



February 2017 Special Board of Directors Meeting

Meeting called to order at 11:24PM.

MOTION by Andrew Boetto to add to the Agenda:

“MOTION by Andrew Boetto to appoint 3 members of the engineering society to the Skule Endowment Fund Committee;

WHEREAS applications were open to the whole society; and

WHEREAS the VP Finance and President of the Engineering Society have reviewed SEF Committee applications;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following 3 students be appointed to the SEF committee:

- 1. Aron Sankar*
- 2. Twesh Upadhyaya*
- 3. Andrew Kidd”*

Seconded by Colin.

No objections.

Motion passed.

The Speaker added the motion to the agenda after Reports by Officers.

MOTION by Colin Parker to move Reports by Officers until after motion 20

Seconded by Samantha.

No objections.

Motion passed.

MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to add to the Agenda:

“MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to add an electronic voting booth to the Sandford Fleming Atrium for the duration of the elections

WHEREAS students are often in the SF Atrium and may find easier access to voting to be convenient

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Society place an electronic voting booth in the SF Atrium no later than the beginning of the Officer election period and until the last of the levy or Director elections periods end, or the last day of class (April 13, 2017), whichever comes first.”

Seconded by Samantha.

No objections

Motion passed.

The Speaker added the motion to the agenda before the In-camera Discussion.



MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to move motions originally listed as 7 and 8 to after the motion originally listed as 18

Seconded by Colin.

No objections.

Motion passed.

1. ADOPTION of the Agenda

Seconded by Raneem.

No objections.

Motion passed.

2. MOTION by Colin Parker to amend and re-approve the November 2016 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

WHEREAS Apurv Bharadwaj noted a mistake in the recording of his words;

WHEREAS Colin Parker is the minuter and is convinced that the recording is mistaken as noted;

WHEREAS the issue was raised but not addressed at the January 2017 Board of Directors meeting;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the words in the November 2016 Board of Directors meeting minutes

“I agree it isn’t good to look over your shoulders about being inequitable.”

be changed to:

“This directorship doesn’t require one to constantly look over their shoulders, and the equity director would be there if one needed them. No where was it stated in the motion that students would be required to meet or listen to the equity director.”

Seconded by Sam.

No objections.

Motion passed.

3. APPROVAL of January 2017 Minutes

Seconded by Muskan.

No objections.

Motion passed.

4. APPROVAL of January Special Meeting Minutes

Seconded by Milan.



No objections.

Motion passed.

5. Business arising from minutes

None.

6. MOTION by the University of Toronto Robotics Association (UTRA) regarding the renewal of the UTRA levy

WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the teams' needs as well as their past accomplishments; and
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Seconded by Colin.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to vote on motions originally listed as motions 9 to 15 in omnibus

Seconded by Kevin R.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Oghosa, Mahta, Muskan, Kevin Z., Jason, Mark, Billy, Twesh, Danil, Kevin R., Andrew, Colin

Against: Aron

Abstaining: Ryan W.

Motion passed.

Vote on Motions in Omnibus:

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Oghosa, Ryan W., Aron, Oghosa, Mahta, Kevin Z., Muskan, Jason, Mark, Danil, Twesh, Kevin R., Milan, Andrew

Motion passed.

Main motion passed in omnibus.

7. MOTION by the University of Toronto Aerospace Team regarding the renewal of the UTAT levy

WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the teams' needs as well as their past accomplishments; and
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.



Passed in omnibus.

8. **MOTION by Engineers Without Borders (EWB) regarding the renewal of the EWB levy**
WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the organization's needs as well as their past accomplishments; and **BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Passed in omnibus.

9. **MOTION by the University of Toronto Concrete Canoe Team regarding the renewal of the Concrete Canoe levy**
WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the organization's needs as well as their past accomplishments; and **BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Passed in omnibus.

10. **MOTION by the U of T Formula SAE Racing Team regarding the renewal of the FSAE levy**
WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the organization's needs as well as their past accomplishments; and **BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Passed in omnibus.

11. **MOTION by the U of T Blue Sky Solar Racing Team regarding the renewal of the Blue Sky levy**
WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the organization's needs as well as their past accomplishments; and **BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Passed in omnibus.



12. MOTION by the University of Toronto Human Powered Design Vehicle Team regarding the renewal of the HPDVT levy

WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the organization's needs as well as their past accomplishments; and **BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Passed in omnibus.

13. MOTION by the University of Toronto Baja Racing Team regarding the creation of the Baja Team levy

WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the organization's needs as well as their past accomplishments; and **BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Seconded by Colin.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Oghosa, Aron, Mahta, Kevin Z., Muskan, Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Kevin R., Milan, Andrew, Colin

Motion passed.

14. MOTION by the University of Toronto Robotics for Space Exploration Team regarding the creation of the RSX levy

WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the organization's needs as well as their past accomplishments; and **BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Seconded by Colin.

Billy: This seems like a lot for a new levy. Is anyone here from the team to explain why? RSX member We've been doing pretty well so far, but competition has become increasingly fierce. We want to keep up, as well as register for a rover challenge in Poland. We have good facilities provided by the University for testing and space, and we have sponsors, but travel and design have a lot of associated costs. As a club we're also responsible for hosting events like SEC, and we hope to extend that to high school students in addition to the current undergraduate students.

Billy: My concern is that this might impact your outreach to other funding sources.



RSX member Our funding team has been aggressively pursuing funds and resources, and we plan to continue to do so.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Mahta, Aron, Williams, Oghosa, Jason, Muskan, Mark, Danil, Twesh, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan, Colin

Abstaining: Kevin Z.

Motion passed.

15. MOTION by the University of Toronto Concrete Toboggan Team regarding the creation of the Concrete Toboggan levy

WHEREAS the team has submitted an updated budget and a letter addressed to Engineers about the organization's needs as well as their past accomplishments; and
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the preamble (subject to minor revisions in the wording) in Appendix A be put to a referendum to full-time members of the University of Toronto Engineering Society at the upcoming Board of Directors elections in March 2017.

Seconded by Colin.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Aron, Mahta, Muskan, Mark, Danil, Twesh, Kevin R., Milan, Andrew, Kevin Z.,

Against: Ryan W.

Abstaining: Billy, Oghosa, Jason

Motion passed.

16. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to call a referendum to renew the Skule Endowment Fund

WHEREAS the Skule Endowment Fund was established by the initiation of \$100.00 per year opt-out levy on full-time members beginning in the Fall 2011 academic session; and
WHEREAS significant strides have been made in cementing the governance and planning of the Fund; and
WHEREAS the continued existence and expansion of the Fund will improve student life for our members for decades to come;
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Society authorize a referendum to occur concurrent with 2017 Officer Elections to renew the Endowment Levy Fund at \$100.00/year, using the preamble and question in Appendix A, subject to minor revisions in wording.

Seconded by Milan.

Andrew: I'd like to keep it at the same value that it was before as I think we need to feed more into the fund to get more interest, until the fund is self-sustaining. I think that this fund will be valuable in the future and we should dedicate funds to it now

Kevin Z.: How much interest is generated?

Andrew: \$50,000 to \$60,000 per year.

Mark: Who manages the fund and what is the interest rate on average?

Andrew: The University manages it, and the interest rate is about 4-5%.



In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Aron, Kevin Z., Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan

Motion passed.

Sneha entered.

17. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to call a referendum to renew the Temporary Special Levy Fund

WHEREAS the Temporary Levy Fund was established by the initiation of \$100.00 per year levy on full-time members beginning in the Fall 1983 academic session, subsequently increased to \$150.00 per year beginning in the Fall 2009 session; and

WHEREAS the Temporary Levy Fund was subsequently reduced to \$125.00 per year beginning in the Fall 2013 session and then further reduced to \$115.00 per year beginning in the Fall 2015 session; and

WHEREAS the Temporary Special Levy Fund continues to demonstrate value in accordance with its purpose; and

WHEREAS the Society and its members would benefit from the flexibility of moving surplus Special Levy funds to broader, permanent Endowment Fund;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Society authorize a referendum to occur concurrent with the 2017 Office Elections to renew the Temporary Special Levy Fund at an amount of \$110.00 per year, using the preamble and question found in Appendix A, subject to minor revisions in wording.

