



July 2015 Board of Directors Meeting

1. Adoption of the Agenda

MOTION by Rachel to add agenda item 7 and renumber everything accordingly:

MOTION by Rachel Reding to approve changes to the Engineering Society Budget for the 2015-2016 Skule Year

WHEREAS the Engineering Society Budget for the 2014-2015 Skule Year currently has \$2700 allocated for UTEK, \$3000 for Hi Skule, \$14,000 for Handbook, \$6,319.96 for Skulebook, \$7,515 for Toike, \$1,500 for Cannon, \$7000 for Cannonball, \$10,400 for Gradball, \$1,200 for Archivist, \$100 for Alumni Outreach \$3,500 for Cannon Guard \$100 for Webmaster, \$1000 LGMB, \$250 for CRO, and \$5,500 for Blue and Gold;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Engineering Society Budget for the 2015-2016 year be amended to have \$3000 allocated to UTEK, \$2600 for Hi Skule, \$12,620 for Handbook, \$7,150 for Skulebook, \$9,750 for Toike, \$5,550 for Cannon, \$7,700 for Cannonball, \$12,900 for Gradball, \$1,640 for Archivist, \$650 for Alumni Outreach, \$4,700 for Cannon Guard, \$145 for Webmaster, \$1,850 for LGMB, \$685 for CRO, and \$10,150 for Blue and Gold for the 2015-2016 year.

Motion passed.

MOTION by Matthew Lee to amend the agenda with Motion 10 as Motion 8 and renumber everything accordingly.

Motion passed.

Agenda adopted at 1:32 PM

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

Ernesto: if you see disclaimer, there was a virus. Did everyone confirm that it was the true results.

Raffi: I amended Tabish's motion to have the Nomination Period end on Monday.

Billy: We'll put it off until next meeting.



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

Minutes approved.

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

Minutes approved.

5. Officer & Orientation Reports

a. President – Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patino (Appendix D)

Milan: I'm in favour of the Godiva Hymn competition. I suggest we constrain timeline to around Godiva Week for more engagement and excitement.

Aidan: Are we just adding verses or deleting them?

Ernesto: Yes, we're adding new ones. Currently the song is more representative of what engineering used to be. I've contacted the LGMB, OC and B&G.

Raffi: Since it's a traditional song with a lot of history, have you consider making a new song?

Ernesto: It's very tied with engineers, so a new song may not fly.

Raffi: At the August Board meeting, there will be a lot of discussion about voting.

b. VP Finance – Rachel Reding (Appendix E)

c. VP Communications – Reena Cabanilla (Appendix F)

Tabish: It's good to get the PSC minutes approved by board.

Raffi: What is the vision?

Reena: We'll have a schedule of what documents we'll edit throughout the year. I'll split up the work and assign sections for everyone to do. Everyone comes to the meetings with suggested changes for their sections. At the PSC meeting, we'll discuss those changes, then we'll submit motions to the Board with those changes.



Milan: The idea was to come prepared for PSC meeting with improvements.

Raffi: When is the first meeting?

Reena: We're still scheduling it. I need to check the doodle.

Raffi: And can students submit edits to PSC?

Reena: I'll email membership a week before asking for requests.

- d. VP Academic – Oghosa Igbinakenzua (Appendix G)
- e. VP Student Life – Madeleine Santia (Appendix H)

Apurv: Would the efficiency be better with new club website? How will that be improved this year?

Maddy: Once we look at it, I'll send out mass email. Some clubs send the wrong email.

Cory: Can you check if there's two email addresses, they have to make it same?

Maddy: I can check, but it should go through.

- f. Orientation Chair- Milan Maljkovic

Ernesto: The mental health event is an event the Officers are working on in collaboration with Orientation; Rachel is the backbone. I contacted Estelle and they're helping us.

Tabish: How much is the Leedur trip?

Milan: \$40

6. MOTION by Madeleine Santia to approve the parking spot rules by the Board of Directors

WHEREAS the BoD approved \$2640 to be allocated to procure a parking spot for the Engineering Society from July 2015 to June 2016; and

WHEREAS it was requested that the booking procedure for the parking spot be developed by the officers and approved by the board at a later meeting;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Engineering Society accepts the rules and



regulations prepared by the Officers in order to allow for use by ~~design teams~~ by Clubs, Directors or Ex-Officios pertaining to their society business (Appendix I).

