



November Board of Directors Meeting

1. Adoption of the Agenda

MOTION by Ernesto to move item 9 to new item 3 and amend it to:

MOTION by Oghosa create the Mature Students' Chair

WHEREAS it has been identified that mature students within the Engineering Society have a significantly unique background prior to university in comparison to other first years

WHEREAS issues such as isolation, lack of peer feedback and mental health concerns have been raised as strong factors that affect mature students

WHEREAS we currently have 115 students within our society that were born before 1991 (>24 years old). Of these 18 were born before 1987 (>28 years old),

WHEREAS there currently exist no structure within the Engineering Society to foster a positive experience for the mature students demographic,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 2, section 2.11, subsection t) be added to read:

t) The Mature Students' Chair, elected by the membership.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 2, section 2.2.3, subsection b) be added to read:

b) The Mature Students' Chair

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the responsibilities for the Mature Student Chair Ex-Officio include the following:

- Foster a sense of community amongst mature students within the Skule Community
- Promote/Organize events to increase awareness of mature students cohort

Seconded by Milan.

No objections.



Motion carries.

MOTION by Ernesto to add a motion:

MOTION by Ernesto to call for an accountability meeting on January 21st at 6:00pm.

No objections.

Agenda amended.

MOTION by Rachel to move item 12 as new item 4.

Raffi seconds.

No objections.

Motion carries.

Agenda adopted (1:49 PM).

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

No objections.

Minutes approved.

- 3. ~~DISCUSSION ITEM on mature student issues within the faculty~~**

MOTION by Oghosa create the Mature Students' Chair

WHEREAS it has been identified that mature students within the Engineering Society have a significantly unique background prior to university in comparison to other first years

WHEREAS issues such as isolation, lack of peer feedback and mental health concerns have been raised as strong factors that affect mature students

WHEREAS we currently have 115 students within our society that were born before 1991 (>24 years old). Of these 18 were born before 1987 (>28 years old),

WHEREAS there currently exist no structure within the Engineering Society to foster a positive experience for the mature students demographic,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 2, section 2.11, subsection t) be added to read:



t) The Mature Students' Chair, elected by the membership.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 2, section 2.2.3, subsection b) be added to read:

b) The Mature Students' Chair

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the responsibilities for the Mature Student Chair Ex-Officio include the following:

- Foster a sense of community amongst mature students within the Skule Community
- Promote/Organize events to increase awareness of mature students cohort

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT nominations for the Mature Students' Chair be done in December and elections in the first week of January

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a report be submitted by the Mature Student's Chair in conjunction with the Vice-President Academic for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the position and for improvement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the report is due by April 1, 2016.

Oghosa: There's an issue identified by a mature student. There's a document outlining the guidelines for the Mature Students Chair.

Peter S.: I am Pankaj K. Singh, I go by Peter. I am 40+ and father of a 3 and half year old. Once we did everything early because life was short. It makes sense as life expectancy is increasing and it makes sense in today's world to come to school in later times in life. There are about 125 students now in the engineering, who can be categorized as mature students. As per a sources number is increasing. These students are not older high school students. They have lived lives and some of them have might have higher education, army services etc. Problems begin as they come to the Skule: 1. Frosh does not suit them and they miss opportunity to create bond with peers; 2. Faculty meet with parents does not invite them as it exclusively is "parents meet with faculty", not family meet; 3. They keep falling isolated and results in: a. Poor performance; b. inferiority feeling; c. Sense of isolation; 4. It seems that we are in a wrong place. Some quit. What can be done? We talk about it, so that people understand that there is some problem. Recognize and define the problem: 1. Stigma; 2. They are not visible (missing from the posters, we do not celebrate them or their success; 3. Vulnerable, intimidated, feel inferior and afraid; 4. We need to understand that what is the mental state of these



mature students; 5. View of society and inside the skull is still that “study is for young”. To do that an advocate is needed. Who should try to make change in the Skule’s environment? Try to improve interaction between mature students and younger students. Outreach to the community with message that UofT is such a good place for second carrier, more of them come here, easier and easier they feel. University of Toronto Engineering has addressed ageism, racism, rights of LGBT, now perhaps it is the time to address ageism. People change branches of engineering, we assume that they might have made a wrong decision at first place. What if they want to correct the decision after 20 years of engineering practice? I heard one professor speaking “How many doctors come to Engineering?” I want to ask another question, “Are we ready?”

