



## March 2015 Board of Directors Meeting

### 1. Adoption of the Agenda

Meeting called to order at 11:05 AM.

Matthew adds to the agenda:

#### 1. Motion by Matthew Lee to ratify the Officer Election results.

**WHEREAS** the results of the Officer 2015 Elections have been received from the CRO

**BIRT** that the results of the Officer 2015 Elections be ratified.

#### 2. Motion by Matthew Lee to ratify the EngSoc Representation Diversion Referendum results.

**WHEREAS** the results of the Engineering Society Representation Diversion Referendum have been received from the CRO.

**BIRT** that the results of the Representation Diversion Referendum be ratified.

#### 3. Motion by Matthew Lee to ratify the SEF/TLF Referendum results.

**WHEREAS** the results of the Skule Endowment Fund and Temporary Levy Fund Referendum have been received from the CRO.

**BIRT** that the results of the Levy Fund Referendum be ratified.

Tabish says these are new items 4, 5 and 6.

**Ernesto seconds.**

**The agenda is adopted.**

### 2. Approval of Minutes

- a. January Board of Directors Meeting: January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Andrew asks where the minutes since September are?



**University of Toronto Engineering Society  
March 2015 Board of Directors Meeting Agenda**

*March 21, 2015  
10:00am  
GB202*

---

Matthew says minutes for September and October are posted on [skule.ca/minutes](http://skule.ca/minutes)

Cory says to remove the link is currently on documents.

Ryan says he doesn't see the January AAC minutes.

Tabish says they were approved in the February meeting.

Peter asks if we still minute changes to minutes?

Tabish says that any changes made to December, January and February minutes will be added to this meeting.

Ernesto asks if the minutes circulated on email are official.

Tabish says they were circulated to the entire board

Mehran requests the opportunity for the Board to provide comments for December and January BoD meeting minutes via email. He requests to approve February BoD meeting minutes separately.

**Teresa moves to approve minutes at the end of the meeting.**

**Saarthak seconds.**

**Motion fails. Tabish says the minutes are approved now.**

They have minutes for February and December, minutes for January will be approved at JCM.

- b. February Board of Directors Meeting: February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015
- c. Finance Committee Meeting: March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Saarthak says that the Indian Student Society said they will receive funding, and asks why and how much.

Mehran says it is part of club funding in the fall, which separate form special projects.

The December and February Board meeting and Finance committee meeting minutes are approved.



---

Andrew asks why the November 2014 minutes is an appendix (on skule.ca).

Tabish says there is probably a reason, but does not know.

The January Board of Director minutes are not passed.

### 3. Officer Reports

#### a. President – Teresa Nguyen

Matthew says that many of the questions of the Project Director Applications are not representative of what they will ask candidates and be tailored to the individual Project Directorship.

Teresa says she asked for feedback for the preliminary application. She says that the process is not perfect yet, but it can be reviewed by the Executive Committee, future Board Members and Council. It is important for applicants to recognize the role of a Project Director and it is prudent to come up with a basic budget.

Cory says to take those comments with a grain of salt, especially with regards to length, but be more concise. He is disappointed that the budget was included without input from himself or Colin.

Teresa says they can talk about it later.

#### b. VP Finance – Mehran Hydary

Ryan asks to clarify what happened with the fund opt out.

Mehran says a notification was sent out as a whole, explaining what the fund is. People were pissed because the word refund was not in the subject of the email. It is a sensitive issue, but they should know what they're opting out of.

Tabish says that reimbursements were done in a more transparent fashion than last year, explaining what the SEF is for and why they should opt out?. He gives props to the Finance Committee.

Saarthak asks how many people opted out?

Mehran says 900 this year, 1200 last year.

Cory says to push to make it more transparent next year.



- 
- c. VP Communications – Karan Shukla  
(absent)
  - d. VP Academic – Ryan Gomes

Ernesto asks if they took feedback for APS 101.

Ryan says he doesn't believe Teresa or him have heard, but he will check with the Representative to see if feedback was taken in consideration.

Tabish says that it was advertised at MBAE.

Ernesto asks if Professor Stickel can send the final syllabi of APS101 to review?

Teresa asks Ryan and Oghosa about putting syllabi on courses.skule.ca and any next steps.

Ryan says he doesn't know if syllabi are on the system?. He could talk the webmaster and look at sorting out files since the names won't be standard.

- e. VP Student Life – Cory Sulpizi

Cory talks about wrapping up, transitioning, and says that the directors are ready to transition, finishing this weekend. He is strategizing with the Orientation Chair.

**4. Motion by Matthew Lee to ratify the Officer Election results.**

**WHEREAS** the results of the Officer 2015 Elections have been received from the CRO,

**BIRT** that the results of the Officer 2015 Elections be ratified.

**Ernesto seconds.**

Ernesto says to vote on it.

**The motion passes. Ernesto abstains.**

**5. Motion by Matthew Lee to ratify the EngSoc Representation Diversion Referendum results.**

**WHEREAS** the results of the Engineering Society Representation Diversion Referendum have been received from the CRO.

**BIRT** that the results of the Representation Diversion Referendum be ratified.



**Ryan seconds.**

Matthew says they barely passed 5 percent threshold (6 percent).

Ryan asks what are the next steps?