Seconded by Milan.

Maddy amends the BE IT RESOLVED clause from “for use by design teams” to “for use by clubs, directors or ex-officios”.

Amendment passes.

Milan: Should we amend that it's for use pertaining to the club?

Milan amends the last BE IT RESOLVED clause to add “pertaining to their society business”

Amendment passes.

Maddy: It's only for use by Affiliated Clubs.

Milan: Will there be a policy at some point?

Ernesto: By virtue of approving the rules, we are approving that they will be enforceable. I don't know if we would use it next year. I'm not sure if it's worth making a formal policy.

Motion as amended carries.

7. MOTION by Rachel Reding to approve changes to the Engineering Society Budget for the 2015-2016 Skule Year

WHEREAS the Engineering Society Budget for the 2014-2015 Skule Year currently has \$2700 allocated for UTEK, \$3000 for Hi Skule, \$14,000 for Handbook, \$6,319.96 for Skulebook, \$7,515 for Toike, \$1,500 for Cannon, \$7000 for Cannonball, \$10,400 for Gradball, \$1,200 for Archivist, \$100 for Alumni Outreach \$3,500 for Cannon Guard \$100 for Webmaster, \$1000 LGMB, \$250 for CRO, and \$5,500 for Blue and Gold;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Engineering Society Budget for the 2015-2016 year be amended to have \$3000 allocated to UTEK, \$2600 for Hi Skule, \$12,620 for Handbook, \$7,150 for Skulebook, \$9,750 for Toike, \$5,550 for Cannon, \$7,700 for Cannonball, \$12,900 for Gradball, \$1,640 for Archivist, \$650 for Alumni Outreach, \$4,700 for Cannon Guard, \$145 for Webmaster, \$1,850 for LGMB, \$685 for CRO, and \$10,150 for Blue and Gold for the 2015-2016 year.



Oghosa seconds

Rachel: When we created the budget, the only people who completed it were myself and Ernesto. At last FC meeting, we reviewed all the director budgets and these are the changes we propose. If there are any specific questions about changes, Esther has good notes in the FC minutes.

Milan: Where was it outlined?

Billy: Appendix B

Milan moves for 5 minute recess at 14:14.

Apurv seconds.

Motion carries (with intent of looking through FC minutes)

Meeting back to order 14:20

Milan: For clarification on the Cannon Newspaper, where did the increase come from?

Rachel: Originally, I budgeted it off what they got last year. When I amended the budget for them, I talked to Edgar to understand where increase was coming from and compared it to other publications. After doing that research better we increased it for them.

Milan: Same question for Blue and Gold.

Rachel: Same thing; it was broken down more item wise. Now we got a better idea of what they were doing. There are a few items for repair. We cut that for the budget because it's a special project. For events, we thought it was viable to give them money for that.

Motion carries.

8. 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;

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.

Raffi seconds.

Billy reads Matthew's statement: The Engineering Society as often preached about the need for transparency in our system and how we have done that in our current system. However, one of the most crucial aspects of transparency that is used in many entities with Board of Directors is the documentation of voting habits of its members. While we can say that often the motions put forth to our Board is passed with unanimous consent, over the years that have also been numerous motions that were divisive in the votes. There have also been several occasions where abstention due to conflicts were not properly noted in the minutes and led to issues with recollection further down the line. This implementation can resolve all those issues and allow the rest of the Society's members to better see the workings of the Board. It also makes Directors more accountable to their discipline members by having concrete records of how they vote on motions and if they reflect what their members want of their representation. Overall, this makes the Board more transparent without adding extensive workload. Rejection of this resolution, from my perspective, constitutes secrecy on the part of the Directors and not the transparency the Society has openly acknowledged in its institution.

Aidan: These meetings are already open to every member. This could add a lot of time. Is this legal through Robert's Rules?

Tabish: Yes. Any member who attends a board meeting can ask for a vote to be taken on roll call.



Cory: I recommend to do this informally first. It might end up being unnecessary. If we want specific motions to have that, we can do that.

Raffi: I think it's a step in the right direction. It's implementable. Every member in their constituency has a right to know how their elected member is voting.

