



---

October 2015 Board of Directors Meeting - Part 2

**1. Adoption of the Agenda**

**MOTION by Raffi to add a motion:**

MOTION by Raffi Dergalstianian to amend Bylaw 3, The Elections Bylaw;

WHEREAS Bylaw 3, 1.0.4 and 1.0.5 currently read:

"1.0.4. The CRO shall not hold any other official position of the Society during his term of office.

1.0.5. The CRO shall not be a candidate for any position during their intended term of office."

WHEREAS it is illogical to prevent the Chief Returning Officer from holding Engineering Society positions that are not elected under his oversight;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 3, 1.0.4 and 1.0.5 be amended to read:

"1.0.4. The CRO shall not hold any other official elected position of the Society during his term of office.

1.0.5. The CRO shall not be a candidate for any Engineering Society position, elected under his oversight, during their intended term of office."

**Rob seconds.**

**No objections.**

Motion is added as new motion 6. Motions are renumbered accordingly.

**MOTION by Rachel to renumber motion 8 as motion 2; and**

**MOTION Rachel to add Finance Committee minutes as new motion 3, after new motion 2.**

**Ryan seconds.**

**No objections.**

Motion 8 is motion 2 and motion 3 is added.

**Everyone in favour of adopting the agenda.**

**Agenda Adopted (2:13 PM).**



**2. MOTION by Rachel Reding to approve the changes to the Operating Budget of the Engineering Society.**

**WHEREAS** the Vice President Finance is required to prepare a budget of operating expenses for the year, in accordance with the Bylaws of the society; and

**WHEREAS** it is prudent to update the budget throughout the year based on actual expenditures and changing circumstances; and

**WHEREAS** the Engineering Society and the University of Toronto Students' Union have entered an agreement whereby the Engineering Society will receive 50% of the University of Toronto Students' Union fees back for undergraduate engineering students;

**WHEREAS** this is estimated to be about \$40,000 for the 2015-2016 school year;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the club funding pool in the 2015-2016 Operating Budget be increased by \$25,000.

**Seconded by: Jason**

Rachel: We're getting 50% of our fees back, estimated to be \$40 000. I don't have the final number yet because enrolment for winter has not been determined. We discussed where we want to put that money and saw club funding as a good avenue. The fall round is the largest round and that's where we want to put our money out.

Ryan: On our end, we budgeted for \$44 000.

Rachel: We estimate we're going to get \$40 000. We only changed it to \$25 000, because we didn't want to change the budget based on estimates.

Ernesto: The other \$15 000 will be used, not necessarily in club funding. We've been discussing options. Maybe special projects, the new Mental Wellness Director we're proposing to create today. Everything is not \$25 000 we're spending, but this is the biggest time for clubs to request funds and we wanted to inject that money now.

Raffi: Have we thought about communicating to clubs that we will get this money and to apply in winter?

**In favour: Everyone except Chris**

**Opposed: None**



**Abstained: Chris**

**Motion carries.**

**3. Approval of the Finance Committee Minutes**

**Milan moves for a 5 minutes recess**

**Rob seconds.**

**No objections.**

**Motion carries.**

**Recess ends (2:24 PM).**

Rachel: We first came up with amount the club would get if we didn't increase club funding, then we created a second amount to increase club funding. Then we combed through and made sure clubs weren't getting more than requested.

Ernesto: How much would we have left for winter?

Rachel: We're aiming for \$10 000 left. The other thing to note that this is first round with the new CPSIF process. We're expecting to have appeals, from big clubs like NSBE, and they'll likely get money if they give us a reasonable pitch.

Amy: Can you speak to IEEE? I thought the Finance Committee was not willing to fund room booking, food, etc.?

Rachel: We initially gave them less than what was requested, but when it increased it gave them the full amount.

**Everyone in favour.**

**No objections.**

**No abstentions.**

**Motion carries.**

**No objections to fix the typo (water works have 300.00.00).**

**4. Approval of the Academic Advocacy Committee Meeting Minutes  
(Appendices A1-A2)**

Ryan: I think there's one package missing, but we did have another meeting before this.



Billy: I didn't receive those. We'll approve them in November.