Teresa says she will have a meeting with the Vice-Provost. They are trying to move forward and recognize that this is a legitimate request. We need to be clear with what we want and they recognize our frustrations.

**The motion passes.**

**6. Motion by Matthew Lee to ratify the SEF/TLF Referendum results.**

**WHEREAS** the results of the Skule Endowment Fund and Temporary Levy Fund Referendum have been received from the CRO.

**BIRT** that the results of the Levy Fund Referendum be ratified.

**Mehran seconds.**

Matthew says they barely passed the threshold.

Mehran asks to compare it with previous years?

Matthew says that it is a bad comparison. Last time it was in conjunction with fee diversion.

Tabish says there was no campaigning with the referendum this year.

**The motion passes.**

**7. MOTION by Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patiño to instruct the VP Communications to take minutes utilizing a projector, or a similar device, that allows members of the board to see minutes being taken live.**

**WHEREAS** Bylaw 4, CH. 2.1.3. reads The Vice-President Communications shall ensure that quality minutes are taken at each meeting; and

**WHEREAS** the majority of the minutes taken under the current VP Communications' oversight has consistently been below the expected level of quality and professionalism; and



**WHEREAS** this has caused unnecessary delays in approving the minutes at board meetings;

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the VP Communications is instructed that the present meeting's minutes are to be taken utilizing a projector, or a similar device, that allows members of the board to see minutes being typed live.

**Mehran seconds.**

Ernesto says the motion was not proceeded correctly, but wants to encourage everyone to think about it for future meetings.

Tabish suggests to have Google Docs open while the VP Communication types.

Cory says that would require everyone to have laptops. Tabish points out that the majority of people present have laptops open.

Teresa says that it is not a voting item, but something that can be implemented next meeting. She says the motion is invalid and void, but is definitely in favour.

Tabish asks if anyone could amend to remove the "present"?

Mehran says the exact bylaw or policy wording should be brought back to the Board before it is voted on.

**The motion fails.**

**8. MOTION by Dimpho Radebe to implement Policy on Equitable Practices.**

**WHEREAS** the Engineering Society currently does not have a policy on equitable practices; and

**WHEREAS** the vast majority of student governments on campus have policies or positions dedicated to equity and equitable practices; and

**WHEREAS** the Engineering Society must recognize its mandate to represent its members on matters that affect academic and professional development, including discrimination and human rights; and

**WHEREAS** such a policy would be beneficial to members and the society at large.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Board of Directors adopt Policy 2015-03-21, Policy on Equitable Practices, attached in the appendix, effective immediately.



**Marissa seconds.**

Dimpho asks what does it mean to be represented by her society? She says that is more than academics and that there are multiple identities that can impact professional and academic life. She was approached by a number of people that the UTSU can't be trusted. She wanted to advocate for social justice issues but didn't feel safe about different views. She feels the need to water down what she wants to say with the fear of advocating for UTSU. There is an environment of exclusion in engineering, and she has experienced real things that have made her uncomfortable. She refers to the venn diagram on diversity, equity, and inclusion. She says that engineering is diverse. With regards to equity, she mentions equity training for Officers. Inclusion is not directly incorporated in the policy, but it is the responsibility of the majority to ensure that everyone feels safe and comfortable.

Marissa says the motion was well researched and that there is no harm in implementing it.

Pierre says that in 2008, EngSoc adopted the University's Anti-harassment Policy. Then the server crashed and they lost those policies. Minutes were made, but they failed to look through the minutes. It was technically repealed 2 years ago, since it was lost. He says they should right that wrong. They should pass a diversity policy, similar to Dimpho's, but thinks they should move to amend it. He thinks that equity training course are not a bad idea, but it takes up time. Club leaders would benefit more than officers. For example, the women's director was removed because WISE does a good job and they don't appoint LGBT issues because LGBTQase is better at that. He thinks they should adopt the University's policy.

Cory has some problems with the policy. It is not drafted to the standards of other documents, tenses are wrong, there are misplaced words; the policy needs work anyways.

**Cory moves to amend the motion to adopt the "Statement on Prohibited Discrimination and Discriminatory Harassment".**

Pierre says they can't adopt, but endorse it.

Ryan says it's symbolic.

Teresa wants to commend Dimpho for having the courage to express her experiences and the effort of drafting a policy. Teresa apologizes for experiences Dimpho felt by EngSoc, wants to encourage an open door policy and takes the feedback seriously. She thinks that state and equity issues should be separate since groups like WISE do a better



job. She recommends endorsing the Governing Council policy to see if they can resync ideas for EngSoc's future.

Back to Cory's amendment, **Teresa seconds it.**

Pierre ask if it is not adopted, is Dimpho's motion off the table? Tabish says yes. Pierre says if they pass the amendment now, he doesn't want to strike Dimpho's off.

**Pierre moves for the Board to refer policy 2015-03-21 to the Policy and Structures committee and bring it back to April BoD meeting.**

**Teresa seconds.**

Ryan says that committee only met twice. He doesn't have confidence that they will meet in the next two weeks, so they should talk about it now.

Andrew says that many policies are working slowly and they not doing enough to combat it [equity issues]. It looks nice on the surface, but he has seen people make uninformed, ignorant comments on the LGBTQ community, women, international students and Islam. They need to be active and not take a backseat.

Ernesto says that the policy is great starting point, but approving it is not right mechanism to get it done. He proposes to discuss ways to take this policy and involve students.