John: A lot of real governments practice this. All of our thoughts do get voiced in the minutes. I agree with Cory.

Milan: We have to keep in mind for summer months that people aren't able to attend. This would service people who aren't able to attend meetings. Also I don't think we need to test it. We can implement it and see if it works. There are a lot of motions in the past where I voiced my concerns but vote that way anyways.

Andrew: I don't know if this is something necessary. I think people care more about what's passed and didn't.

Cory: Instead of roll call, we could ask who's in favour, who's against, etc.

Milan: It's not our decision for people to show up, I don't think saying people don't care is an excuse.

John: Should we make this effective for next meeting?

Cory moves to amend: BIRFT all votes on motions conducted at Board of Directors meetings be recorded by the minute taker.

Aidan: Should we forward this to PSC?

Raffi: No, it's an issue for the BoD. It should be decided by you.

Ernesto: I don't think it's prudent to push everything to PSC. It's more of a procedural decision.

Kevin: I don't know if I agree fully with the amendment. I'm not sure if it makes sense to say the minute taker has to do it right away.

Cory: We can implement any system we want.

Ernesto: It's procedural. The motion is not enforceable until the minutes are approved. It won't be recorded for this meeting. We can informally let people know how people voted

Raffi: Can we informally practice it here?



Ben: We can just ask every time there's a vote.

Billy: I am looking into technical system where those with laptops and smartphones can add themselves to speaker list.

Robert: Tophat?

Tabish moves to call the question.

Ernesto seconds.

Question called.

Amendment passes.

Motion carries.

9. MOTION by Matthew Lee to adjust discipline club funding for inflation

WHEREAS the Engineering Society has increased the fees collected from its members by the annual inflation indicated by the CPI over the past few years;

WHEREAS the Engineering Society has not made the corresponding adjustments to Discipline Club funding, as prescribed in Bylaw 7, since 2012.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT ~~the funding allocations to Discipline Clubs be corrected for inflation on key items used by the clubs, effective immediately, to the amount of \$4.78 per student from \$4.50 per student (increase of 6.15%).~~ the funding allocations to the Discipline Clubs be increased every year by the percentage that the membership fees may be increased as per bylaw 1, section 1.2.4;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT VP Finance brings to the August BoD meeting a proposed increase for 2015-2016 Discipline Club allocations membership fees.

Tabish seconds.

Matthew's statement: It is pertinent to ensure that discipline club, which spends a large amount of funds to improve the student life aspects of their disciplines, to have appropriate funding for their activities. As mentioned in the motion itself, the Engineering Society has increased their student fees annually by the cost of inflation and since the last update of Bylaw 7, which specifies the funding formula; there has not been a corresponding increase to that funding. While other affiliated clubs can obtain funding from the Society



taking into account their actual costs, which incorporate inflation, in their budgets, the Discipline Clubs are limited in their funding to the amount prescribed in the bylaw. Therefore, it is important to rectify this 3 year gap and ensure Discipline Clubs are not working with relatively shrinking budgets.

Ernesto amends the BE IT RESOLVED clause: the funding allocations to the Discipline Clubs be increased every year by the percentage that the membership fees may be increased as per bylaw 1, section 1.2.4

Tabish seconds.

Aidan: It makes sense to standardize all of the fees. Inflation is not a constant rate, whereas cost of living is consistent.

Raffi: How are increases in student membership incurred?

Ernesto: We approve the increase.

Raffi: We don't have it approved for this year already?

Ernesto: We do it at the end of each academic year. We have to submit this to the Vice Provost. I want to do this for this Discipline Clubs. We have to make an amendment.

Milan: I'm in favour of the amendment

Milan moves to call question.

Oghosa seconds.

No one objects.

Amendment passes unanimously.

Kevin: What would happen if we do \$4.75 instead of \$4.78?

Milan: \$4.78 is not value we're discussed. \$4.78 is no longer relevant. Kevin was saying to round it out to 5 or 0. It could end up being a drastic change.

Raffi: How would it affect the deficit or surplus in the budget?

Rachel: Depends on a few things. Right now we're operating on a deficit. We're doing things that could allow us to get more budget. All I could say is it could put us more into a deficit.