**No objections.**

**Minutes approved.**

**5. Approval of the Policies and Structures Committee Minutes (Appendix B)**

**No objections.**

**Minutes approved.**

**6. Approval of the Affiliation Committee Minutes (Appendices C1-C2)**

Aidan: We affiliated some clubs.

**No objections.**

**Minutes approved.**

**7. Officer Reports**

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

Raffi: Will the SEF Committee be a Standing Committee of the Board?

Ernesto: No. It's a separate entity from EngSoc.

Ryan: The proxy system for the UTSU SGM will be very different and much easier to do.

b. VP Finance – Rachel Reding (Appendix E)

Rachel: I was working on the Mental Wellness Position, defining it. It's a lot of work and it's outside of the VP Finance portfolio.

Raffi: Is that going to be elected this school year?

Rachel: It's going to start as a Temporary Director.

c. VP Communications – Reena Cabanilla (Appendix F)

Raffi: Will we have Council sweaters?

Reena: If you pay for it



**Ernesto moves to recess for 10 minutes.**

**Rob seconds.**

**Amy opposes. Milan and Peter oppose too.**

**Recess carries (2:49 PM)**

*Ryan and Victoria leave at 3:00 PM*

**Recess ends (3:01 PM)**

*Oghosa and Maddy enter to present their Officer Reports*

- d. VP Academic – Oghosa Igbinakenzua (Appendix G)

Ernesto: What was the number of turnout for mid course feedback?

Oghosa: Last I checked, on Tuesday, was about 50 for first-year, for all the courses. It's still open.

Ernesto: Maybe we can advertise it more?

Oghosa: First-year Reps are doing a good job of advertising it.

- e. VP Student Life – Madeleine Santia (Appendix H)

**8. MOTION by Raffi Dergalstanian to amend Bylaw 3, The Elections Bylaw;**

**WHEREAS** Bylaw 3, 1.0.4 and 1.0.5 currently read:

"1.0.4. The CRO shall not hold any other official position of the Society during his term of office.

1.0.5. The CRO shall not be a candidate for any position during their intended term of office."

**WHEREAS** it is illogical to prevent the Chief Returning Officer from holding Engineering Society positions that are not elected under his oversight;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 3, 1.0.4 and 1.0.5 be amended to read:

"1.0.4. The CRO shall not hold any other official elected position of the Society during his term of office.

1.0.5. The CRO shall not be a candidate for any Engineering Society position, elected under his oversight, during their intended term of office."



Raffi: There's a UTSU election upcoming. I'm running for it. By our bylaws, I would not be allowed to hold that position. It's illogical because I'm not running that election. If the CRO ever decides to do Blue and Gold Chair, Bnad, etc., by our bylaws that would be illegal. It only makes sense for CRO to not be candidate if he/she is running that election.

Milan: It's not a conflict of interest. There's nothing there that would create strife or internal conflict by holding those two positions.

Ernesto: Under the new UTSU board proposal we're supporting, there's a new provision for our CRO to run the election. So now it's not a problem, but for future elections it might affect it.

Rob: How does this affect the JCM?

Raffi: CRO only casts a vote during a tie break.

Rob: Is there any way to nullify the vote?

Raffi: I would vote as Ex-officio

Rob: Are there any issues?

Billy: There are if they are chairing that meeting.

Milan: You should proxy that vote, or we could put something in the bylaws.

Raffi: I could always abstain that vote.

**In favour: everyone except Amy and Peter**

**Opposed: none**

**Abstained: Amy and Peter**

**Motion carries.**

**9. MOTION by Raffi Dergalstanian and Sanchit Mathur to call a General Meeting for the purpose of Officer Accountability and Recall**

**WHEREAS** to provide the Society members an opportunity to discuss the performance of the current council; and

**WHEREAS** pursuant to bylaw 2 (Project Directors):



- 0.1.7. A Project Director may only be recalled upon a two-thirds vote by:
- The Board of Directors of the Society;
  - A General Meeting called for such purpose

and bylaw 3:

- 3.7. Recall
- 3.7.1. An Officer may only be recalled by a two-thirds vote at a General Meeting called for that purpose

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** an Accountability General Meeting called for November 26 2015 at 7pm in SF1105.