Teresa emphasizes that concerns can be submitted to the Ombudsman. She apologizes for the sentiments felt, but due diligence part of a professional identity. She wants to be prudent and diligent, and look into making the policy robust.

Marissa says that EngSoc should have their own policy and not just adopt the University's. Amend the policy later on.

Cory says the policy is being reviewed very quickly. The policy is aimed at people in the society and there are issues with wording and tenses. He wants the policy to be written properly first time. The Policy and Structures committee or whoever can do that, but he wants to bring it to a different committee.

Saarthak says he was questioned by Ernesto about an inclusive atmosphere and equity commission. He wants to create a portfolio for VP equity. There are issues in equity and something must be done. The proposal is good one and he believes there is a history of sending stuff to other committees and not doing anything about it. He would like to make clear that EngSoc has found problem and would like to take an active stance to fix it.



Pierre says that engineers don't build a bridge then fix it later. That shit don't fly. He says if the Policy and Structures committee lacks commitment, then fire them. He says they should do things right and logically, not just to pass a statement and react to an incident. Things can't change now and at this instance. Do it right and push it to Policy and Structures committee.

Dimpho says that there is no structure in EngSoc for people to write policies or something to help regular members do that.

Teresa says that there is the Policy and Structures committee.

Tabish says if you have a policy and want to make changes, ideally the Policy and Structures committee should help students. They would've worked to help draft policy, but now it is a barrier. He recommends referring it to the committee to bring up to standard.

Shubham sees merits in both policies and wants to move forward and talk about meeting next week to figure out what to do next.

Ernesto recognizes the value and importance of this policy, but they must recognize they have to do this right. He knows there is an issue with with the bylaw and wants to push it to the Policy and Structure committee.

Matthew asks what is amendment they're debating?

Tabish says referring the policy by Dimpho to the Policy and Structures committee.

Andrew says that people feel excluded and they must talk about it now. Calling policy half assed and garbage is offensive. They should not talk about the grammar of policy. He asks why issues for grammar were not dealt with before? He thinks it should pass now.

Shubham says the wording [about the half assed and garbage comment] is offensive, but they trying to do it right. Dimpho's policy not wrong, but changes can't be made for a year.

Andrew asks if they care so much about the issues why didn't they do something in last week.

Tabish stops Andrew from talking.



Pierre says they can't just change the policy when it was already submitted to board. They have to be able to read policy ahead of time, make informed mind about it and then meet. There is no sense of urgency to pass it now or three weeks from now. The Policy and Structures will be restructured next year. He never said that this proposal is garbage, but they have to evaluate and look at it carefully. It is a shame the Policy and Structures committee didn't look at it carefully two weeks ago and he wants to take time to evaluate it and get feedback. Substantial things in policy will take time and money (equity training). If they will be stuck and committed with the policy for a year, they should be 100% okay with it, not iffy with details and wording matters.

Tabish says that this policy can't be changed until March 2016.

Cory wants to put more time into it, so it's done well and properly and not shrug it off.

Teresa says that engineers are stereotyped not communicate well and she is not comfortable with a document with grammar discrepancies.

Ogi asks if the policy is pushed back, how will they ensure that changes are made?

Cory says that whoever is at meeting will make changes to it and decide what document will be.

Ernesto wants add a motion that meeting should be advertised so that entire society knows.

Tabish says to have an open policy forum meeting to discuss the meeting and make sure Dimpho is at this meeting to help facilitate the discussion

**Pierre makes an amendment to the amendment: BIRFT Policy 2015-03-21 be referred to the Policy and Structures committee, bring it back to April meeting.**

**Cory seconds.**

**The amendment passes.**

**Cory amends to endorse the University of Toronto's Anti-harassment Policy along with Pierre's BIFR clause.**

**Faizan seconds.**

**The amendment passes.**

**Motion as amended passes.**



---

**Pierre motions for a 2 minute recess. Ryan seconds. Motion passes.**

Tabish says that the meeting is set for April 1<sup>st</sup>, 6 pm. Location TBD

12:52-back to order

**9. MOTION by Mehran Hydary to update the policy on finances**

**WHEREAS** in the 2014-2015 year, the Vice President Finance and Vice President Student Life has been working with the Faculty to create a new centralized process for club funding applications; and

**WHEREAS** the process has been implemented within the Engineering Society and the Faculty of Applied Sciences and Engineering; and

**WHEREAS** the current Policy on Finances does not accurately reflect the new process; and

**WHEREAS** the Policy of Finances, Section 4, titled "Funding Appeals" lists what is required from a student group that is appealing a decision from the Finance Committee; and

**WHEREAS** the Policy of Finances, Section 6, titled "Financial Reporting" lists what is to be reported from the Finance Committee and Board of Directors decisions;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the following clause be added under the Policy on Finances, Section 4, titled "Funding Appeals"

"4. 2. d. A pitch presented to the Finance Committee from the appealing club regarding the aforementioned."

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the following clause be added under the Policy on Finances, Section 6, titled "Financial Reporting"

"Final allocations made from the Engineering Society to the Clubs must be submitted to the Centralized Student Initiative Fund Committee to maintain transparency across Faculty, Departments and the Engineering Society regarding funding allocations before the end of each fiscal year".