Ernesto: it is very evident that the need to represent mature students exist, we are a society that prides itself in being inclusive. Times have changed and current traditions are not inclusive. The spirit of creating the Chair is that we now have a face and advocate for mature students. He could advise the Orientation Chair or Faculty if there is a problem.

Ernesto amends:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT elections for the Mature Students’ Chair be done in December.

Billy: Are there any upcoming elections?

Raffi: No, but there is exams.

Ernesto: We can have nominations in December, then do elections during Godiva Week.

Ernesto amends his amendment:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT nominations for the Mature Students’ Chair be done in December and elections in the first week of January

No objections.

Amendment passes.

Milan: This motion needs to happen. Election by the Membership is my concern. I don’t think it makes sense for Mature Students’ Chair should be elected by the Membership.

Milan amends:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Mature Students’ Chair be elected by the mature student body



Raffi: It's logistically impossible for only mature students to elect a chair. We would have to have a meeting for only mature students.

Ernesto: I agree with the issue, but the problem is we have the issue of self-identification. There is no clear line in what constitutes a mature student. We are assuming that only the people that are interested in this are going to vote. If we were to see something is going wrong, we can change it. For the first year, we should make it easier for us and let the Membership vote.

Raffi: Wouldn't it make more sense to have a club of mature students, as opposed to a chair?

Peter S.: We talked about making a club. A club does not have that sort of part to talk to the Chair of Engineering. We could if we have a speaker who represents mature students. It makes a lot of sense that only mature students do work for them, but many of the good things that have been done for the students have been done by students that aren't represented by them. The main important issue is that we bring this issue into the light.

Raffi: Doesn't this conflict with Bylaw 1, where we define membership? We only have three types of membership, but we don't really define what a mature student is?

Billy: We don't define what a fourth-year is for Fourth-year Chair.

Raffi: This is more ambiguous.

Billy: We would have to make necessary amendments.

Milan: I went into this amendment assuming the Mature Students' Chair is a mature student.

Milan moves to withdraw his amendment.

No objections.

Amendment withdrawn.

Oghosa: We felt that having a club would be hard to maintain over time. If it's directly embedded in EngSoc's structure, it's easy to maintain.

Raffi: Why is this under VPA instead of VPSL? It sounds more like student life issues.



Peter S.: The issue is that mature students don't interact with anything. Then I was pointed to a member of the AAC. Then we talked to other people, to Micah Stickle, then it seemed reasonable.

Ernesto: A lot of the issues are about academic advocacy. VPSL has more directors to oversee than VPA, so we're trying to balance it. Both ways is fine.

Ben: Why are we trying to create this as an Ex-Officio and not a Project Directorship?

Ernesto: Project Directors are task specific, not representatives. Many Ex-Officios are representatives.

Peter L.: If we have a need for it, there will always be a club for it. There's always a possibility that no one will run for it.

Peter S.: Can a club head go to the Faculty and request "this doesn't seem well", can they go to other schools and speak that we have an assembly for mature students? It would be understatement to say a club would say all the purposes.

Milan: There's no reason to say we can also have a club if people feel the need for it. At the end of the day this is a representative. They can go to faculty, other schools and present themselves as a representative

Peter L: We can look into if a club can do that. Mature students make up about 2% of student body, whereas international students make up about 30-45%. Should we also look at larger constituencies?

Ernesto: We have to look at things at a case by case basis. If international students feel underrepresented, we can do something. I'm an international student and I feel services by the CIE are good. This particular case really needs it.

Peter L: I don't know if chair is right way to go, but I don't have a solution.

Peter S.: These people are coming more and more in numbers. It is about the trend. More and more people will come to this university. Perhaps in future years we won't need this anymore. We need it because increasing people are afraid to do that. The basic problem is that we are trying to foster a social movement, not satisfying 150 people.

Peter L: I'm not opposed to the idea, but I don't know if this is the best way to go.



Raffi: I'm a firm believer if you want to try something new, you have to do it, but evaluate the effectiveness.

Raffi amends:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a report be submitted by the Mature Student's Chair in conjunction with the Vice-President Academic for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the position and for improvement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the report is due by April 1, 2016.

Milan seconds.

No objections.

Amendment carries.

Ben: Other examples where we created an initiative, like Alumni Outreach, we created something temporary before creating something permanent. There's nothing in the bylaws to create a temporary Ex-Officio. I think this is something to consider.