Raffi: Sanchit and I met to discuss this. We decided this year that we want to interview Project Directors and make a decision whether or not there would be precedent for recall. The major issue that myself, Sanchit, Billy and Ernesto discussed was quorum. Last time we held an accountability meeting and quorum was not reached. We need this motion to pass to show that EngSoc is transparent and democratic.

Peter: Can you further explain how you will set this precedent?

Raffi: Take Suds for example. We'd interview them, ask them what they've done and what they plan to do. If we feel they've done their job well, we won't recall them. If we feel they're not doing job well and it's detrimental to EngSoc, then we'll decide to recall them

Rob: Has anyone been recalled?

Billy: Anton.

Ernesto: What's the timeline for interviews?

Raffi: They will likely happen in november. We're trying to coordinate with the Directors and trying to interview as many as possible. There's a few that we can't interview, like Orientation Chair. We're trying to hit communication and commercial operation directors.

**In favour: everyone**

**Opposed: none**

**Abstained: none**

**Motion carries.**

- 10. MOTION by Ernesto Diaz Lozano to appoint three (3) undergraduate engineering students to the Skule Endowment Fund Committee**



**WHEREAS** the Skule Endowment Fund Committee's first meeting for the 2015-2016 Academic Year is on November 10; and

**WHEREAS** the constitution of the Skule Endowment Fund Committee outlines that the Committee shall comprise:

1. The Fund shall have a Committee, consisting of the following nine (9) Members:
  - a. The Vice President Finance of the Engineering Society, ex-officio, who will be the chair of the committee;
  - b. The President of the Engineering Society, ex-officio;
  - c. Three (3) undergraduate engineering students appointed by the Engineering Society Board of Directors;
  - d. The Dean of the Faculty, ex-officio;
  - e. The President of the Engineering Alumni Association or their designate, ex-officio;
  - f. The Finance and Budget Officer of the Faculty, ex-officio;
  - g. The Registrar of the Faculty, ex-officio;

and

**WHEREAS** the President and VP Finance have created and promoted an online application form for members of the society to apply for one of the three (3) undergraduate engineering students appointed by the Engineering positions; and

**WHEREAS** the President and VP Finance have reviewed the applications and provided a recommendation for appointment, which has been circulated to the members of the Board as Appendix I;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Board appoints three (3) undergraduate engineering students to the Skule Endowment Fund Committee.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** Sourabh, Andrew and Patrice be appointed.

Ernesto: We're having our first meeting on November 10. We sent the document with our recommendations. Rachel and I prepared a survey and it was advertised with Facebook, mass mail and we told Discipline Club Chairs to help promote it. All the responses were put in table format. Rachel and I read through independently and gave them a qualitative score of 1 to 10. Then we averaged those scores and the top scores were our recommendations. I know it's a crude method, but we wanted to pass on to the Board verbatim the information on the forms. Our ranking is a suggestion. There are 8 candidates, all strong candidates. We didn't interview them in person, so all the information is there.



Rob: Is there any merit to put their average score next to their name?

Ernesto: I'm okay, I would rather let the Board decide if they want that. I did table like this deliberately. If we put them on the board then it might influence the Board.

Milan: The score of 5, 7, 9 out of ten doesn't mean anything to me. I think we should follow what Ernesto said and caution against using the score.

Billy: Who's in favour of considering scores?

Rob, Chris; scores not considered.

*Victoria returns at 3:55 PM*

The students are appointed.

**Rob amends: BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Sourabh, Andrew and Patrice be appointed.**

**In favour: everyone except Chris**

**Opposed: Chris**

**Abstained: none**

**Amendment passes.**

**In favour: everyone**

**Opposed: none**

**Abstained: none**

**Motion carries.**

**11. MOTION by Oghosa Igbinakenzua to reopen nominations for the Board of Directors seat on the Academic Advocacy Committee**

**WHEREAS** the Faculty Council and Faculty Council Standing Committees will be preparing for a variety of academic initiatives this year; and

**WHEREAS** the Representatives of the Engineering Society, as the unified voice of the student body, require guidance and direction from a committee of interested students in their representation to Faculty Council and its Standing Committees; and

**WHEREAS** initiatives such as an Engineering Society anti-calendar, mid-course evaluations, and continuous curriculum improvements require student input;



**WHEREAS** that the Academic Advocacy Committee should be composed of the VP Academic, three (3) members of the Board of Directors, and Three (3) Faculty of Engineering students; and one (1) representative from each discipline appointed by discipline club chairs

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Board of Directors direct the Speaker to conduct the nominations and election process for the one (1) Board of Directors member of the Academic Advocacy Committee immediately.