**No one seconds.**

**The motion fails.**



**10. MOTION to instruct the policy and structure committee to look into the exact wording for the creation the role of Executive Secretary**

**WHEREAS** the Society has entered a phase of transition where outgoing executives are strategizing with incoming executives; and

**WHEREAS** it has been discussed at the January Board meeting about creating such role in order for VP Communications to take on a managerial role for the communication infrastructure of the Society; and

**WHEREAS** it is the intention to have the executive secretary to fulfill the following duties:

- take minutes for board meetings
- maintain policies and bylaws to ensure they are up to date
- to act as de facto chair of the Policy and Structure Committee
- to provide quality control of other relevant duties that the current Policy and Structure committee proposes to be suitable.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** that the P&S Committee provide that exact bylaw amendments for the April Board Meeting to fulfill the spirit of this motion.

**Cory seconds.**

Cory does not think this should be in same meeting as other discussion [Item 8].

Pierre thinks that the Executive Secretary is a useful role, but there is no benefit towards person, they are just doing someone else's job. That loses the appeal. He says it should be couple with another role (e.g. the handbook and planner) - Policy and Structures chair. Someone who cares about policy would do minute taking. They would be familiar with how a document is formatted on word and how to take minutes properly. They can also find communication lapses, such as problems with Dimpho's wording. They should be chair of some committee and Policy and Structures makes the most sense.

**The motion passes.**

Yerusha voted no.

Tabish states Yerusha's message. She states that VP Comm is not required to take minutes. If VP Comm thinks they can produce quality minutes, she doesn't see why to prevent them from doing so. If VP Comm thinks an Executive Secretary is Required, they are welcome to create such a position. This policy limits VP Comm's freedom.



Cory says she can bring that up when they are actually voting on the real motion. This motion was passed anyways.

**11. SPECIAL MOTION to constitutionally include 1 representative from each discipline club on AAC**

**WHEREAS** this has been a discussion with the Discipline Club Chairs for a need enhance how EngSoc communicates priorities within academic advocacy; and

**WHEREAS** it is the intention to enhance academic advocacy while tightening Skule's culture of interdisciplinary rivalry.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 1, 5.14.6 which currently reads: The Academic Advocacy Committee shall consist of the Vice President Academic, other members of the Board that may be appointed, and Faculty Council Standing Committee

*Be amended to read:*

5.14.6 The Academic Advocacy Committee shall consist of the Vice President Academic, other members of the Board that may be appointed, one representative from each discipline appointed by discipline club chairs, and Faculty Council Standing Committee

~~**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 7 is amended to now include the following:~~

~~1.0.3. All discipline club funding shall be withheld until its release is approved by the Board. The Board may decline to release funding for the following reasons:~~

~~1.0.3.e the club has not appointed a representative to the Academic Advocacy Committee~~

**Ernesto seconds.**

Teresa saw that Ryan had trouble communicating with discipline clubs and chairs, and thinks that an academic representative will centralize best practices and conversations. There will be equal amounts of pressure on VPA's level on communication with discipline clubs.

Ernesto says that for coordination purposes it is worth taking the risk and seeing how it works.

Pierre doesn't like EngSoc putting more and more requirements on discipline clubs. He doesn't think this is stringent, but they don't function as closely with discipline clubs as ASSU does. He thinks the Board should consist of one rep from discipline club every year. There is an easier relationship between the President and a fourth year, since the



President is in fourth year, rather than the VPA. To keep having discipline clubs sit on EngSoc things, they should have appointees from discipline clubs.

Saarthak ask if TrackOne has a discipline club and how will they be represented?

Teresa says academic advocacy goes through the department and TrackOne doesn't have a department. Advocacy for them happens directly with the VPA and president.

Tabish asks about the TrackOne rep?

Saarthak says the first year chair should be the rep, given this year's TrackOne rep.

Praneet says that the academic advocacy asks discipline clubs for advice, not one member of the AAC has come to discipline club meetings. Discipline club favour the social aspect. To promote academic advocacy, there needs to be a smaller and holistic group. Getting discipline clubs to do this will get half assed work.

Teresa says that most discipline clubs are in favour. She wants to enhance communication because they don't feel part of conversation. She wants to provide leadership opportunities for the VPA to hear practices and decide the best practices for moving forward, Academic rep or equivalent.

Praneet asks what is meant by "or equivalent"?

Teresa says it could be a designate appointed by club

Ryan says he had trouble communicating with discipline clubs, but the text in the motion is vague with respect to the structure of the AAC as there is no mention of how voting would work. Ideally, every single rep gets a vote, which would mean adding more members. There will be problems with quorum and if all discipline clubs show up, they will have more votes than the committee. He does not want to value one group more than other.

Marissa says that the AAC works well because they are a small team, creative, agile and adding more members may cause them talk in circles. She is worried about getting stuff done. Projects they work on don't relate to interests of discipline clubs but rather engineering academics in general. Ideally they discipline clubs would work in project that involves them.

Peter asks about forcing discipline clubs to bring people there, if people are interested in this or just want funding? There is overlap between what the AAC does and academic rep. There is a communication problem. This is one route, but it is not best.



Teresa wishes for the outgoing discipline chairs to consider. “Advocacy” committee is a process, not a project management, and the Faculty need to see formal, representative bodies. For example, for APS101 they compiled feedback from students and Professor Stickel was impressed. Faculty has robust, formal structure for academic motions. She wants to parallel that so Faculty takes it more seriously and take best practices with more weight. She says there is no harm in trying it out.

