they notified that they would be recalled if they didn't go?

Billy: I told them beforehand.

Raneem: Were they told what being recalled means?

Matthew: I think this should pass, and I assume that they will remain in the position as a result of Samantha or the discipline club chairs not agreeing. That makes it clear that we don't approve of their actions.

Billy: This gives the power to Samantha and discipline club chairs to prevent this from being unnecessarily destructive

Danil: What would happen if we did recall them?

Colin: We would probably get new representatives in a month following elections

MOTION by Apurv Bharadwaj to call the question

Seconded by Aron.

In favour: Samantha, Raneem, Aron, Mark, Twesh, Muskan, Oghosa, Danja, Danil, Billy, Ryan W., Kevin R.

Voting on main motion:

In favour: Billy, Danil, Muskan, Twesh, Jason, Mark, Aron

Against: Raneem, Kevin R., Colin, Ryan W.

Motion carried.

- 8. MOTION by Jonathan Swyers for Milan to perform 10 pushups for every meeting he lacked to wear the White Fireman's Hardhat while President WHEREAS Bylaw 4 Section 1 states the President must wear the White Fireman's Hardhat at all Meetings; and WHEREAS The President's purposeful avoidance of this must be punished; BE IT RESOLVED Milan learns his lesson and will wear the hardhat from now on.**

AMENDMENT by Jonathan Swyers to change pushups to squats

Amendment carried.

Motion carried.

9. Adjournment

Motion carried.

Attendance

Officers		
President	Milan Maljkovic	
VP Finance	Andrew Boetto	Absent
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	Proxied to Twesh
Civil Representative	Sneha Adhikari	
Computer Representative	Billy Graydon	
Electrical Representative	Danja Papajani	
Engineering Science Representative	Apurv Bharadwaj	
Industrial Representative	Aron Sankar	
Materials Science Representative	Mahta Massoud	
Mechanical Representative	Mark Chaboryk	
Mineral Representative	Olivia Mogielnicki	Proxied to Samantha
First Year	Muskan Sethi	
First Year	Danil Ojha	
First Year	Kevin Zhang	Absent
University of Toronto Student Union Representative	Ryan Gomes	