**Seconded by: Ben**

**Raffi moves to call the question**

**Question called.**

**In favour: everyone**

**Opposed: none**

**Abstained: none**

**Motion carries**

**Nominations: Twesh, Chris**

**Elected representative: Twesh**

**12. MOTION by Rachel Reding to create the Mental Wellness Directorship as a Temporary Internal Directorship.**

**WHEREAS** over the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 terms, steps have been taken to raise mental health awareness and improve mental health in the Skule community by officers in the Engineering Society; and

**WHEREAS** the responsibility of taking on this initiative is not well-defined in a specific officer position, and;

**WHEREAS** the workload of such a position is substantial enough to fill a directorship position, and

**WHEREAS** the goal of this portfolio is to raise mental health awareness and improve mental health in the Skule community;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the temporary internal director position be created, with the oversight of the VP Student Life of the Engineering Society.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the responsibilities of the Mental Wellness Directorship include the following:



- a. Raise mental health awareness by promoting services provided by the affiliated Engineering Society groups, the Faculty and the University of Toronto, and;
- b. Improve mental health in the Skule community by providing stress relief activities to the members of the Engineering Society.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the applications for the position will be sent out within the next 5 business days;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the new Mental Wellness Director be elected at the November 2015 Board Meeting.

**Seconded by: Raffi**

Rachel: This is something I really wanted to see more prevalence of over my time. I found it would be better if this was filled by a director. The Officer team has been working together to create an event every month. We did one during frosh week and had a good turnout. This month we had the puppies and they were really cute. I heard tonnes of people say they were happy. Carole approached us and she was interested in running a mental wellness event and she held something on Friday. The biggest thing I wanted to push was to have the Officers work with other groups every month. We're working with EAA to do bubble soccer. In this process, it became a lot of work. I would like to see someone take this on. I really want to see this become a directorship position.

John: Pretty recently we created the Alumni Outreach Director. How would this be started? Trial or full?

Rachel: The same way as Alumni Outreach. If we see that it's successful as a Temporary Director, we would make it a full directorship. We talked about who it would fall under, VP Student Life or VP Academic. We decided it should be VP Student Life.

John: Is there any overlap with other things?

Rachel: There is definitely is overlap if people get stressed with school or resources with Faculty, that would be under VP Academic. But for the majority of this, it's VP Student Life.

Apurv: Which population? The mental health community? Allies? What's the final goal? To get more allies or raise awareness?

Rachel: I think it can be seen in both ways. We also created a committee with the faculty with 2 Mental Health Reps and they're working with the faculty to



get more allies. This could also get the faculty involved and show which services are available.

Raffi: Is it open to all students?

Rachel: Yes

Raffi: I think it's a good idea. Engineering has a negative connotation with mental health. It's a great opportunity for EngSoc to have a voice about mental health. Rachel mentioned there's a mental health committee, but there are only two reps and that conversation is dominated by Faculty.

Peter: What's the general timeline?

Rachel: They'll have some of November and December, but mostly second semester. The way it works with Temporary Director, if we create a permanent Director, they could run for it the following year.

**In favour: everyone**

**Opposed: none**

**Abstained: none**

**Motion carries.**

**13. SPECIAL MOTION by Reena Cabanilla to amend Bylaw 7, the Discipline Club Bylaw**

**WHEREAS** the Policy and Structures Committee has reviewed and revised Bylaw 7

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the revised version of Bylaw 7 as presented in Appendix J be adopted.

**Seconded by: Milan**

John: You mentioned that policies don't allow for co-Chairs. What's the reasoning? Is it worth disallowing that? I was told that if have there were co-Chairs, then the club would have two voting members?

Raffi: I don't see the point of having co-Chairs. That would complicate things with the JCM.

Billy: In the past some clubs have had co-Chairs. It was fine for them, but for our purposes they would have one vote or one person would have a vote.