Mehran says that he agrees with Teresa and this is the right direction. He thinks the second BIRT clause is unfair because they don’t have that information now. **He moves to amend this motion: strike the last BIFR clause.**

**Faizan seconds.**

Mehran say that since they are trying [this motion], it is not fair to make a financial requirement.

Faizan says that there is a contradiction. They want to enhance communication, but this works against working together with discipline clubs.

Ryan says that if they remove this, there is no incentive for discipline clubs to be involved with this. Not for this motion, but to make it work, they should keep that part.

Shubham says that financials and academics should be segregated and is for this amendment.

Teresa mentions the Temporary Levy Fund and says that academic and finances are not separate. Discipline clubs get money from gratitude and should recognize that EngSoc provides funding. She had more conversations about academics with discipline chairs than social. With respect to the BIR clause, discipline clubs are on board this year and in favour of this.

Pierre says if they want discipline clubs to take it seriously, they should find an academic rep. Academics are a huge part, money they can control, of the Levy Fund and it is weird they are not synced.

Mehran reminds them about the amendment. The motion is still young. He wants the committee to have responsible oversight and withhold the BIR clause.

Shubham says that they should be promoting academic advocacy better, not force discipline clubs to come to the AAC.

Matt asks that considering this is project for next year, is there any evidence of consultation done within their own clubs?



Teresa says she received the opinions of current chairs.

Ernesto says that the clause can be defining of the success of the motion or not. If they withhold it, it might go worse. This is a matter of doing something in best way.

Faizan says the motion is getting unclear. He says if they want discipline clubs to be accountable for academics, have them be responsible, but instead of having discipline clubs appoint them, take it on themselves.

**The amendment passes.**

**Pierre amends to strike any reference to the AAC of EngSoc Board members (strike clause 1.1b)**

Ryan says it will renewed this year.

**Shubham seconds the amendment.**

Pierre says that the point of the AAC is to have people with experience in the course to criticize it. They are in a position to criticize curriculum and should recognize that committee is huge. He wants to empower them by giving them a committee that is only them, a committee that is truly representative of students.

Ryan is 100% against this. He asks how there can be a committee of the Board with no Board members? Most of the work done this semester was done by him and 3 members. Discipline clubs did not respond to him and he is not for replacing work done by AAC. It needs Board of Directors on it.

Shubham changes his mind.

Teresa says not to appoint discipline club chairs to committee. She feels they would be more responsive if an academic rep was on the committee. Discipline clubs recognize that anti-calendars are a good idea. With regards to the opposition for people to participate, she suggests to open the door for all members instead of leaving class rep positions uncontested. They need to equip committee with best resources for advocacy.

Ryan says he is not against adding discipline club reps, but removing Board reps.

Oghosa says that it is important to have Board members still part of the committee because they are the ones who put the work to action.

**The amendment fails.**



Oghosa says that it is important to have discipline clubs part of the committee, but not in a formal way they part of EngSoc. They serve to get work done and should not be hindered by getting more people.

**Ryan makes an amendment to the terms of ref for AAC to add: discipline club reps are entitled to 3 votes.**

**Praneet seconds.**

Ryan says this will not put one group more important than the other.  
Praneet says get input from all bodies.

Cory asks how does 3 votes among 8 people work?

Ryan says that for a lot of faculty standing committee rep it's first come first serve. It's more procedural, but it's important to have it defined.

Cory asks if it makes more sense to have it evenly split?

Ryan says that it is hard to do that. This year's AAC tried to distribute votes so that everyone has a chance.

Teresa says that the incentive for discipline clubs to come out is the empowerment in knowing they do have a vote. She doesn't know if this is the best solution in this case. She wants to consider how to empower discipline clubs.

Praneet says if they want to get them more involved, it comes from VPA and president. Conversations with discipline clubs are not enough.

Teresa says that club chairs collect course syllabi all in good faith. The club chairs could have appointed someone, but they ended up doing it themselves. She says set instructions for discipline clubs and get it started right from get go.

Tabish cuts her off since she's not talking about the voting amendment.

Teresa says consider the empowerment factor and what a vote can do.

Ernesto sees the difficulty in this situation. If they do vote in favour, there are more clauses to consider. He wants a holistic revision rather than pass and then revise the entire terms of reference.

Ryan mentions discipline club members of the AAC.



Tabish says define the role.

**An amendment is made.**

**Shubham abstains.**

**The amendment passes.**

Praneet says that it is one thing getting recommendations from outgoing discipline clubs chairs. The next meeting with the VPA and President should be with the incoming discipline club chairs.

Faizan wants to consider alternatives to having discipline clubs chairs.

Tabish says that it is up to Oghosa and Ernesto.

Teresa acknowledges Praneet's points. She says that continuity is a concern and the next year's team is in control of this. Given the path that they [the relationship between discipline chairs and herself] are on now, that she is transitioning the team and risk management assessment, the harm it could bring does not outweigh benefit.

**Shubham moves to call the question.**

**Question failed.**

Peter suggests that instead of putting chairs under the President, put academic reps under the VPA.

Teresa says that's the motion.

Peter says to make it more inclined.