Seconded by Colin.

Andrew: This helps people to improve conditions in labs and such.

Kevin Z.: Why have 2 funds?

Andrew: This one is a lot older. This is meant to fund material in the department.

Colin: I make it clear in my mind as a chequing account and a savings account with the TSLF and SEF respectively. If we only had one account, we'd be tempted to spend it all.

Kevin R.: Could you give a history of the reduction in terms of cost?

Andrew: It started as \$100 per student, then \$150, then \$125.

Kevin R.: The faculty may pay for bare-minimum equipment, but this provides things like robotic arms, screens, and study benches in the Bahen centre.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Aron, Kevin Z., Mahta, Oghosa, Muskan, Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Sneha, Andrew, Kevin R., Milan, Colin

Motion passed.

18. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to increase the Engineering Society fee to account for cost of living



WHEREAS the Society's constitution and mandate allow for the membership fee to increase without referendum to reflect an increase in the cost-of-living, as determined by Government of Canada; and

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has set the Consumer Price Index increase at 1.5% for 2016

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Engineering Society requests that the University of Toronto increase the membership fee levied on its members by 1.5%, effective beginning in the Fall 2017 session

Seconded by Aron.

Kevin R.: You can't escape inflation.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Aron, Raneem, Mahta, Jason, Kevin Z., Oghosa, Mark, Billy, Twesh, Muskan, Sneha, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan, Ryan W.

Motion passed.

19. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to approve Levy Fund allocations

WHEREAS the undergraduate student levy voted two years ago to establish a levy fund whose purpose is to improve the undergraduate student experience; and

WHEREAS the Finance Committee believes these projects will improve the academic experience of the student body and help our facilities to grow and develop; and

WHEREAS additional documentation and individual applications will be hosted online; and

WHEREAS the Vice-President Finance is now in the process of contacting departments to ensure these projects have not already been funded;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Engineering Society Board of Directors approves the disbursement of funds as indicated in Appendix B;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Vice-President Finance may lower any disbursement should the costs of the projects have fallen throughout this process.

Seconded by Raneem.

Billy: For item 3.3, why does it take \$10,000 to put a new lock on?

Aron: That's the standard price for these locks.

Billy: Are they using any competitive sourcing?

Aron: I think it has to be done through University of Toronto staff.

AMENDMENT by Billy Graydon to change the "Finance Committee approval" value for item 3.3 to \$0

Seconded by Mark.



Kevin R.: I always view the TSLF material as things that improve the student experience. I don't think students will care about this. The carryover from TSLF will go to SEF, so I don't think this is a big loss.

Aron: To clarify the purpose, there is a study room that can only be opened by a member of MIE discipline club which means it is difficult to use late in the day. This does affect a substantial amount of people.

Mark: Why does it need to be locked?

Aron: There is equipment in there, like a television.

Jonathan: There is a cheaper option for ~\$2000 that needs to be manually updated each semester.

Colin: As far as I know, which is admittedly just conversations with ECE discipline club members, that cheaper option is feasible.

In favour: Billy, Ryan W., Samantha, Mahta, Mark, Jason, Twesh, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R., Milan, Oghosa

Abstaining: Colin, Olivia, Raneem, Aron, Kevin Z., Danil

Amendment passed.

Andrew: I just got a message saying that some of the numbers are misplaced. For items 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, and 6.1, the "Net Requested amount" value is the number we should be considering. The value that appears as the "Finance Committee approval" value is not correct for those items.

Muskan: How did you figure out the yellow number?

Andrew: Many of them were multiple items, so we determined how many of them we wanted to approve.

Kevin R.: Note that the departments will generally find the money to get the items they want, even if we only give partial funding. They might take cuts elsewhere, though, and we'd like to support some of these items

Billy: For item 3.6, why was it denied?

Raneem: The application was the same as last year and has many errors. The item will only be for one course, and doesn't apply to many students

Andrew: Also note that this was meant to be a core requirement of the course, so tuition should fund it. The TSLF is meant to go above and beyond

Billy: For item 4.1. I'm in the course that the equipment would be fore and I think that the current equipment works decently, despite some minor inconvenience. I think that they can work around the limited equipment with some course reorganization.

Aron: This was a top priority for ECE club and ECE department. We didn't have a lot of information on the impacted students, but we given the endorsement from students especially this was valued by us. We only plan to fund ~2 machines instead of the full request

Twesh: This was out of reach of students generally; we felt that it wouldn't get done otherwise



AMENDMENT by Billy Graydon to change the “Finance Committee approval” value for item 4.1 from \$49,958.40 to \$24,979.20

Seconded by Aron.

Milan: This operates under the same assumption that the same number of students as are currently in the course would be served by the machines in the future.

Andrew: They didn't specify if the course specifically was growing, but I assume that the suggestion of an increase was based on increasing enrolment numbers

Kevin R.: I do trust the judgment of a board member that has used the equipment, even if a lab manager may be more familiar. I don't think that cutting this now would be a huge issue considering that there would be a funding round next year

Billy: I agree that I may not know as much as a lab manager but I'm familiar with the use in the course. Also, one lab section was half empty this year.

In favour: Ryan W., Aron, Mahta, Oghosa, Mark, Billy, Danil, Muskan, Kevin R., Milan

Against: Twesh, Sneha

Abstaining: Raneem, Samantha, Olivia, Kevin Z., Jason, Andrew, Colin

Amendment passed.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Aron, Oghosa, Mahta, Jason, Kevin Z., Billy, Mark, Danil, Twesh, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan, Colin

Motion passed.

20. REPORTS by Officers or their designates

a. President - Milan Maljkovic

Kevin R.: Part of the CEIE Protocol Documentation for the new Arena is directed towards providing spaces for student in AERO201 and similar courses to provide safe, reliable places to work on their projects.

Aron: It's been awhile since we received an update about the External Relations Director. It'd be a good idea to get an idea if the position is worth it soon.

Milan: I've been thinking about it and I'm not sure if it's valuable to have another person involved in communications that I need to be a part of. As this position isn't a VP position I'm not sure it's that compatible with my portfolio.

Muskan: What are the details on the cannon firing issue?

Milan: A complainant pointed out the firing but didn't follow up. I've included it for transparency and because we're happy to have the conversation if it comes up, but it hasn't manifested into anything yet.

Billy: Regarding National Engineering Month, this is the time of year that we should be making sure we're doing something there.



Milan: I'm awaiting a response from the External Relations Director about that right now

b. Vice-President Finance - Andrew Boetto

Andrew: This month was busy with levy fund material. Two meetings of the finance committee and a lot of behind the scenes work with myself and Sourabh. I've also been working on the SEF refund process, which we're hoping to move online to avoid working with a lot of cheques. The content of the motions in this meeting have been taking a lot of my time as well. Commercial operations are all winding down but generally doing pretty well.

c. Vice-President Communications - Colin Parker

Twesh: Why was the AGM set for March 3rd?

Colin: It fit all of our schedules as was in a good position to not conflict too much with midterms.

Billy: I heard that the photo contract will be expiring soon. Will there be a consideration of alternatives?

Colin: Yeah. We haven't looked into the contract previously but we will, and we have received another offer that we'll investigate.

Milan: The current contract actually expires in 2018.

d. Vice-President Academic - Samantha Stuart

No questions.

e. Vice-President Student Life - Raneem Shammis

Aron: I'm unsure about the idea of a Fourth Year Chair being elected before the school year. It's a big question for a lot of people whether or not they are going on PEY or coming back, or if they'll pass, and a number of other issues.