**In favour: everyone**



**Opposed: none**  
**Abstained: none**

**Motion carries.**

**14. DISCUSSION ITEM: Winter Council Retreat**

**Billy moves to discuss this after item 15.**

**No objections.**

**Motion carries.**

**15. DISCUSSION ITEM: Security and Privacy Committee Report**

Ernesto: The SPC had a couple of meetings over the summer. We explored the possibility of putting cameras in the entrances of the Pit. The Faculty said for all cameras we would have the footage would be maintained by the Faculty. We can't have sole access to the footage. Some stakeholders felt it was not appropriate. Stores is looking into getting cameras inside stores looking at the tellers. Should we write a policy saying who has access to the footage? If the Faculty finds out, it could be an issue. On the other side we could leave it up to the Managers, but run the risk that it is in on paper.

Aidan: Cafe has cameras now. If we don't write policy and do it on the down low and if we get broken into and record footage in area we weren't supposed to, it could not be admissible in court. I think it sets a dangerous precedent.

Billy: It is only municipal, ordinance and University policy that governs camera policies. This would be a Federal court case so it doesn't apply there.

Rob: We should look into this. Stores is owned by EngSoc so they don't pay rent, whereas Cafe pays rent. If they found that Stores is 100% owned by EngSoc, we should write a policy. If not, it's more of a grey area.

Milan: Given that Cafe is not owned by EngSoc, under what conditions are we allowed to have cameras in Cafe?

Twesh: What events happened?

Ernesto: Two break ins, both in 2015.

Twesh: Was that Stores?

Ernesto: Not Stores.



Aidan: Stores has a lot of cash on hand. In both instances, cash was stolen.

Milan: They were already interested in getting cameras.

Rob: This progressed this discussion.

Twesh: If we keep this, only for our purposes, then I think the Faculty will find out. I think it's best if we keep this open so they're more likely to help out.

Milan: He said one of the cameras is useless and was opposed to use one of theirs. I agree with putting cameras in areas with high risk of break ins.

Rob: How we go about finding out if the faculty is okay with this? We have to be careful and tread lightly (e.g. is Cafe allowed to have cameras?).

Aidan: We have to tread carefully with putting cameras around Skule. There are certain things we don't want the Faculty seeing, where the Faculty turns blind eye. They could take a lot of things away if they have constant watch over the Pit, but it seems like they don't want cameras.

Apurv: I suggest that we look at another Faculty and student union and how they dealt with a similar issue.

Raffi: If we do cameras discreetly and court finds out, would it be weird if they revoke the cameras seeing how it benefitted us? What's the legality? Can we consult legal counsel?

Billy: The only laws are Municipal and Freedom of Information Act because we are affiliated with the University and the University is under that. The University has a whole Freedom of Information Act.

Raffi: Suppose we put cameras for robberies, and someone gets assaulted? Could we use footage for that?

Rob: Footage would not be under constant review, only if we have an incident.

Billy: If we have footage and get a court order that something happened, then we would have to give over the footage. We might be under obligation not to review it

Rachel: Steve gave us guidelines and proposal policy on cameras. It's more like a best practices manual. If you put up a camera in a random hallway, you should put up a sign.

Aidan: Last year I was in charge of one of rooms that got broken into. There's very little evidence to figure out who did it. Cameras more exist as a greater



deterrent. If they know that they are being watched, it's proven to be more effective. We could make these doors out of steel and people would still break in. The break in in my case seemed more like smash and grab. If they knew that there were cameras, it would probably have not occur.

Milan: I would like to remind everyone that this is focused on Stores than broader EngSoc. We're a society that prides in being transparent, don't think it's appropriate to be discussing implementing cameras on the down-low. We need to remind ourselves of our values every day.

Twesh: Maybe just put up signs like Rachel suggests. Are there any other solutions other than cameras?

Rob: I can only speak to Stores' safe; it's very heavy.

Twesh: Why are they feeling cameras are necessary?

Rob: Everything has inherent flaws. There are also two tills and thousands of dollars' worth of textbooks, computers, etc.

Milan: Is there potential value in installing cameras?

Rob: It's a matter of delaying people.

**Rachel moves to limit debate.**

**Apurv seconds.**

**Majority votes for. Debate ended.**

SPC will have another meeting probably.