Tabish says this should be discussed outside of the Board meeting.

Peter asks if there is better way than calling and emailing for first come first serve for voting.

Tabish and Ryan said that votes are given to different people.

Peter wants to look over all terms of reference and make sure they are set. It is important that outgoing people know what's missing this year. He doesn't know if they are up to date with this.



Tabish closes speaker list.

**The motion as amended fails.**

**12. MOTION by the Search & Review committee to adjust the business manager's compensation package**

**WHEREAS** the Review Committee was struck by the Board in November 2014 to comprise of the President, VP Finance and one of the At Large Board representatives to review the performance and revise the compensation package for the Business Manager; and

**WHEREAS** the current Business Manager has held her position for four years and previous years did not provide due diligence in performance reviews; and

**WHEREAS** VP Finance has been successful at adopting the Faculty's staff performance assessment practices which was used by the Review Committee; and

**WHEREAS**, VP Finance has attached the projected modification; and

**WHEREAS** the President has attached a summary of the performance review

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** that the Board accepts the decisions and adjustments of the Review Committee

**Ryan seconds.**

Mehran says the table attached has 3 recommendations. Rhonda is only getting cost of living, not the 3-4%. It shows how the wage increase will affect EngSoc's budget. He recommends a 3.5% increase to fairly compensate Rhonda.

Teresa says they forwarded a performance review from faculty. Rhonda has excellent people skills; EngSoc is extremely unique and Rhonda provide excellent services. The contract tightens up so that language is more clear. The committee meets every year to help motivate Rhonda.

**Mehran moves to add: BIRT that the Society adopt a 3.5% wage increase over next 5 years.**

**Praneet seconds.**

Pierre asks if this includes next year?



Mehran says it starts July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Pierre asks why a 3.5% wage increase?

Mehran says they stuck it in the middle. The projections are in the three recommendations.

Teresa says that since they are a not for profit organization, it makes sense to use something less than the University's 4%.

**The amendment passes.**

Pierre asks how they performed the performance review?

Mehran says that the document was sent out.

**The motion as amended passes.**

### **13. MOTION by Cory Sulpizi to amend the Policy on Club Affiliation**

**WHEREAS** the Engineering Society's mandate is to provide equal opportunities to all of its members; and

**WHEREAS** recognized clubs should act in the best interest of all of our members without discrimination and encourage members from all forms of demographics to participate; and

**WHEREAS** recognized clubs should hold environments inclusive to people of all backgrounds;

**BE IT RESOLVED** that section 1.2 be added to the Policy on Club Affiliation, which reads:  
1.2. The club must be inclusive to all members of the Engineering Society, regardless of language, gender, ethnicity, religion, or any other visible or non-visible characteristic.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that all other sections of the Policy on Club Affiliation are renumbered accordingly.

**Teresa seconds.**

Cory says that at the surface it seems straight forward, but there are two issues: one issue was brought up today, while the other issue is language. Clubs that want to operate in another language do not follow this policy (e.g. CESA). He asks if language



should be included? If they want to be inclusive of all members, they should have English.

Tabish asks if this is about membership?

Cory says it's affiliation.

Pierre says they must give certain clubs and minorities space to discuss issues, and if they can only discuss issues in particular language, this opens huge can of worms. Language bars clubs from a space they consider safe.

Cory says that language is an outside one and they can neglect it. He asks if the other ones are an issue? (e.g. an all girls room to discuss sexual issues)

Pierre recommends to change it to clubs social events should be inclusive to all. For example, they could have an all girls' sexual assault panel.

Shuhbam asks if there are any complaints of excluding people?

Pierre says that KESA runs their events in Korean.

Ernesto suggests that given context of today's meeting, take it to April 1st meeting. It is more of an equity issue.

Tabish says to refer it to the Policy and Structures meeting.

**The motion fails.**

#### **14. SPECIAL MOTION by Cory Sulpizi to amend the automatic recall clauses in Bylaw 1**

**WHEREAS** the Engineering Society added an "automatic recall" for Board of Directors members in Bylaw 1 in 2012; and

**WHEREAS** the automatic recall clauses do not fairly reflect extraneous circumstances, including but not limited to medical emergencies, family emergencies, or other unavoidable absences;

**BE IT RESOLVED** that section 4.1, which reads:

*4.12 Automatic Recall*

*4.12.1 A Board member shall be immediately recalled upon:*

- a) Absence without regrets from two regular meetings of the Board of Directors, or*
- b) Absence from three regular meetings of the Board of Directors, except those taking place*



---

Be amended to read:

*4.12 Automatic Recall*

*4.12.1 A Board member shall be immediately recalled upon the following conditions:*

- a) Absence without regrets from two regular meetings of the Board of Directors, or*
- b) Absence from three regular meetings of the Board of Directors, except those taking place the Summer Months.*

*4.12.2 A Board Member's absence may be neglected in section 4.12.1 if the Board Member's absence is proven to be extraneous, at the discretion of the Speaker.*

**Ernesto seconds.**

Cory says that this was brought up last meeting and that there are certain circumstances where people have to miss meetings (e.g. Karan's absence today or if someone hypothetically has a medical emergency).

Tabish says that there are people who can't make Board meetings because they have other things going on. This motion is a good thing to have in place.