Aidan: Regarding what Kevin said about rounding, that only happens when you pay for things in cash because we don't make pennies.

Ernesto: That last BIR clause was change. Whenever we calculate percentage fee, we take the percentage and multiply it by Discipline Club funding.

Rachel: We can't cut pennies because it's a big difference in the scale of operations.

Raffi moves to call the question.

Maddy seconds.

Question is not called.

Milan: Discussing updating this for next year based on percentage, is there an amendment for this upcoming year?

Ernesto: We can say "BIFRT membership fees be approved"?

Raffi: Can we table Milan's potential amendment to next meeting so Rachel can make calculations?

Milan amends: BIFRT VP Finance brings to the August BoD meeting a proposed increase for 2015-2016 Discipline Club allocations membership fees

Milan: Can I have clarification for Discipline Club funding? Because Rachel is intending to secure Discipline Club funding by next meeting.

Ernesto: The procedure is they submit their budget and we're proposing to approve it next meeting. I suggest to put this motion before the other one.

Aidan: What if we don't plan Discipline Club funding based on the original schedule?

Milan: We're leaving this until the August BoD meeting. There we will discuss whether we make adjustments for the August BoD meeting or not.

Milan moves to call question.

Aidan seconds.

Question called.

All in favour.



Amendments pass unanimously.

Aidan calls the question.

Milan seconds.

Question called.

Motion carries unanimously.

10. MOTION by Matthew Lee to establish incentives for election staff

WHEREAS in the past years, attracting and retaining, sufficient and competent election staff has been problematic;

WHEREAS the CRO has faced difficulties in conducting elections to the highest standards as a result of low staff support;

WHEREAS colleges across the university have utilized an honourarium to garner higher interest for these positions;

WHEREAS to help obtain a larger pool of applications from which Council can select a CRO, and from which the CRO can select a competent support staff;

WHEREAS the amount of compensation does not greatly influence the Engineering Society's finances given the consistent unused election budget;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT an honourarium of \$1200 annually be established for the incentivized recruitment and retention of election staff;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT \$600 of the honourarium be earmarked specifically for the CRO with the remaining amount distributed to the support staff hired by the CRO in amounts reflective of their performance, as reviewed by the CRO at the completion of each election cycle.

No one seconds.

Motion fails.

11. MOTION by Matthew Lee to Investigate Discipline Club Funding

WHEREAS the Engineering Society currently uses a funding formula of \$1000 (\$250 for Track One) + \$4.50 per student for Discipline Clubs;



WHEREAS data taken from the Engineering Society budget of June in the 1T3-1T4 year is presented in Appendix J indicates the imbalance in funding per student;

WHEREAS this imbalance is, in essence, the use of funding from larger disciplines to subsidize those of smaller disciplines;

WHEREAS this is not a practical means of distributing student funding, considering that the per student funding for one club is more than triple that of some others;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Finance Committee investigate new means by which to allocate funding to discipline clubs which absolves the gross imbalance of per student funding;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the recommendations of the Finance Committee be presented at the September Board of Directors meeting and that the recommendations be such that implementation in the current academic year is possible.

Cory seconds.

Matthew's statement: For those who are unaware of the funding methodology for Discipline clubs, I have outlined it in the motion. Furthermore, I have conducted a brief analysis of what this constitutes in terms of per student funding which has been attached as an appendix. What is clearly evident, if you would all refer to the appendix, is an imbalance in the funding distribution to discipline clubs. For the upcoming year, full time students will pay \$24.43 per semester to the Society for their student fees, discounting fees to levies and EAA. Comparing this to the per student funding, I find the numbers shocking where for most clubs, they are getting a very small percentage of their member's fees while some clubs get a much bigger portion. As mentioned in the motion, this imbalance is in principle to be a welfare system to smaller disciplines at the expense of the larger ones. The root cause of this is the base \$1000 funding to each club regardless of size. While I understand the merit of providing a base amount to allow the clubs to function, the current method is not logical. Why is an entire discipline, specifically Mineral, who has 72 students (in the analysis timeframe) given 4 times the base funding compared to TrackOne who has more than double the student population?