**DISCUSSION ITEM: Winter Council Retreat**

Maddy: I came up with a bunch of options. I found four, but it all goes back to Hart House Farm. One of our worries is if someone goes outside. Our plan so far is to barricade the doors with furniture.

Amy: Is that a fire hazard?

Milan: Yes.

Maddy: We need a way to ensure that we can hear if people try to leave.

Jason: What about a buzzer system?



Maddy: We're only there for one night.

**Milan moves to dissolve Robert's Rules.**

**Seconded by Jason.**

**Robert's Rules dissolved.**

Raffi: How about the buddy system?

Milan: Yes, people got drunk last time, but we're still adults. There are enough people who are reasonable enough to keep an eye on each other.

Aidan: If certain people know they are being kept inside, they will try to get outside.

Maddy: We don't want for people who go outside to forget to go in.

Ernesto: I do have a concern, but I agree with Milan, we are adults. I think we should have a retreat. The justification is we now have first years, also the last one was in summer and everyone wasn't here. We'll be subsidizing this a bit less. People have to arrange transportation and people pay for lodging, and we'll pay for food.

Rob: What's the timeline?

Maddy: In second semester, the weekend after Cannonball.

Rob: Have we looked into day trip somewhere?

Maddy: We haven't looked into a day trip. I don't know what kind of options there are.

Rachel: We talked about doing skiing, but it's more expensive and not everyone can ski.

Maddy: Also we would not be subsidizing for a bus. We would be organizing a carpool.

Aidan: We don't have to turn up like we did in the summer.

Milan: Evening of retreat aside, it was good time. I think this is tightest Council has been. I think we got a lot collaboration out of that as well.

Maddy: In terms of logistics, who would have access to a vehicle?



*Milan, Apurv and Ben raise their hands.*

Milan: Is it a similar structure to last one?

Maddy: We would have to figure out activities, but we wanted to get a sense if people are down.

Aidan: We could do skating if it's cold enough.

Maddy: One of ideas was a snowball fight.

Rachel: Someone else needs to come up with the next rap.

**16. DISCUSSION ITEM: Poor Voter Turnout**

Rob: Poor voting turnout. The Fourth-year Chair had only two votes. Is that really the most accurate representation? What could be done to encourage voter turnout?

Aidan: There are a lot of positions, like Project Directors, that aren't voted for, but should we move some of the things that are elected to an application like Project Directors? It could be more effective than a general election. Sometimes these turn into a popularity contest.

Milan: I see a few issues. We would have to maintain fairness and would have to vet every position. People who we would be vetting would be people who would not be affected by Fourth-year Chair. I think it's a lot of time to add for people who are already busy. I think we should look at how we can engage people. Perhaps marketing or communication.

Rachel: To increase voter turnout, we could we post info on our website. Could we create a timeline throughout the year so people know what to look out for and what each position does?

Raffi: There is a website, [elections.skule.ca](http://elections.skule.ca). It has everything there. It has descriptions for Class Reps. It has the timeline for current, not future elections, but it could. I think it has to do with marketing and apathy. It's well documented that people in their final year don't care. Fourth-year is always the lowest turnout.

Rob: This was a by-election. I think the point was because it was a by-election. I know last it was higher.

Aidan: It was definitely higher than two votes, but not low enough to raise suspicion.



Raffi: People know there's an election, they'll know it's over and won't really notice the by-election.

Billy: Are PEY students supposed to vote for that?

Raffi: I can't restrict you from not voting. People from PEY are allowed to vote. Nothing I can do as CRO. It more to do with the backend. I could try to fix it.

Milan: Something that worked pretty well was social media by other Faculties and Colleges. We very rarely use social media as a use of awareness. Maybe putting a Facebook event for elections or by-elections.

Aidan: Voter turnout for student elections is pretty shitty. UTSU got 15%, that's actually pretty pathetic. It is our duty as Board to go hustle people, get people to vote. We've got to keep in mind is what is motivating people to vote, not this one particular election. We got a First-year chair, no second or third, why do we have a Fourth-year chair?

Billy: We got rid of Second-year and Third-year Chairs.

Aidan: If the Fourth-year class is not seeing value of this position, maybe we should look at getting rid of it. What is value of this position itself?