Ryan is concerned that they had to recall 4 board members this year he agrees with this. He says to look at attendance requirements as well because they are losing people to meet quorum requirements.

Pierre says that this is kind of corrupt. The majority of the Board can appoint a Speaker and the Speaker can recall anyone they believe don't have a legitimate excuse. There should be specific reasons, such as death or infirmity. It shouldn't be up to the Speaker to decide which club meeting is more important for example.

Cory says that a clause specifying the reason doesn't fit in with this.

Shubham says that in order to handle this kind of issue, add a BIFR clause.

Many members present agree that the Speaker should overruled by majority.

**Shubham wants to add the amendment: BIFRT the Speaker should inform board anytime an absence is neglected ~~and the reason.~~**

Marissa says that she understands logic, but some may not want their reasons to be publicized and discussed.

Pierre suggests that they could say "family emergency".

Teresa says the spirit is fantastic, but it presents lot of complications. She is always thinking about what organization is inheriting and she agrees with Pierre. She has zero



tolerance for allowing the slightest bit of corruption. Wording is critical. EngSoc isn't going anywhere, so it is prudent to pass motions that allow zero risk. The risk that Pierre presented is too big.

Cory says the risk is not there because the Board can overrule the Speaker.

Shubham says he doesn't see the risk there if the Board can overturn the Speaker's decision.

Ernesto says to keep in mind that corruption can exist in other avenues, which is why they have an Ombudsman to voice complaints. Any organization will have risk, so they should create avenues to mitigate these risks.

Pierre says if they want to let it slide, they will only be doing a favour. It's not worse than it is now. Allow the Board to overrule speaker.

Praneet suggests that instead of giving discretion to speaker, have a unanimous vote.

Cory says he didn't put that because it won't become very cumbersome.

Tabish says that they are overcomplicating the situation. If the Speaker says no, the Board can overrule.

Shubham moves to call question.

Praneet seconds.

Cory wants to remove the reason.

Tabish says the question has been called. They are going in circles.

Cory says to strike the reason.

**Shubham makes an amendment to the amendment: strike the reason.**

**Cory seconds.**

Question is called

**Amendment passes.**

Back to the motion



Teresa says when one looks at system, one designs it with as few points of failure as possible. This motion adds lot of complications, she recommends to keep things simple. Cory says it is not complicated.

**The motion as amended passes.**

Vinson's absence is being neglected.

Faizan needs to be added to the mailing list and doodle.

**15. MOTION by Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patiño to establish precedent on Bylaw 2 interpretation regarding eligibility of Temporary Directors to run for Permanent Directorships.**

**WHEREAS** Bylaw 2 currently lists Temporary Internal Directors under Project Directors, and

**WHEREAS** Project Directors are not eligible to run for their same position unless they have held office for less than 2 months (Bylaw 2, CH0.1.2), and

**WHEREAS** A Temporary Internal Director running for a Project Directorship created based on the Temporary Internal Directorship would not violate the provisions of Bylaw 2, CH.0.1.2 because the Temporary Internal Directorship is considered a separate and distinct position, even in the case where the Project Directorship was created directly from the Temporary Internal Directorship,

**BE IT RESOLVED** that this board officially establishes precedent for the eligibility of Temporary Internal Directors running for Permanent Directorships.

**Pierre seconds.**

Ernesto says there is confusion on how this bylaw should be interpreted. The Temporary Director is its own Directorship. The Temporary Directorship is transitioned to Permanent Directorship through year.

Pierre says just vote.

Matthew says there is an established precedence in running for Officers. In Officer Bylaw, once one is elected for a position, they cannot run for the exact same or similar position. If a similar position is being created, they should not reappoint it to the Temporary Director.



Cory says to keep in mind the reason behind not letting project directors run for same position again. This is in place so that everyone has fair chance and the leadership is not stagnant.

Tabish asks what is the precedence?

Ernesto says a person can run from the Temporary Directorship to the same Permanent Directorship if established. Establishing the Directorship is a different entity. There is a purpose that bylaws are set in a way and not establishing precedence goes against the bylaw.

Tabish says what Cory said is the ethical point of view. From a legal perspective, Temporary Directors can run for the same Permanent Directorship.

Pierre says that is not true.

Tabish says that now they can run.

Pierre says if this motion fails, counter precedence is set to not let people run again.

Teresa says there is value in annual leadership turnover. The project experiences different styles of leadership and growth. If a project is in its early stages, it's okay if the Temporary Directors pursue Permanent Directorship. This allows projects in its baby stages to stabilize and after year passes turn over to annual leadership turnover.

Matt is concerned that setting this precedent sets a path where they can set precedence where a person can keep running for the same position.

Teresa says to follow the bylaws.

Ernesto says there is a problem. The same body that set bylaws is interpreting it. Interpreting is the motion alone. He says to discuss how to change bylaws, so this precedence is nullified, not by discussing Nico's case.

Matthew asks by setting precedence now, how will it apply to future?

Saathank asks do temp directors receive a green hardhat?

Teresa says yes.

Tabish says the policy on hardhats got repealed.

Cory says it is no big deal, they can put it back.



Ernesto says the way the bylaw is written, this is how it will be interpreted.

Tabish says there should be an informed decision if Temporary Director should be allowed to run for Project Director or not.

Cory is against this because it is the same directorship. They are basically letting them run twice.