Milan: The role of Alumni Outreach is different. This is an issue of representation. I don't see this as a logistical issue for EngSoc.

Raffi: The University or Faculty doesn't do much to accommodate mature students. I think we need to give this position some kind of weight or power.

Ernesto moves to call question.

No objections.

Question called.

Ben and Peter L. abstain.

Everyone else in favour.

Motion carries.

4. ELECTION of the Mental Wellness Director (recommendations in Appendix L)

Rachel: One of the things I wanted to tackle was mental wellness. I wanted to host events every month, but it was taking a lot a time and I felt I wasn't doing



it due diligence and felt it called for a director. We did a call for director, had 20 applicants and did 12 interviews.

Avineet was elected.

5. **Approval** of the Finance Committee Meeting Minutes (Appendices B)

No objections.

Minutes approved.

6. **Approval** of the Academic Advocacy Committee Meeting Minutes (Appendices C1-C2)

No objections.

Minutes approved.

7. **Approval** of the Policies and Structures Committee Minutes (Appendix D)

No objections.

Minutes approved.

8. **Approval** of the Affiliation Committee Minutes (Appendices E)

No objections.

Minutes approved.

9. **Officer & Orientation Reports**

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

Milan: What services are from SGSU?

Ernesto: Winterfest.

Raffi: Can I submit a verse?

Ernesto: Yes.

Raffi: Why do you feel the UTSU does not represent St. George students?

Ernesto: There's a lack of unity on this campus. The St. George round table was created. UTM has the UTMSU to speak for them.



Raffi: If UTMSU were to leave, would the St. George round table dissolve?

Ernesto: No, but SGSU would not move forward

Raffi: UTM can get 500 signatures to call another general meeting. there's a possibility we'll have to rally again.

Billy: Any discussion of that at UTSU board meetings?

Raffi: Not to my knowledge.

Twesh: For the referendum, what are you expecting students to say? How will it be worded?

Ernesto: There will have to be more background on why we have to pay. There will be context.

Twesh: Will that be money they will otherwise pay the UTSU?

Ernesto: It's additional, but maybe a dollar.

Twesh: Who is in the round table?

Ernesto: Colleges and first entry professional faculties. Not law or medicine. We want to have them part of the round table, but we'll have to consult them.

Twesh: Will the AGM be in November next year?

Ernesto: It will be in February.

Raffi: The question for the referendum will have to be posed in the positive.

Kevin: I know it's only \$1, but for Blue Sky we heard of someone wanting to get back their 13 cents. I want to caution that if all they see is UTM and UTSU bickering, there might face backlash from that side.

Ernesto: We have to tackle those things before the AGM.

Raffi: Be careful with quorum requirement for the referendum. There is a lot of apathy.

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



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

Raffi: How was the parking spot?

Maddy: Think it's kind of a fail. People are not really using it.

Raffi: Hopefully it's better in second semester.

Maddy: I'm going to send out a reminder in second semester.

- f. Orientation Chair – Milan Maljkovic (Appendix K)

Ernesto: Consent was not an issue in the incident?

Milan: Yes. She indicated she was not comfortable and he left. I saw her later in the week, so it doesn't seem to be a big issue but it does raise flags.

10. MOTION by Raffi Dergalstanian to elect two (2) Directors the Board to the Election Rules Committee

WHEREAS bylaw 3, section 8.0.1 states: 8.0.1. There shall be an Election Rules Committee, comprising:

- a. The CRO;
- b. The President;
- c. The Speaker of the Board; and
- d. Two (2) Directors of the Board.

WHEREAS it would be prudent for the Office of Returning Officers and the Election Rules Committee to begin their work on the Official Election Rules immediately.

WHEREAS the Official Election Rules must be approved by the Board of Directors at the January Board meeting.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors elect two (2) of its own members to this committee.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the committee begin its work immediately and present the Official Election Rules pending approval at the January Board meeting.

Rob seconds.



Raffi: We need to write the election rules for the officer and spring elections. The old ones are outdated. Note that if you do decide to run for this, you won't be penalized for running for any positions.

No objections or abstentions.

Motion carries.

11. **ELECTION** of the Election Rules Committee members

Nominations: Milan, Twesh, Oghosa

Elected members: Milan, Twesh

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

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

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

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

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

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the recommendations provided in the latest revision of the Club Affiliation Report, November 2015 (Appendix E) be adopted

Peter L. seconds.