Further analysis shown indicates the range of possibility from the current funding methodology to a purely per student funding method. Discounting the different base amount given to TrackOne, the effect is more pronounced with fewer students, as a result of splitting the base funding over fewer people.



While I believe the only financially logical way for funding allocation is for it to be purely population based, I recognize the large variability of funding from year to year and negative impact to smaller disciplines. However, I do not believe that to be any reason to continue this population-reciprocal trend in funding.

My suggestion to the Finance Committee is to establish a tiered system for the base funding, such as \$250 for clubs less than 250 members, \$500 for clubs with 250-500 members, etc. That way, the variability from year to year is reduced but gets the funding distribution more even. The funding does not have to be perfectly even but I believe that in order to be fair, a 5-10% range in difference is the maximum acceptable deviation.

This motion is not saying anything regarding the current funding system except to acknowledge there is an imbalance and that we need to address it. The current motion does not compel any specific method to be used but just for the Finance Committee to review, and possibly discuss, with discipline clubs to rebalance the funding.

Cory: Last year we briefly discussed locker allocations. Some clubs have a large amount of lockers. This is weird because some clubs have a lot of lockers and there are clubs that don't have lockers. There needs to be a better system for clubs to have equal funding.

Milan: Base funding is not accurate. The base funding is \$1000. If everybody gets equal funding, you're giving Min \$500 and ECE \$5000. It seems less fair.

Tabish: The problem with this motion is treating Discipline Club funding as a student entitlement fund. Base funding is for operations. \$4.50 per student is for any other event for that student. Min has 100, EngSci has 1000. Min has 100% participation, EngSci has 50. The major problem I have is that it doesn't account for active participation and members, and it's not a student entitlement fund.

Raffi: He's basing it off of one year. It should be based off many years. There's a discrepancy because of systematic problem of involving students.

Ernesto: The language of the motion is not proposing any solution, it's just instructing the FC. The FC is very busy. I'm very worried of setting a precedent of the Board pushing things to committees. If Matthew has an issue with this, he should bring a more concrete proposal instead of us doing the work for him.

Aidan: Most students that choose to get involved benefit equally if they choose to use those resources. Disciplines that are larger will benefit from this motion, students in smaller disciplines will get penalized. There's an overhead cost as long as we recognize that disciplines run their own events.



Ogi: If Discipline Clubs were funded without \$1000, Min would be affected the most. I asked the Min Club President, the first thing that would have to go is the Dinner Dance. With less funding, Min Club won't be able to contribute. I'm pretty sure Min has more than 72 students. The graphic is bit emphasized on Min. Discipline Clubs need funding allocated for operation costs.

Rachel: A lot of people have made the point about operational costs. Every student has a right to go to their own dinner dance. Changing funding allocation won't advantage many of the larger clubs either. I agree with Ernesto. Proposing a problem without a solution is difficult for us.

Tabish: I think we should still look at other ways to make it more equitable so that other sources of funding are considered. We should have someone look into this.

Cory: I don't care for the motion itself, but I urge Ernesto and Oghosa to look at the lockers.

Milan: We don't have Matthew here to give us insight. We can play around with the numbers so it would be even. Ernesto's point is important.

Milan moves to call the question.

Aidan seconds.

Question called.

Motions fails (no one in favour, no abstentions).

12. MOTION by Matthew Lee to add requirements for Speaker applicants

WHEREAS the role of Speaker of the Board is a position crucial to the efficient function of the Board of Directors;

WHEREAS to ensure both correct and consistent knowledge of procedures for the conduct of Board Meetings;

WHEREAS to ensure competency in the selection of a new Speaker each year;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the requirements for appointment as Speaker include the following, effective immediately:

1) Applicants must have concrete experience chairing meetings with the usage of Robert's Rules of Order, by means of holding a previous position in which



chairing meetings was the primary occupation in the group, and/or recognized training from an entity specializing in parliamentary procedures

2) Should all applicants not have the experience or credentials listed above, an appointee may be selected from applicants not holding the necessary qualifications but shall be required to obtain training in parliamentary procedures within 3 months of appointment

No on seconds.

Motion fails.