Raneem: I think that's true of many positions. Starting in time to work during the summer would be quite valuable for this one, though.

Aron: Is this position's election process specified in the bylaws? How might it be changed?

Raneem: I don't think it's specified -- I think the current person in the position can choose to run the election.

21. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to appoint 3 members of the Engineering Society to the Skule Endowment Fund Committee;

WHEREAS applications were open to the whole society; and

WHEREAS the VP Finance and President of the Engineering Society have reviewed SEF Committee applications;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following 3 students be appointed to the SEF committee:

1. Aron Sankar
2. Twesh Upadhyaya
3. Andrew Kidd



Billy: Could you tell us about the application process?

Milan: We didn't feel that interviews were necessary based on the strengths of the applications. I deferred to Andrew's judgment on the subject matter.

Billy: Were there any other applications received?

Milan: Yes, one.

Billy: For the purpose of the minutes, I'd like to point out that I think we must have more of a public rationale available to people when we make a decision of this importance.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Ryan W., Raneem, Mahta, Kevin Z., Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Muskan, Sneha, Kevin R., Milan, Andrew

Abstaining: Twesh, Aron

Motion passed.

MOTION by Colin Parker to recess for 8 minutes

Seconded by Milan.

AMENDMENT by Milan Maljkovic to add:

"BE IT RESOLVED THAT Colin Parker must watch the time"

Seconded by Billy.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Oghosa, Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan

Against: Aron

Amendment passed.

In favour: Aron, Ryan W., Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Oghosa, Kevin Z., Jason, Mahta, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan

Motion passed.

The meeting was reconvened at 12:47PM.

22. MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to appoint a member to the Review Committee

WHEREAS Bylaw 6, 1.0.1 states that the "Review" component of the Search and Review Committee shall convene at least once annually to review the operations of the Society and the duties of those employed by the Society; and

WHEREAS Bylaw 6 sub-section 2.02 states: "the Review component of the Committee will be comprised of:



- a. President
- b. Vice-President Finance
- c. One additional member to be selected by the Board of Directors, selected from the following candidates:
Orientation Chair, Suds Managers, Stores Managers or Cafeteria Managers.”

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors select an additional member for the Search and Review committee.

Seconded by Raneem.

Milan: I emailed the potential candidates described in part C earlier in the week and nobody got back to me.

Aron: What is the time period during which this committee will work?

Raneem: There were two meetings last year. Each was 1-2 hours long.

Aron: I could do it if people wanted to.

[Minuter’s note: Aron Sankar is a Board of Directors representative and a Suds Manager]

Colin: When did you send an email to the candidates?

Milan: Monday or earlier; I’m not sure.

Colin: We could delegate the responsibility of selecting to the officer team to give us some more time to get responses.

Ryan G. entered.

AMENDMENT by Milan Maljkovic to change:

“BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors select an additional member for the Search and Review committee.”

to:

“BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors select Aron Sankar for the Search and Review committee.”

Seconded by Billy.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Oghosa, Mahta, Ryan W., Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Ryan G., Danja, Sneha, Muskan, Andrew

Against: Kevin R., Twesh

Abstaining: Aron

Amendment passed.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Oghosa, Mahta, Mark, Billy, Danil, Ryan G., Sneha, Danja, Muskan, Andrew, Milan, Jason

Against: Twesh

Abstaining: Aron



Motion passed.

MOTION by Aron Sankar to recess for 5 minutes

Seconded Muskan.

Motion passed.

The meeting was reconvened at 1:46PM.

23. MOTION by Ankita Khanda to clarify the “outreach” element of the Archivist project directorship

WHEREAS an important part of the Archivist portfolio involves organising events and displays to educate students about Skule™ history;

WHEREAS the Archivist has run events for a number of years, but this responsibility is not codified in the bylaws; and

WHEREAS it would be prudent to document this element of the portfolio specifically to ensure this important work continues in future years.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 2 (“The Project Directors Bylaw”) is amended to include the following:

1.8.1 (d) Educating students about Skule history by organising events and displays

Ankita entered.

Seconded by Milan.

In favour: Sam, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Aron, Mahta, Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Ryan G., Danja, Muskan, Sneha, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan

Motion passed.

24. MOTION by Jonathan Swyers to mandate Reports by Officers

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 4 Section 0.0.2. be amended to read:

0.0.2. The President and all Vice Presidents shall be required to submit a report to the Speaker of their milestones, relevant updates, and general progress from the previous Board Meeting at least 72 hours prior to the commencement of each regular meeting of the Board. They shall each provide a brief summary and offer the opportunity for questions from any Member present at the aforementioned Board Meeting regarding this status report.

Seconded by Twesh.



Jonathan: I think that the Board of Directors gets a lot of value as an overseeing body by having officer reports and getting them well enough in advance of the meeting that members can read them and ask questions. While this team has done a good job of being transparent, that's no always the case. I think that adding this when it is necessitated would cause a lot of tension.

Raneem: I think that this kind of requirement can create a lot of tension. I think that you wouldn't get much content in the officer reports if you were to add this time constraint.

Milan: The bylaw addition is a bit unclear regarding to the format of the report or reports. Also, I'm concerned that this wouldn't do anything since a punishment doesn't exist.

Colin: I'm in favour of this. I think that officer reports are very important and allow people to understand otherwise esoteric positions. I don't think that the lack of punishment matters -- the VP Communications already has bylaw requirements that don't have punishments but I think that them existing is a good motivator. I do think that the second half needs to be clarified.

Twesh: A bylaw without punishment does have some meaning. Extenuating circumstances may exist, but they can be considered and repeated bylaw violations may be addressed through mechanisms like the accountability meeting. I think we can put details of the report format in a policy.

Jonathan: It's the Board of Director's job to keep track of officers, and the situation where only the VP Finance is obligated to report there could be problems in the future where officers aren't transparent.

Ryan W.: I think that the brevity of officer reports in meetings is important, as they are redundant if the reports are submitted on time, and the summary requirement in the bylaw proposal should be removed or the brevity should be emphasized.

Billy: I think this is important but we should come back later with more thought.

Milan: I've written up a potential amendment:

"0.0.2. The Officers shall be required to submit a written report to the Speaker of the Board of their milestones, relevant updates, and general progress from the previous regular Board meeting.

0.0.3. The Officers shall submit the aforementioned report at least 72 hours prior to the commencement of each regular meeting of the Board, barring extraneous circumstances at the discretion of the Speaker.

0.0.4. Each Officer report shall include:

a) updates on new and/or ongoing initiatives within the portfolio;

b) progress of the project directors they oversee;

c) updates on collaboration with parties external to their portfolio;

d) any other information they deem relevant to the progress of the portfolio;

0.0.5. Each Officer shall provide a verbal summary, limited to 5 minutes, of higher-level initiatives outlined in their report."

Twesh: Is there a point in saying "extenuating circumstances" when punishments don't exist?



Raneem: Verbal reports are important because not everyone will have read the material or have access to it in the meeting -- particularly people who aren't members of the Board of Directors.

Colin: I don't think the verbal reports are useful. People should have read the material if it was circulated on time. I do think that there is a logistical problem with circulation that we may want to consider -- I send an email 5-7 days ahead of each Board of Directors meeting but not 72 hours before, so the submission of the reports may not be apparent to the membership.

Ryan W.: The important thing that officers need to do in the meeting is answer questions.

Kevin R.: I don't think it's worthwhile to effect a change the structure of Board meetings so that they must include certain things. This level of agenda manipulation doesn't happen elsewhere.

Twesh: I think that putting the onus on the officers to give a verbal report is an additional check on them, and helps in case the Board of Directors members don't read the content ahead of time. I don't think that the extenuating circumstances should be included because they aren't included in other similar bylaw requirements like the requirement for Project Directors to submit transition reports.