Maddy: The three clubs being approved are the UofT Steel Bridge Team, Skule Dev, and UT Industry Insights. They are all doing a lot events.

No objections or abstentions.

Motion carries.

13. **MOTION by Ernesto Diaz Lozano to hold a referendum on a 2 day Fall break**



WHEREAS the University of Toronto Student's Union recently held a referendum on the topic of implementing a campus wide Fall Reading week, and

WHEREAS an overwhelming majority (92.5%) of the students that voted supported the implementation of a Fall Reading week, and

WHEREAS the referendum had a significant voter turnout (22%), therefore it is a legitimate representation of the students' opinion on the matter, and

WHEREAS implementing a full reading week in the fall is challenging in the Faculty of Engineering because of CEAB requirements, and

WHEREAS the UTSU referendum was campus wide and thus does not provide a clear indication of the position of engineering students on the matter,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Engineering Society Board of Directors authorizes the Chief Returning Officer to conduct a referendum asking full-time and part-time members of the Society whether they wish for the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering to create a 2 day Fall break, in lieu of a full Reading week

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the referendum is to be held during the upcoming Officer elections; the final wording of such to be set by the Office of Returning Officers in consultation with the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and the Officers of the Society and ratified by the Board of Directors at the January 2016 meeting.

Raffi seconds.

Ernesto: We discussed this at large by email. The consensus was a full reading week was highly unfeasible. A two day break can be done without any major change to timeline of Orientation or anything else. This is showing that EngSoc is responsive to voice of students and being proactive. If students don't support this, we can reevaluate it. A concern that was brought up was that the Faculty could remove the engineering study day. The OROs should come up with the wording because I want the ORO to engage the committees in consultation with the Faculty.

Kevin: 22% of all campus students voted and 92% said yes. We have no idea of what percentage of that is engineering students?

Ernesto: Yes.



Milan: What is being ratified? The referendum or wording?

Ernesto: The referendum is to be held during the upcoming officer elections. Let's remove that semi colon and move it after "Officer elections".

Twesh: I was told that we couldn't vote on this referendum.

Chris: I tried to go on this website and vote against it, but couldn't vote because I'm an engineering student.

Ernesto: Engineering students that are part-time members can't vote, but this one should be more tailored to engineering students.

No objections or abstentions.

Motion carries.

14. SPECIAL MOTION by Ernesto Diaz Lozano to amend Bylaw 2: The Directors Bylaw to mandate directors to produce transition reports.

WHEREAS effective transitioning is one of the largest challenges the Engineering Society faces, and

WHEREAS there is currently no clear indication that directors need to write transition reports, and

WHEREAS Bylaw 4, Section 1.0.1, subsection c reads: [The president is responsible for:]

c) Transition of the Engineering Society and,

WHEREAS it is reasonable that the ultimate responsibility for transition lies on the President for accountability purposes, however, there also needs to be a clear responsibility for each director to proactively participate in the transition process by writing transition reports,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 2, Section 1, subsection 1.0.2 be added to read

1.0.2 All project directors must submit transition reports in accordance to the guidelines for transition reports prepared by the President.

Milan seconds.

Ernesto: Transition is a big challenge. We want to cut that cycle and push our directors to make more effective transition reports. Directors have to follow



the transition report guidelines, but that doesn't mean we'll give them a template. We'll tell them this is the 5 or 6 things that they have to include in their report, then it's up to them what else they want to include. We'll ask them to include a description, timeline, summary of issues, a section on finances. We'll ask them to submit a first draft in January. In February we'll go through them with Rhonda and see if there's anything they need to include. In March, they'll issue their final versions. I'm amending the bylaw to make it more legitimate.

Opposed: John

Abstained: Ogi

In favour: Everyone else

Motion carries.

15. SPECIAL MOTION by Reena Cabanilla to amend Bylaw 4, the Officers Bylaw

WHEREAS the Policy and Structures Committee has reviewed and revised Bylaw 4

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the revised version of Bylaw 4 as presented in Appendix M be adopted.

Raffi seconds.

No objections or abstentions.

Motion carries.