13. DISCUSSION ITEM: regarding changes to security following the recent break-in in Sandford Fleming

Ernesto: While the issue that happened got resolved, it doesn't mean that there are no concerns. This is the second break in we had. I emailed some stakeholders. Last Saturday there was a break and enter in one of the rooms in SF basement. The police was called. We released a statement and 4 days later got noticed that stuff returned. Back in January there was a break-in in the Blue and Gold room.

Aidan: They caused a lot of damage.

Ernesto: In response, we started a conversion with Blue and Gold, Cafe, Stores, Suds, Chief, and are putting together a proposal to install cameras in the entrances. Footage will be stored in a DVR and only accessed by me or Rhonda and cleared every month. Also we are discussing any policies about keys, safes. We would like to leave this meeting with a direction we would like to take. If we don't act, the Faculty would do it.

Robert: After this discussion, I propose to start a smaller committee, perhaps who have stakes in that, so we could take a clearer course of action. Perhaps we should consult professionals.

Milan: Did you also notify ECE club?

Ernesto: No, I forgot.

Apurv: Do we not have an alarm system for rooms in SF? Would it be out of our budget?

Ernesto: No, we're discussing that.

Billy: The concern with alarms are false alarms, which are costly.



Aidan: If people want to get into a room, they will get in, which is why need monitoring. It's dangerous to have the Faculty put cameras in the Pit. For example, we're not supposed to use power tools in the Pit.

John: It should be part of EngSoc's side. We should be extremely careful how we carry this out.

Milan: What Ernesto originally outlined, they won't point into the Pit. Just at doors on the east and north side.

Tejas: In the case that something does happen, what if something happens that is not related to us? What is the allowance of us giving them (e.g. Faculty) the footage? How would it work between EngSoc viewing and everyone else?

Ernesto: It's definitely a difficult problem. If someone broke in and stole something from the Faculty, we have to give footage. The way we angle the cameras we'll make sure they cover the entrances. Hopefully we'll be smart and not do anything in front of the cameras. Sometimes transit agencies put cameras on buses, but drivers don't want that. There's a policy that footage would not be used for performance assessments but if there was an assault for example. We would specify when to use footage.

Aidan: Make it clear that we need to control these not the Faculty.

Kevin: I'm concerned that if we install cameras it leads to complacency. It's not actually secured. If someone is serious about doing something, they could take that knowledge and get around it. There's merit to investigate other things. I know some doors have dead bolts. The other concern is how footage would be managed. It's important to have a policy that we would only look at if there's an incident. Also at what point do we let people review footage (e.g. if someone loses their pencil case). We should make sure people aren't constantly looking at the footage.

Billy: There is that legislator at bylaw level at the city level or university level.

Tabish: Is this legal? Are we legally allowed to record footage in a University of Toronto hallway, considering the hallway does not belong to EngSoc. Also, cameras should not be all end all of security.

John: What are the operating costs?

Colin: The DVR is a majority of cost, \$500-\$800. Cameras are \$50 each.

Raffi: It sets a dangerous precedence. If you see illegal activity, now the onus is on you to report footage.



Ernesto: I don't think it works like that. We are not hiring a security guard to look at that. If something happens, we'll look at the footage.

Tejas: We won't review footage until something happens. I was speaking with the building security guy. He only passes through once, is the only guy who goes through all the engineering buildings. Maybe we should approach Campus Police, with Faculty support about implementing more security guards.

Milan: The onus is on the respective clubs and organizations to implement their own security systems. It should be brought down to the club or director of the club. Instead of wiping footage every month, do a rolling system.

Billy: In all of legislation, it might cover this.

Tabish: I want to remind the Board that if this is a rival group, they will do whatever it takes. I don't think whole front should fall on the student organization.

Milan moves to suspend Robert's Rules until the end of the discussion.

Seconded by Robert.

Robert's Rules suspended.

Milan: The initial idea of cameras is to have an idea of who comes into and out of pit.

Robert: Security is not just preventing an entry but also delaying an entry.

John: I don't think cameras will even do that.

Colin: Cameras also reduce suspects.

John: Should we have transparency as to how information is stored?

Cory: It's not just for breaking into rooms. It's also good if someone is robbed, assaulted. It adds security.

Aidan: Regardless what will the Faculty say?

Ernesto: If we put cameras now, we'll show the Faculty we're ahead on that.