Aron: I think that providing verbal officer reports is useful for developing a more organic question period and being more inclusive of people who are walking in.

AMENDMENT by Kevin Rupasinghe to replace the original motion wording with:

0.0.2. The Officers shall be required to submit a written report to the Speaker of the Board of their milestones, relevant updates, and general progress from the previous regular Board meeting.

0.0.3. The Officers shall submit the aforementioned report at least 72 hours prior to the commencement of each regular meeting of the Board, barring extraneous circumstances at the discretion of the Speaker.

0.0.4. Each Officer report shall include:

- a) updates on new and/or ongoing initiatives within the portfolio;
- b) progress of the project directors they oversee;
- c) updates on collaboration with parties external to their portfolio;
- d) any other information they deem relevant to the progress of the portfolio;

0.0.5. Each Officer shall provide a brief verbal summary of higher-level initiatives outlined in their report.

Seconded by Muskan.

In favour: Samantha, Raneem, Ryan W., Aron, Oghosa, Mahta, Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Ryan G., Danja, Twesh, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R., Milan

Abstaining: Andrew

Amendment passes.

AMENDMENT by Ryan Gomes to remove the word "brief" in 0.0.5 and add ", limited to 5 minutes,"



Seconded by Muskan.

Ryan G.: We've gone further than the speaking limit in Robert's Rules of 10 minutes and we often go for a very long time. I think that if we're going to specify this much, we should specify time as well.

Colin: I think 10 minutes is more reasonable to effectively introduce everything that may need to be covered in the wide scope of officer responsibilities.

In favour: Ryan W., Ryan G., Danja, Mahta, Billy, Muskan, Kevin R, Milan, Jason, Mark

Against: Oghosa, Aron, Twesh, Sneha, Colin

Abstaining: Raneem, Andrew, Samantha, Olivia, Danil

Amendment passes.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Ryan W., Oghosa, Aron, Mahta, Jason, Mark, Billy, Danil, Ryan G., Danja, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R., Milan

Against: Twesh

Abstaining: Colin, Raneem, Andrew

Motion passed.

25. MOTION by Twesh Upadhyaya to create a directorship for branding and promotion in the Engineering Society

WHEREAS the board referred the creation of a Media Director to the Policy and Structures Committee.

WHEREAS the PSC was tasked to return a recommendation by the February Board Meeting.

WHEREAS the PSC concluded that a position should be created to better promote the Engineering Society to its membership, to address concerns regarding apathy and detachment of a large segment of the membership.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT, a Temporary Internal Director position called the Branding Director be created, to be elected concurrently with Project Directors and to serve for the 2017-2018 Skule year and to be overseen by the Vice-President Student Life, with the following mandate:

The Branding Director shall be responsible for the branding and promotion of the Engineering Society to its membership. The key roles include the following:

- a) Ensuring consistency across Engineering Society graphics and formatting.
- b) Designing graphics that promote Engineering Society and its work.
- c) Work with the Vice-President Communications to design social media content that promotes the Engineering Society and its work.

Seconded by Sneha.



AMENDMENT by Twesh Upadhyaya to change:

"To be overseen by the VP Student Life"

to:

"To be overseen by the VP Communications"

Seconded by Billy.

No objections.

Amendment passed.

Twesh: This issue has frequently come up, and has been addressed in some cases, but this is a better way to address branding. This is not a social media director. A social media director would require extensive oversight and would create too much bureaucracy. Branding and promotion was a much better approach to have consistency in formatting, colours, and so on. It gives the population a better idea what the society actually is, and what EngSoc is doing for them. During voting season, students hear vague claims that Engsoc takes care of 99% of what you do. However, this would help actualize it.

Aron: When reading this, sounds like promoting EngSoc to students. That isn't as important as promoting what EngSoc does. This shouldn't be about consistency in graphics; it should be more about "what can we do for you?", explanations of how to get involved, and understanding of what EngSoc does.

Muskan: We should be promoting what we do and improving the general public's understanding. However, based on my previous experience in high school, having an image of the Engineering Society would really help associate the Engineering Society with events. That way people who want to get engaged will know when EngSoc is involved, and it would promote what we do.

Twesh: The way this role would start off is for external matters (e.g. voting). Other matters would be a secondary priority.

Colin: I think that this is a cool idea. To give context for its utility: even in a graphical context, it helps a lot. Mechanisms to promote an event include Facebook, plasma screens, ECF login screens, posters, Digest, projectors, and so on. At least 5 aspect ratios are involved in this, and it's generally assumed VP Comm is in charge of promotion and graphics which is false. They do not necessarily have that skillset. Uniform branding is valuable, and would help us get messages out better.

Sneha: Are they promoting more higher level events that EngSoc is involved in? AGM, elections, and so on? In the event that project directors would like to promote a specific event, or do they have their own jurisdiction over this? Also, we'll have a new officer team coming up soon. It would be worthwhile to sit with them and see what they would like this position to be about, as each team has their own strengths.

Twesh: This is not meant so much to help directorships with their branding. It would be like promoting AGM, open positions and what they're about, and so on. In the case of specific project director events, they could say "Hey check this out, it's an EngSoc event" but wouldn't be extensively working together.



AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to change “The Branding Director shall be responsible for the branding and promotion of the Engineering Society to its membership.” to “The Branding Director shall be responsible for the branding and promoting understanding of the Engineering Society and resources available to its membership.”

Seconded by Colin.

Twesh: I think that this doesn't add much. To promote EngSoc, someone would have to know what it's about, but the Branding Director is not responsible for saying everything that's available. I don't think it needs to be explicitly stated.

Colin: I don't think that's a conflict. Depends what the new person running for it thinks.

Aron: It's the difference between how EngSoc looks versus telling constituents about services and better informing them. Focusing on what is available to membership is more important.

Oghosa: I agree with Twesh. This amendment moves away from general point of unifying content promoted by EngSoc. This role is supposed to just define branding and communication content provided by EngSoc.

Colin: I don't think there should be a distinction between graphics that look nice and those that promote an understanding of EngSoc. Graphics should do both. If the director don't have that motivation in mind, they are not useful, and I don't want this to pass.

Twesh: I see what your intent is with this amendment, but I think the wording here is unnecessarily long. There are other things that EngSoc does beyond directly providing services to students.

Colin: A word that means “things you do for someone” is “service”.

Aron: I think that everything EngSoc does can be called a service.

Jonathan: Because this is a temporary internal directorship, not going in the bylaws, this position will likely be heavily influenced by next year's officer team. I don't think it should be too substantive today.

Twesh: The goal behind this directorship is to promote EngSoc more to its members as our general membership doesn't know what we do. A side effect is more people finding out about us, but this is not the main goal. Having a single person that promotes “EngSoc” is crazy; each club and project director does this on their own. The goal here is to promote the central body and its positions; not every single position. The goal is to promote the Engineering Society and promote its general operations -- not what the officers or directors might do.

Aron: I have a very different view of the directorship. I think it should serve the constituents not EngSoc itself as a political entity.

Twesh: I did not intend for this to seem political; this has nothing to do with that. In terms of serving the membership, 99% of our positions really should serve them, but there's still a significant need for EngSoc to be better promoted, and in doing so we're only going to better serve this membership later by increasing general awareness. The end goal is still to engage membership, but we need inward focus.

Colin: Next year, whoever is elected to the position won't have the time, interest, or understanding to understand this distinction. They will make calls based on their understanding



of the portfolio which will change over time and be impacted by circumstances. The general concept of the directorship is strong, and these nuances will not be substantial.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to call the question

Seconded by Muskan.

In favour: Muskan, Kevin R., Milan, Ryan W., Mahta, Mark, Oghosa, Jason, Twesh, Billy

Abstaining: Aron

Motion to call the question passed.