Ernesto asks why they can't interpret bylaws as that?

**Matthew moves for an amendment: add "similarly named Directorship "**

Ernesto says the point was that the way the bylaws were written now was the way to interpret them and that therefore temporary internal directors were allowed to run for permanent directors, because the clause of 'similar position' applies to officers, not directors.

Pierre says he's right, it doesn't contradict bylaw. Congratufuckinglations. Cory has an argument, on meta level.

Matthew says that the bylaw states that Officers not allowed to run for the same or similarly named position.

Ernesto says that they are different entities.

Teresa says that VP Activities used to run Orientation. Back in that year, the VP Activity ran for Orientation Chair, but it was the same position. Removing context out of current motion, the motion is clarifying how it should be read.

Matthew says there is no documentation in the CRO archives of such a decision.

Cory says it speaks to what to go towards in future, try to change bylaw to make sure it's fine again.

Ernesto calls the question.

Shubham seconds.

**Amendment fails.**

**The motion passes.**



## 16. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION – Bylaw 2 Structure

Cory asks to discuss this later?

Ernesto wants to discuss this in a more relaxed environment. Temporary Internal Directors should be considered a third category. The current appeals commitment only deals with elections. They need someone to deal with how to interpret bylaws.

Tabish says Ernesto can discuss this with the Policy and Structures committee.

Pierre says to write a draft, bring it to the Policy and Structures committee, then bring to Board for discussion.

## 17. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION - Appeals panel for conflict resolution.

Teresa says there already is an elections appeal committee.

Ernesto suggests creating an organization involved with bylaw interpretation. He asks if they are acting as they're supposed to interpret bylaws? This body can step in if there is a dispute. They can deal with issues through the society not just elections.

Mehran says there is the ombudsman.

Ernesto says the ombudsman deals with complaints.

Teresa says that is an interesting idea to consider. Officers report to the Board, who does board report to? The university in the process of a be all end all appeals, the Student Society Summit. How should this appeals board should be structured? How do these students get appointed? Versus an Appeals Board with actual professionals. This is something for Ernesto to keep on his radar.

Ernesto says that this is more within themselves.

Teresa says that faculty wide there is an Internal Appeals committee. She wants to consider if the Board is the ultimate decision making body and also the faculty wide committee.

## 18. OTHER BUSINESS

Pierre wants to condemn Team Change U of T.



Tabish reads Yerusha's message. She says that during the UTSU electoral debates, the VP University Affairs candidate from the Change U of T slate, Xinbo Zhang, expressed that he would not entertain the wish of engineers to divert fees to EngSoc or to transfer representation to EngSoc. This is alarming and engineering students need to know the possible consequences of voting for this candidate.

They watch the video of the electoral forum, where Change U of T's VP University Affairs candidate says that engineers are represented.

Ernesto says bite me and that shit don't fly.

**MOTION by Pierre Harfouche for EngSoc to condemn Team Change U of T**

**WHEREAS** at the University of Toronto Students' Union electoral forum, candidates for Vice-President University Affairs were asked how they would address the referendums in Engineering with regards to UTSU fees and representation.

**WHEREAS** the Vice-President University Affairs candidate for team change, Ximbo Zhang, replied that the UTSU represents all student and did not speak to making progress towards working to accomplish the goals of the referendum.

**WHEREAS** Team Change endorses this viewpoint.

**BIRT** the Engineering Society condemns team Change U of T.

**BIFRT** the Engineering Society implores Engineering Candidates on the Change U of T slate to run as independent candidates to represent the interests of Engineering students.

**Shubham seconds.**

Ryan and Saarthak abstain.

**The motion passes.**

Milan gives updates about Orientation. He put up applications for Vice Chairs and selected the team. They are discussing events (fuck Frosh Nite), reorganizing scheduling and discussing with other Orientation leaders (Ryerson, Arts and Science). The first GM is next week, and he will put up Head Leedur and Subcommittee applications immediately after.

Saarthak says that there is better exec team than last year.



**University of Toronto Engineering Society**  
**March 2015 Board of Directors Meeting Agenda**

*March 21, 2015*  
*10:00am*  
*GB202*

---

**19. ADJOURNMENT (3:19 PM)**

**Moved by Praneet.**

**Seconded by Cory.**



## Attendance

<b>Officers</b>		
President	Teresa Nguyen	
VP Finance	Mehran Hydari	
VP Communication	Karan Shukla	
VP Academic	Ryan Gomes	
VP Student Life	Cory Sulpizi	
<b>Directors of the Board</b>		
At-Large	Praneet Bagga	
At-Large	Peter Luo	
At-Large	Yerusha Nuh	
At-Large	Marissa Zhang	
Chemical Representative	Ishan Gupta	
Civil Representative	Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patino	
Computer Representative	Shubham Manchanda	
Electrical Representative	Anamjit Singh Sivia	
Engineering Science Representative	Ashkan Parcham-Kashani	
Industrial Representative	Benjamin Leung	
Materials Science Representative	Vinson Truong	
Mechanical Representative	Faizan Akbani	
Mineral Representative	<i>Vacant</i>	
First Year	Stephen Xu	
First Year	Francis Kang	
First Year	Saarthak Saxena	
Speaker (Non-Voting)	Tabish Gilani	

**A – Absent**

**AwR – Absent with Regrets**

**P – Proxy**