Aidan: There are groups out there that are looking to steal stuff. ESSCO put out a policy. Since it's been happening a lot to us, open the discussion to other engineering schools to say what is okay and what is not okay.

Raffi: Why is this topic for EngSoc to increase security? Why not the university?

Cory: I would rather have us take action than the university to protect students.

Tejas; I don't want to give the Faculty freedom to put cameras in the Pit.

Milan: It's a lot more expensive.

Colin: When will we see cameras put into effect?

Robert: As soon as possible.

Milan: Rather than striking a committee, is this something we could delegate as an action item?

Robert: It doesn't have to be a committee, maybe two people and any other people with interests.

Discussion closed.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

MOTION by Robert Goldberg to create the Privacy and Security Committee.

John seconds.

Raffi amends: "Privacy and Security" to read "Security and Privacy Committee"

Aidan: Change it so it's not worded as committee. Make the meeting open for people who are interested in it.

Cory: Such a meeting should happen as soon as possible.

Ernesto: Let's decide a deadline for the committee to bring forward a recommendation. I have a meeting with Professor Coyle on August 14.

Ernesto amends: BE IT RESOLVED THAT the committee brings a comprehensive proposal by August 1st.



Oghosa: What happens after this is resolved?

Billy: We delegate tasks to committee, then they take it to the Board.

Aidan amends: “Committee” to “ad-hoc Committee”.

Robert seconds.

Omnibus amendments pass unanimously.

Tejas: Is there a specific number of board members?

Robert amends: BIFRT two Board members will be part of the Committee.

Aidan amends: BIFRT this meeting is open to all stakeholders and members of the Board.

Tabish: Ernesto should not be chair but actively involved in the discussion. Have the committee decide the chair.

Raffi: Shouldn't the chair be VPSL since it's the responsibility of students?

Raffi amends: BIFRT the Chair should be the VPSL.

Milan: Now we're adding another point of bureaucracy. Let's just pick two people and keep Ernesto involved.

Maddy: Ernesto and I already talk about the DTA.

Ernesto: Maddy and I can co-chair. I will schedule a meeting soon, work out a proposal, and bring it to the Board then Professor Coyle.

Amendments are passed.

Milan: Instead of 6 BIFRT clauses, bring it down to 4.

Raffi moves to vote for two members now.

Motion passes.

Nominations: Robert, Aidan

Committee members: Robert and Aidan



Full motion:

MOTION by Robert Goldberg to create the Security and Privacy ad-hoc Committee

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Committee brings a comprehensive proposal by August 1st;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT two Board members will be part of the Committee;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this meeting is open to all stakeholders and members of the Board;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chair should be the VPSL.

Milan moves to call question.

Raffi seconds.

Question called.

Motion passed unanimously.

Oghosa moves to add a motion that the Officer team appoints two people go bowling with them at 6 PM.

Milan moves to suspend Robert's Rules.

Raffi seconds.

Aidan moves to informally do this after the Board meeting.

Billy rules to follow Aidan's suggestion.

Billy: We'll tentatively set the August meeting for the 29th.

Milan moves to adjourn.

John seconds.

15. ADJOURNMENT (4:15 PM)



Attendance

Officers		
President	Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patino	
VP Finance	Rachel Reding	P
VP Communication	Reena Cabanilla	
VP Academic	Oghosa Igbinakenzua	
VP Student Life	Madeleine Santia	
Directors of the Board		
At-Large	Kevin Rupasinghe	
At-Large	Ryan Gomes	
At-Large	Aidan Solala	
At-Large	John Sweeney	
Chemical Representative	Jason Tang	
Civil Representative	Peter Luo	
Computer Representative	Milan Maljkovic	
Electrical Representative	Andrew Boetto	
Engineering Science Representative	Apurv Bharadwaj	
Industrial Representative	Benjamin Leung	
Materials Science Representative	Amy Zhao	
Mechanical Representative	Robert Goldberg	
Mineral Representative	Ognjen Kelec	
<i>First Year</i>	<i>Vacant</i>	
<i>First Year</i>	<i>Vacant</i>	
<i>First Year</i>	<i>Vacant</i>	
Speaker (Non-Voting)	Billy Graydon	

A – Absent

AwR – Absent with Regrets

P – Proxy