Vote on amendment:

In favour: Ryan W, Aron, Jason, Mahta, Mark, Billy, Danil, Ryan G., Danja, Sneha, Colin, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan, Sam, Olivia

Opposed: Twesh

Abstaining: Oghosa

Amendment passed.

Main motion:

Ryan G.: A question for the Speaker in terms of bylaws, that I'd rather discuss now than later: bylaws as they are restrict the ability of the board to maintain temporary directorships beyond its term. Is it possible to create temporary directorships beyond this board's term?

Milan: Effectively this will be post-dated to start April 2017. Is that valid? We don't seem to have any provisions for it.

Billy: The Speaker ruling on interpreting bylaws is a UTSU thing. The board should interpret bylaws. There is nothing in the bylaws that limits when a directorship can be created; they simply say temporary internal directorships exist until the next round of directors is elected. I see no reason why this is illegal and I would encourage the board to vote in favour of this interpretation.

Colin: I drafted the same structure with the other proposed directorship. I don't think it's clean, but it gets the job done. We could create a temporary directorship in April for a similar but lesser effect, or create a permanent directorship and consider removing it later in contravention of the spirit of the temporary directorship structure, or we could post-date creation which is ugly but works well.

Raneem: The Mental Wellness Director faced same thing. The new board coming in decided whether or not to create a permanent directorship. What's wrong with that?

Ryan G.: With these positions in particular, there is no process by which we're electing them, so there's no way to report on their progress by JCM. Regarding the spirit of the temporary directorship bylaws, in my interpretation, the whole point is that the board decides they want this position, elect someone, observe their progress over the year, and then decide. It's another thing to have one board create a position for a new board. In my opinion, in situations like this it's more prudent to create it as a permanent director with a note saying that it should be reviewed to keep it cleaner in the spirit of the bylaw.



Billy: I see Ryan's arguments, but we don't know the spirit of the bylaw for sure. Its up to us to interpret it, and therefore I would like the boards approval to do a straw poll about how we're interpreting this question.

Twesh: What's the intent by making this permanent?

Ryan: What it's essentially doing is that it makes it such that we can elect it with all the other directors, and then next year the board can decide whether or not they like it next year. It is consistent with the bylaws and ensures next that the board reviews it.

Twesh: There are bylaws that prevent it as temporary directorship. Wouldn't it be better to make a temporary directorship and then review the bylaws?

MOTION by Billy Graydon to suspend Robert's Rules to have a straw poll to decide how to interpret the bylaws. Once that is settled we can continue.

Seconded by Milan.

In favour: Aron, Mahta, Oghosa, Mark, Jason, Billy, Danil, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan, Raneem, Sam Olivia

Abstaining: Ryan W., Twesh, Ryan G.

Motion passed.

Strawpoll:

Straw poll question: Can a board of directors create a temporary internal director for the *next* school year?

Yes: Samantha, Aron, Ryan W., Oghosa, Billy, Mark, Jason, Sneha, Kevin, Milan

No: Ryan G, Twesh, Mahta,

Abstaining: Danil, Olivia, Andrew

Eric: Will now resume normal rules, and return to the speaker's list.

Ryan G: Creating this position in a way that allows it to be elected with all the other positions and be reviewed by the board next year is a prudent way to move forward.

AMENDMENT by Ryan Gomes to add:

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this position be reviewed by the 2017-2018 Board of Directors at their February meeting."

Seconded by Colin.

Twesh: We want this to be a one year position and re-evaluate it. However if we made it a temporary directorship now, it would disappear in April. One route is to make it full and review in a year, and second is to post-date the creation until after the JCM. Considering we have a



motion to abolish the JCM, would it not make sense just to make it a temporary internal directorship?

Eric: That text won't likely be abolished but replaced

Billy: I would like to post-date the directorship and disagree with the amendment. The motion itself is in contravention of the bylaws. This is trying to create a permanent director with the mandate of the temporary project director, we should vote no on the amendment and leave it as is.

Kevin R.: I agree with Billy, but if the JCM does continue it would get terminated. If the following year determines if they do not want to follow this course of action, that's what it's for. It's meaningless if we create this until the end of the JCM; if the next board would like to see this exist they will vote it into existence. People forget what happened in these meetings -- people won't remember to check it in a year. It makes more sense to make it temporary and revisit in a couple months.

Aron: It doesn't make sense to have them review it in February, that said even if we make the temporary directorship now, there's an April board meeting where it could be renewed for another year.

MOTION by Aron Sankar to call the question.

Seconded by Billy.

In favour: Aron, Oghosa, Billy, Colin, Sam, Olivia Jason, Mark, Mahta, Ryan W., Kevin R, Muskan, Twesh

Opposed: Ryan G., Danja

Abstaining: Raneem, Andrew, Sneha

Motion to call the question passed.

Vote on amendment:

In favour: Ryan W., Danja, Muskan, Ryan W., Danil

Opposed: Samantha, Olivia, Kevin R., Milan, Aron, Oghosa, Billy, Mark, Twesh, Sneha

Abstaining: Raneem, Andrew

Amendment failed.

Twesh: As an alternative solution, I suggest we pass it as-is as a temporary director. Under our current bylaws, this would cease to exist at JCM, but with abolishing of JCM it resolves the issue. When that motion is on the table, we can amend it so that all temporary directorships cease to exist one year later

Eric: We can't discuss next motion in this motion.

MOTION by Twesh Upadhyaya to table the current motion until after motion 25 on the original agenda

Seconded by Ryan.



In favour: Ryan W, Raneem, Mark, Billy, Twesh, Danil, Sneha, Danja, Muskan, Milan, Colin, Samantha

Opposed: Oghosa, Aron, Kevin R.

Abstaining: Ryan W., Andrew, Olivia

Motion passed

MOTION by Colin to recess for 5 minutes

Seconded by Milan.

Motion passed.

26. MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to abolish the Joint Council Meeting

WHEREAS the Joint Council Meeting (JCM) is a vestige of the Engineering Society from days before the Board of Directors and serves function other than the election of Project Directors;

WHEREAS the election of Project Directors at the JCM is a troublesome and time-consuming process; and

WHEREAS a standing committee embarked upon a process to reform the process by which Project Directors are elected to ultimately eliminate the JCM;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 2, Chapter 4, which currently reads:

4.0. Project Directors

4.0.1. Unless stated otherwise in the Bylaws, all Project Directors shall be elected at the Joint Council Meeting, henceforth referred to as the JCM.

4.0.2. The Nomination Period for Project Directors shall be as follows:

a. For Project Directors elected at the JCM, the Nomination Period shall commence no later than 9:00 am on the Monday of the fourth week after Reading Week of winter term and shall close no earlier than four (4) business days later;

b. For all other Project Directorships, the Nomination Period shall be described in their position description in Bylaw 2 (Directors), Chapter 1 (Project Directors); or

c. In the event that a Project Director position is vacant, the Nomination Period shall be five (5) business days and the election shall occur at the first Board meeting thereafter.

4.0.3. Members may be nominated for more than one Project Director position.

4.0.4. A Member shall be considered nominated upon receipt by the CRO, during the Nomination Period, of a completed Nomination Form, which shall include but not be limited to:

a. The Member's name, student number, contact information, and signature; and



b. The names, student numbers, and signatures of ten (10) Nominators, all of whom shall be Members.

4.0.5. The CRO shall determine the order in which positions are elected. However, no elections shall be held after the CRO is elected at any given meeting.

4.0.6. Each candidate shall be given the opportunity to speak for two (2) minutes before the election in which he is nominated.

4.0.7. If a Member wins an election for a position, he shall be removed from consideration for any others.

4.0.8. Each Project Director shall be elected by a show of hands:

a. Candidates shall be sent out of the room.

b. Votes for each candidate shall be counted.

c. The candidate with the fewest votes shall be removed from consideration.

d. Another vote shall be held, and the process shall continue until one candidate receives a majority.

e. In all cases of ties, the CRO shall cast the deciding vote.

f. When only one candidate is nominated, voters shall vote either 'yes' or 'no'.

g. In the event that there is more than one (1) director sought for a project, the process shall be repeated with the winner of the previous election removed.

be stricken in its entirety and replaced with the following:

4.0. Project Directors

4.0.1. Unless stated otherwise in the Bylaws, all Project Directors shall be elected at the April Board of Directors Meeting.