16. SPECIAL MOTION by Billy Graydon to amend Bylaw 1, the Constitution to allow for no Board meeting in December

WHEREAS Bylaw 1 Section 4.6.1. mandates that the Board meet at least once each month during the academic year

WHEREAS the Board has not held a meeting in December for 3 out of the 5 years it has existed, contrary to that clause

WHEREAS the December meeting last year carried no substantive motions;

WHEREAS scheduling of the December meeting conflicts with examinations, as well as Board members leaving for the holidays



BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 1 Section 4.6.1., which currently reads:
4.6.1 The Board of Directors shall meet at least once a month during the Academic Year.

be amended to read:

4.6.1 The Board of Directors shall meet at least once a month during the Academic Year, except for the month of December

Raffi seconds.

Billy: I'm proposing this because it needs to pass if we do not want to have a meeting in December. If we pass this, we have the option of holding a meeting in December or not.

Raffi: Doesn't the Corporations Act say we have to meet at least once a month?

Billy: If it does, our bylaws are already contrary to that because it says we do not have to meet in in the summer.

Kevin: If you pass it, I don't see it being likely that people will have a December meeting. If you do allow it, there will be zero chance we will have one. If we're supposed to be meeting in December, we'll meet in December.

Raffi: But what's the point?

Billy: I also received a number of emails from members that have a lot of conflicts in December and counting towards quota for missing meetings. I can't find it in the OCA.

Ernesto: Same. It only says we have to have a shareholders' meeting.

Kevin: Why isn't that an issue for April?

Billy: A combination of exams and people going away for holiday. In April we generally hold it after the JCM.

Kevin: Is it unreasonable for the Board meeting to happen not at the end of the month and push the January one at the beginning of the month?

Ernesto: I think we should discuss if we want this to be an option.

Andrew: What about the option that absences are not counted?



Billy: Officially we would need a different bylaw amendment. The other option is that we have a clause where Speaker has authority to not count that absence. We don't have a set of guidelines to of when to use that.

Kevin: My personal preference is that we still keep it. If we want to, explore options like using your discretion, but to explicitly state we don't have to have one sets precedent that we don't have a meeting in December ever.

In favour: Reena, Rob, Rachel, Andrew, Maddy, John, Victoria, Twesh, Chris

Opposed: Ernesto, Kevin, Milan, Jason, Amy, Ben

Abstained: Aidan, Peter L., Apurv, Ogi, Oghosa

Motion fails.

17. DISCUSSION ITEM on whether and when to have a December meeting

Billy: We don't have an option of whether we want to. One option is the 13th, there were concerns. Are there any other dates?

Options seem to be the 6th, 12th, 17th.

Most people in favour of the 12th.

Next meeting will be on December 12th, at 1:00-2:00pm.

18. MOTION by Ernesto to call for an accountability meeting on January 21st at 6:00pm.

Ernesto: We didn't give a 21 day notice for the November accountability meeting, so it was cancelled. A concern was brought up by a Member. It's a chance for Members to provide feedback. The proposed time is January 21 at 6:00pm. We want the Board to make a decision.

Raffi: An Accountability Meeting can be called a meeting for the purpose for recall with 100 students signatures. I completely disagree that it's used for feedback. They have emails, office hours.

In favour: Rob, Amy, Aidan

Opposed: Victoria, Ben, Peter, Kevin

Abstained: Everyone else



Motion fails.

19. OTHER BUSINESS

20. ADJOURNMENT

Rob moves to adjourn.

Aidan seconds.

Opposed: Jason, Oghosa

Abstained: Peter, Ben, Apurv

In favour: Everyone else

Meeting adjourned (5:12 PM).



Attendance

Officers		
President	Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patino	
VP Finance	Rachel Reding	
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	AwR
At-Large	Aidan Solala	P
At-Large	John Sweeney	P
Chemical Representative	Jason Tang	
Civil Representative	Peter Luo	
Computer Representative	Milan Maljkovic	
Electrical Representative	Andrew Boetto	
Engineering Science Representative	Apurv Bharadwaj	P
Industrial Representative	Benjamin Leung	
Materials Science Representative	Amy Zhao	
Mechanical Representative	Robert Goldberg	
Mineral Representative	Ognjen Kelec	P
First Year	Victoria Cheng	
First Year	Chris Choquette	
First Year	Twesh Upadhyaya	
UTSU Representative	Benjamin Coleman	A
Speaker (Non-Voting)	Billy Graydon	
Members of the Society (Non-Voting)		
Chief Returning Officer	Raffi Dergalstianian	
	Peter Singh	
	Avineet Randhawa	
	Adham Husseini	
	Yashii Kaushik	

A – Absent

AwR – Absent with Regrets

P – Proxy