Twesh: Maybe they don't understand the importance of EngSoc. Maybe we should do something like here are people you elected, keep saying these are your elected reps, drive home the fact that this is a democracy so they keep it in mind for the whole year. If people really don't care, we have to push it along the year.

Apurv: I totally encourage voting but that being said, some people do believe they don't want to vote and they have their reasons. We have to watch how far we take it.

Milan: The underlying issue is that people are here to get their degrees not get involved. Many people see EngSoc as a collective entity than the same group as them. An example is people getting money back for the SEF. They don't realize the money goes back to them, that those services are there and are being provided by students. Pushing for more things like Officer videos, transparency and awareness are key.

Victoria: One of the things that deter is vote.skule.ca is not user friendly. We can't use on mobile. And there are a lot of glitches that frustrated people.



Raffi: The issue with mobile is that there's a possibility that one person passes around their phone and it's not democratic. In terms of glitches, we had summer by-elections and I take responsibility for that. It's not a great website and we're trying to work on it. It's hard to market an election.

Aidan: It's a person's own prerogative if they want to take engagement. There are a lot of great people in our class and no matter how hard we try to motivate people to vote, some people we can't motivate. One thing we should explore is if people know where the EngSoc office is. Is it worth exploring to have a polling station in the Pit? A computer where someone could vote?

Milan: I agree with Aidan. Having it in such a hub, is there any ramifications? Maybe some potential issues with privacy?

Chris: In high school, elections are run by the administration and it's mandated that everyone votes. In university, it's a bigger community and less tight knit. Would it be worth opening up the way we do elections and campaign? Use other methods of communication?

Rob: I like the idea of a polling station in pit. I would like to suggest one in Bahen. The only foreseeable issue is that we need someone to man polling station at all times. It's logistically challenging, but worth looking into.

Raffi: Polling stations are a great idea. The UTSU does it. The DROs and myself don't need to run them. We would need to find polling clerks. It would increase the turnout. I'll look into that. In terms of what Chris was saying: we limit the campaign to Facebook events because it's easier to keep track of. If we introduce posters, it's hard to keep track of. The UTSU has someone paid a lot of money to keep track of them. People mostly use Facebook.

Aidan: What if we have "I voted" stickers or pins, and get someone to wear that after they vote. It helps spread the message of voting. Yes, the UTSU does posters, but the thing that bothers me is that it's a lot of wasted ink and paper for things that aren't an effective way of getting people. Something we could look into is a designated space for posters. Another thing is in general Skule Facebook group, we could have a post from CRO saying these are all the candidates and link to all the Facebook groups. We can get these links out to all the year groups. These wouldn't increase election costs.

Billy: Should we refer this to a committee?

Raffi: We got a lot of great ideas.

Aidan: We don't need a committee, maybe a meeting for a discussion about this.



**MOTION by Billy to strike an ad-hoc committee on elections marketing.**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** further debate be struck.

**Milan seconds.**

**Everyone in favour.**

Members of the Promotion of Student Candidates Committee: Raffi, Milan, Apurv, Rob, Aidan, Twesh, Ben, Amy, Reena

**17. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION by Milan to adjourn.**

**Seconded by John.**

**In favour: everyone**

**Meeting Adjourned (5:37 PM)**



## Attendance

<b>Officers</b>		
President	Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patino	
VP Finance	Rachel Reding	
VP Communication	Reena Cabanilla	
VP Academic	Oghosa Igbinakenzua	P
VP Student Life	Madeleine Santia	P
<b>Directors of the Board</b>		
At-Large	Kevin Rupasinghe	AwR
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	AwR
Engineering Science Representative	Apurv Bharadwaj	
Industrial Representative	Benjamin Leung	
Materials Science Representative	Amy Zhao	
Mechanical Representative	Robert Goldberg	
Mineral Representative	Ognjen Kelec	AwR
First Year	Victoria Cheng	
First Year	Chris Choquette	
First Year	Twesh Upadhyaya	
UTSU Representative	Benjamin Coleman	A
Speaker (Non-Voting)	Billy Graydon	
<b>Members of the Society (Non-Voting)</b>		
Chief Returning Officer	Raffi Dergalstianian	

**A – Absent**

**AwR – Absent with Regrets**

**P – Proxy**