4.1 Nominations

4.1.1. The Nomination Period for Project Directors shall be as follows:

a. For Project Directors elected at the April Board of Directors Meeting, the Nomination Period shall commence no later than 9:00 am on the Monday of the fourth week after Reading Week of winter term and shall close no earlier than four (4) business days later;

b. For all other Project Directorships, the Nomination Period shall be described in their position description in Bylaw 2 (Directors), Chapter 1 (Project Directors); or

c. In the event that a Project Director position is vacant, the Nomination Period shall be five (5) business days and the election shall occur at the first Board meeting thereafter.

4.1.2. Members may be nominated for more than one Project Director position.



4.1.3. A Member shall be considered nominated upon receipt by the CRO, during the Nomination Period, of a completed Nomination Form, which shall include but not be limited to: The Member's name, student number, contact information, and signature; and The names, student numbers, and signatures of ten (10) Nominators, all of whom shall be Members.

4.2 Hiring Committees

4.2.1. Once the nomination period is closed, all nominees for each project directorship shall be interviewed by a hiring committee consisting of the following members:

The outgoing project director(s)

The incoming overseeing officer

The outgoing overseeing officer

Three (3) general members of the society, or two (2) in the case of a co-directorship

4.2.2. Board of Directors members or Project Directors may, provided they are Members of the Society, sit on any hiring committee.

4.2.4. The hiring committee shall interview all nominees and minute each interview question and answer.

4.2.5. The hiring committee shall recommend a candidate, or candidates, from among the nominated candidates, or recommend to re-open nominations.

4.3 Board Meeting

4.3.1. The recommendation report shall be circulated among candidates no later than one week prior to the April Board of Directors Meeting.

4.3.2. The Board of Directors shall be responsible for electing each Project Director in accordance with the recommendation, or recommendations, provided by the hiring committee.

4.3.3 Any Member may move to amend the recommendation for any particular Project Director in accordance with bylaws and rules of procedure governing the consideration of motions at a Board of Directors meeting.

4.3.4 If a recommendation report supports multiple candidates, no candidate, or is undecided as to whom should be hired as the project director, then the Board may, on their own judgement after considering the recommendation report, elect a candidate or re-open nominations.

4.3.5 If a candidate that received the recommendation withdraws, then they shall provide notice to the speaker as soon as possible and that position shall be elected, or nominations re-opened, at the discretion of the Board of Directors after considering the recommendation report.

4.4 Elections

4.4.1 If any recommendation report by a hiring committee is contested or does not render a clear decision, then that position shall be elected, or



nominations re-opened, at the discretion of the Board of Directors after considering the recommendation report in its totality.

4.4.2. The CRO shall determine the order in which positions are elected. However, no elections shall be held after the new CRO is elected at any given meeting.

4.4.3. Each candidate shall be given the opportunity to speak for two (2) minutes before the election in which he is nominated.

4.4.4. If a Member wins the election for one position, he shall be removed from consideration for any others.

4.4.5. Each Project Director shall be elected by a show of hands from board members:

a. Candidates shall be sent out of the room.

b. Votes for each candidate, and for re-opening of nominations, shall be counted.

c. The candidate with the fewest votes shall be removed from consideration.

d. Another vote shall be held, and the process shall continue until one candidate receives a simple majority of votes.

e. In all cases of ties, the CRO or the person acting as CRO, as the case may be, shall cast the deciding vote.

f. When only one candidate is nominated, voters shall vote either 'yes' or 'no'.

g. In the event that there is more than one (1) director sought for a project, the process shall be repeated with the winner of the previous election removed.

Seconded Ryan W.

AMENDMENT by Twesh Upadhyaya to change:

"All Temporary Internal Director positions cease to exist at the adjournment of the Joint Council Meeting (First Part) immediately following the creation of the position."

to:

"All Temporary Internal Director positions cease to exist at the adjournment of the Board of Directors meeting 1 year from the one at which they were created."

Billy: It's possible for terms to get out of sync.

Aron: Is there a point in ensuring that director elections are synced?

Colin: Yes. Syncing promotion is important, and syncing them with officer elections is important

Ryan G.: Temporary internal directorships present a difficult scheduling challenge for elections. I think letting them be out of sync is a problem.



MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to call the question

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Ryan W., Aron, Raneem, Aron, Mark, Jason, Billy, Twesh, Ryan G., Danja, Muskan, Sneha, Kevin R., Andrew, Milan, Oghosa

Motion to call the question passed.

Vote on amendment:

Opposed: Ryan W., Samantha, Oghosa, Sneha, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Ryan G., Danja, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R., Milan

Abstaining: Raneem, Olivia, Aron, Andrew, Colin

Amendment failed.

Ryan G.: What consultation was done?

Milan: I reached out to council early on to gather input and help. I spoke with discipline clubs and council was informed of this motion a few days ago.

Kevin R.: I think that the consultation has been decent, but I think that there has not been enough time for council to consider the impact of this change and it seems like a short timeline with only a month and a half until the Joint Council Meeting.

Billy: I think there has been enough notice to the council.

Aron: I don't think that additional circling around this topic will provide more substantial additions to this motion. Without putting this in practice, we won't have a good idea if this is a substantial.

Kevin R.: If the Faculty did this kind of thing -- proposing a drastic change to something that affects students this suddenly -- we'd be pissed. We asked for input, and for people to dedicate a bunch of their time to helping us design a change, but if someone couldn't do that they now don't have the chance to give feedback before this is implemented. The Joint Council Meeting is the perfect opportunity for asking council what they think about this.

Colin: Note that there wasn't a week of notice. The agenda was later than usual, and I circulated it to the general membership much later than usual due to some awkward scheduling.

Ryan G.: I agree that the timing of the notices is rushed.

Oghosa: I don't think that cutting out Council's voice in governance is good.

Muskan: I think that a lot of thought was put into this, and we're in the best position to put this forward now. If it is seen that it isn't the most effective solution, they can get rid of it later.

Ryan W.: I agree with Kevin's points. I do like the hiring committee idea and think it's a huge step forward. I also want to ask: why three general members or two for a co-directorship?

Milan: We came to the conclusion that 6 is an effective number of people that isn't too intimidating and for co-directorships there is one more outgoing project director so less space for general members.

Aron: We can use the AGM as a check if we pass this motion. People need to approve our decision anyway.



Jonathan: Only Bylaw 1 changes get ratified at the AGM. I see the point of general members of the committee, but I think 6 people is intimidating, so that's something to consider. Also, what happens to JCM part 2?

Billy: This isn't consistent with the way motions should be considered. If we think it is inappropriate to consider the question, we should not enter discussion on it at all.

MOTION by Billy Graydon to suspend the rules to object with a simple majority

Seconded by Colin.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Aron, Oghosa, Ryan W., Mahta, Mark, Billy, Danil, Muskan, Kevin R., Andrew, Sneha

Abstaining: Ryan G., Danja, Twesh

Motion passed.

MOTION by Billy Graydon to object to consideration of the question

Seconded by Colin.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Oghosa, Mahta, Danil, Twesh, Ryan G., Danja, Sneha, Kevin R., Colin

Opposed: Billy, Mark, Aron, Muskan

Abstaining: Andrew

Motion passed.

Back to discussion on motion 15 on the Branding Director position:

Ryan G.: I'm concerned that I as CRO can't solicit nominations for a position that doesn't exist yet.

Colin: We did that for valedictorian this year, technically.

Ryan G.: Fair point. I think that the implementation is the only point we're in contention over.

Milan: There is interesting precedent with Design Team Association Project Manager. A motion to renew it wasn't created until April after it was destroyed.

MOTION by Muskan Sethi to call the question

Seconded by Aron.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Aron, Oghosa, Mahta, Mark, Billy, Danil, Danja, Muskan, Sneha, Kevin R., Andrew, Colin

Opposed: Ryan G., Twesh

Motion to call the question passed.

Vote on main motion:



In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Ryan W., Raneem, Aron, Mahta, Oghosa, Mark, Billy, Danil, Muskan, Kevin R., Andrew, Sneha, Colin

Abstaining: Twesh, Ryan G., Danja

Motion passed.

27. MOTION by Colin Parker to Create a Directorship Position for Inclusivity and Equity in the Engineering Society

WHEREAS Ryan Gomes submitted a motion to the November Board of Directors meeting to create an Equity Director as a project director

WHEREAS discussion of the topic of that motion was delegated to an ad-hoc committee

WHEREAS the ad-hoc committee was open to the membership and held two meetings

WHEREAS the ad-hoc committee concluded that a position should be created to address concerns about inclusivity and equity in the Skule community

WHEREAS the ad-hoc committee concluded that the position should liaise with the Ombudsperson to gather input from students

WHEREAS the ad-hoc committee has reached a consensus about the position's structure on all matters except the name of the position and whether it should be a Project Directorship or a Temporary Internal Director

WHEREAS the directorship must be named by a vote according to Robert's Rules of Order

WHEREAS the ad-hoc committee suggests amending this motion to implement either a Project Directorship or a Temporary Internal Directorship

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following be added to Bylaw 2:

1.23 _____ Director

1.23.1 There shall be a _____ Director, who shall be responsible for promoting inclusivity in the community through the following:

a) The development and promotion of programming for the engineering community;

b) Reaching out to clubs to collaborate on events and provide support;

c) Working with campus organizations to facilitate education and discussion on inclusivity and equity;

d) Actively seeking out the opinions and views of the Members to improve inclusivity within the community and the government of the Engineering Society;

e) Working with the Ombudsperson to respond to issues related to inclusivity and equity raised on the census and be available to support the Ombudsperson on issues relevant to the director's portfolio.

1.23.2 The Director shall be overseen by the Vice-President Student Life and shall consult with that officer on public events.



BE IT RESOLVED THAT the ____ Temporary Internal Director be created, to be elected concurrently with Project Directors and to serve for the 2017-2018 Skule year and to be overseen by the Vice-President Student Life, with the following mandate:

The ____ Director shall promote inclusivity in the community through the following:

- a) The development and promotion of programming for the engineering community;
- b) Reaching out to clubs to collaborate on events and provide support;
- c) Working with campus organizations to facilitate education and discussion on inclusivity and equity;
- d) Actively seeking out the opinions and views of the Members to improve inclusivity within the community and the government of the Engineering Society;
- e) Working with the Ombudsperson to respond to issues related to inclusivity and equity raised on the census and be available to support the Ombudsperson on issues relevant to the director's portfolio.

Seconded by Oghosa.

Colin: All the blanks are the same, so according to Robert's Rules we now enter discussion followed by voting on the word or words to fill the blank.

Ryan G.: Colin had a question earlier regarding the benefits of calling it an "equity" director, so I think it would be useful to repeat the answer I gave then:

"There's a fundamental reason why the director should be called an Equity Director beyond my arguments that we shouldn't be afraid to use the word and other organizations utilize it. While it's been characterized as a difference of semantics, I contend that it creates a fundamental difference to the position that would leave it as a detriment to the society.

There's a quote that I feel aptly summarizes what equity means far better than any definition I could contrive: "Equity derives from a concept of social justice. It represents a belief that there are some things which people should have, that there are basic needs that should be fulfilled, that burdens and rewards should not be spread too divergently across the community, and that policy should be directed with impartiality, fairness and justice towards these ends." Equity as a concept is fundamentally rooted in the idea that there are systemic barriers and burdens that some people bear in society that need to be addressed. These often manifest itself along the lines of race, sexual orientation, gender, financial status etc. To refer back to the proposed wording, the kind of programming an Equity Director would develop would examine discussions and education regarding these systemic barriers and work on collaborations with clubs to bring about programming surrounding these issues.

Inclusivity, on the other hand, is far broader. Inclusivity does generally include working to include many of the types of folks I mentioned in the last paragraph, but it



often also can refer to other issues not based in these topics. For example, some members over the years have mentioned in the past that they don't feel necessarily included within the EngSoc community (usually through the census), but sometimes the reasons have to do more with an introvert vs extrovert problem, or perceived cliquishness. That's not to say that we shouldn't be working to address these points as well as a community, but my major concern is that this is what an Inclusivity Director would focus on, instead of the more systemic barriers that I mentioned previously."

Ryan G.: We could also name it the "inclusivity and equity director".

Muskan: I think that inclusivity could be focused more on outcomes than barriers.

Billy: On a note that Ryan raised, that "Inclusivity on the other hand is far broader...", I agree. I think inclusivity includes equity and is hugely important as pointed out on the EngSoc census. There are groups who would not be served by an equity director but would be served by an inclusivity director.

Aron: I think naming it something more broad would allow the director to focus on whatever issues they think are the best.

MOTION by Aron Sankar to call the vote

Seconded by Muskan.

Motion passed.

Following a short election with the options of "equity", "inclusivity", "equity and inclusivity", and "inclusivity and equity", the "equity and inclusivity" option won.

Andrew: I'm concerned about this position policing others. Does it need to be a directorship? Can anyone provide an example of its utility?

Gomes: If they policed others, an officer would smack them down. An example of its utility is collaborating with clubs to help with events

Raneem: Could this being a co-directorship help it tackle such a broad scope?

AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to remove the provisions for making the position permanent

Seconded by Billy.

Aron: Based on previous discussion I think that the board is comfortable with this kind of amendment, so I think we should decide this now.

Gomes: I think that the difference is in responsibility. It's easy to shut down conversations about equity, and I think that the next board of directors will shut this down regardless of the position's performance

Billy: The intent of the motion is not relevant in the future -- it could be a policing situation later



Ryan G.: If the director polices people, and the officer doesn't do anything, then it's the responsibility of the overseeing officer at that point. Oversight structures are in place

Ryan W.: We've been talking a lot about the potential behaviour of next year's Board, but I don't think that that's relevant. While people could hijack these systems later and seize the means of production, that's not really up to us. I think that this motion is well-structured and if piloted by good volunteers it would be valuable

MOTION by Aron Sankar to call the question

Seconded by Colin.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Aron, Ryan W., Oghosa, Mahta, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Muskan, Sneha, Kevin R.

Opposed: Raneem, Ryan G., Danja

Motion to call the question passed.

Vote on amendment:

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Ryan W., Aron, Oghosa, Mahta, Mark, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Kevin R., Sneha, Colin

Opposed: Raneem, Ryan G., Danja

Amendment passed.

Twesh: Could anyone give an example of a situation in which this would help?

Ryan G.: A main part of the role would be holding events to raise awareness about issues.

Aron: For example, if commuters feel excluded this director could find a solution to having people stay overnight. Or, another example, if there are language barriers they could discuss or promote the implementation of language workshops

Twesh: These are examples where you are solving the problem, but a lot of substantial issues aren't things that can be solved. For the bigger issues, how can this position tackle them?

Muskan: This directorship can direct people towards, say, grants and scholarships or direct people to resources that they may not be aware of. We may not be able to solve these problems but we can work on them

Ryan W.: For larger issues it would be the responsibility of the director to educate about them

Twesh: EngSoc doesn't typically provide resources for education. Racism and such seem like things that the university should handle. It could also prove to be a liability issue.

MOTION by Oghosa Igbinakenzua to call the question

Ryan W. seconded.

In favour: Samantha, Ryan W., Mahta, Oghosa, Danil, Twesh, Sneha, Kevin R.,

Opposed: Ryan G., Danja, Muskan, Billy, Raneem

Abstaining: Aron, Colin



Motion to call the question failed.

AMENDMENT by Ryan G. to “BIFT that the equity and inclusivity temporary along with the temporary branding director have their nominations solicited at the same time as project directorships”

Seconded by Muskan.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Danil, Ryan G., Danja, Muskan, Sneha, Colin

Opposed: Aron, Oghosa, Twesh, Kevin R.

Abstaining: Mahta

Amendment passed.

AMENDMENT by Ryan G. to change “director” to “co-directorship”

Seconded by Raneem.

Ryan G.: Raneem brought this up and we didn’t discuss it, so I think we should.

Aron: I think we should try it for a year and see if there is enough work to justify a co-directorship.

Raneem: I think that people have discussed distinctions between equity and inclusivity so I think having people tackling each issue.

Colin: I don’t think it would be good. In this meeting we have had enough difficulty defining the difference between equity and inclusivity, and arguments about that can split a pair of directors. We don’t know what this position’s portfolio will look like yet -- I’d prefer to see a more harmonious vision try to carve it out at first than risk conflict and infighting. Co-directorships have historically worked well, but have only been used for the commercial operations where the liability is high and the tasks that need to be done are very clear most of the time.

MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to call the question

Seconded by Billy.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Aron, Mahta, Oghosa, Billy, Danil, Ryan G., Danja, Muskan, Sneha, Kevin R.

Motion to call the question passed.

Vote on amendment:

In favour: Muskan, Ryan G., Danja, Raneem

Opposed: Samantha, Ryan W., Aron, Oghosa, Mahta, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Sneha, Kevin R., Colin



Abstaining: Olivia
Amendment failed.

MOTION by Aron to call the question

Seconded by Ryan W.
Motion to call the question passed.

Main motion passed.

- 28. MOTION by Billy Graydon to allow Academic Break and Elective Memberships**
WHEREAS many members of the Society are forced to temporarily withdraw from the Faculty due to academic probation, medical or family matters and other extraneous factors;
WHEREAS many members choose to take time off to work for a year rather than doing PEY;
WHEREAS many individuals from other faculties have found a home in the engineering community; and
WHEREAS all of these individuals contribute in very meaningful ways to the community;
BE IT RESOLVED THAT bylaw 1 Section 1.0.1, which currently reads:
- 1.0.1. There shall be three (3) types of Members:
 - a. Full Time Members
 - b. Part Time Members
 - c. Alumni Members
 - d. Ex-Officio Members
- be amended to read:
- 1.0.1. There shall be six (6) types of Members:
 - a. Full Time Members
 - b. Part Time Members
 - c. Alumni Members
 - d. Ex-Officio Members
 - e. Academic Break Members
 - f. Elective Members
- BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the following be added to section 1.1:
- 1.1.6. Academic Break Members shall have previously been Full Time or Part Time Members of the Society, shall be eligible to return to the Faculty to complete their studies, shall intend to return to the Faculty to complete their studies, and shall register to the VP Finance in writing at the start of each academic year their interest in remaining an Academic Break Member.
 - 1.1.7. Elective Members shall be students in a program of study at the University of Toronto, and shall register to the VP Finance in writing at the start of each academic year their interest in being an Elective Member.



BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Section 1.1.4, which currently reads:

1.1.4. Full Time Members shall have paid in full the Membership Fee described in Section 1.2

be amended to read:

1.1.4. Full Time, Academic Break and Elective Members shall have paid in full the Membership Fee described in Section 1.2

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the following be added to Section 1.2:

1.2.5. Academic Break and Elective Members shall pay a membership fee in the same amount as the Full Time membership fee

1.2.6. Academic Break and Elective Members shall remit their membership fee in a manner and by deadlines which the VP Finance may from time to time set, and in failure thereof shall cease to be a member

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Section 1.3, which currently reads:

1.3. Rights of Membership

1.3.1. Alumni Members shall enjoy no rights of Membership other than the right to speak at General Meetings and at meetings of the Board of Directors.

1.3.2. All other rights and responsibilities of Members described in this document shall pertain only to Full Time and Part Time Members.

1.3.3. Ex-Officio Members shall enjoy no rights of Membership other than the right to speak and vote at General Meetings and a meetings of the Board of Directors.

Be amended to read:

1.3. Rights of Membership

1.3.1. Alumni Members shall enjoy no rights of Membership other than the right to speak at General Meetings and at meetings of the Board of Directors.

1.3.2. Ex-Officio Members shall enjoy no rights of Membership other than the right to speak and vote at General Meetings and a meetings of the Board of Directors. If an Ex-Officio Member is also eligible to be a member in any other capacity, he shall enjoy the union of the rights of the two classes of membership.

1.3.3. All other rights and responsibilities of Members described in the bylaws shall pertain only to Full Time, Part Time, Academic Break and Elective Members.

1.3.4. Notwithstanding 1.3.3, Elective Members shall not have a vote in any election of the Society and may not serve as its Speaker or President, or as a Director of the same.

Seconded by Colin.

MOTION by Billy Graydon to withdraw the motion

Seconded by Aron.



In favour: Colin, Sam, Raneem, Ryan W., Mahta, Oghosa, Aron, Billy, Danil, Ryan G., Danja, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R.

Opposed: Twesh

Abstaining: Olivia

Motion to withdraw passed. Main motion withdrawn.

29. MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to add an electronic voting booth to the Sandford Fleming Atrium for the duration of the elections

WHEREAS students are often in the SF Atrium and may find easier access to voting to be convenient

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Society place an electronic voting booth in the SF Atrium no later than the beginning of the Officer election period and until the last of the levy or Director elections periods end, or the last day of class (April 13, 2017), whichever comes first

Seconded by Oghosa.

Kevin R.: Voter turnout is often low, and I think that having a conveniently accessible voting booth would allow people who are otherwise loitering to vote.

Raneem: Our voting system doesn't work on phones. There are some logistical problems with a booth but we can work them out.

Ryan G.: I don't see a lot of problems with it but the logistical issues are considerable.

AMENDMENT by Billy Graydon to add:

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT if it is impossible for the project to be completed, then the Board of Directors accepts the best efforts of those involved"

Seconded by Raneem.

Colin: The difference between this and an informal solution is not substantial.

In favour: Billy, Twesh, Oghosa, Raneem, Aron, Ryan W., Sneha, Danil, Colin

Opposed: Kevin R., Muskan

Abstaining: Olivia

Amendment passed.

Colin: I think this should be assigned to a specific person if we're going to do it. Otherwise it will end up being me.

Twesh: I think that this could bias votes towards a particular crowd, since particular cultures are more common in the Pit



Kevin R.: I think the main reason that the Pit is good because the EngSoc office is there. I think there is a good variety of people going through the atrium due to its central location and resources there. I don't think it would have a substantial or predictable effect on the vote

AMENDMENT by Muskan Sethi to add *"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Muskan Sethi takes the lead on the logistics involved in the project"*

Seconded by Sneha.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Aron, Ryan W., Oghosa, Billy, Danil, Sneha, Kevin R.

Abstaining: Twesh, Muskan

Amendment passed.

Aron: I think that it being in the Pit would influence the vote substantially towards that demographic.

Raneem: The motion does not restrict us to just the Pit.

In favour: Samantha, Olivia, Raneem, Ryan W., Oghosa, Danil, Sneha, Kevin R.

Opposed: Aron, Twesh

Abstaining: Billy, Muskan, Colin

30. Discussion item on Temporary Internal Directorships

Aron: We can always renew the Branding and Inclusivity/Equity Director at the April Board Meeting after the JCM by the current board for the upcoming year. That wouldn't be any less in the spirit of making it permanent and forcing it on next year's board anyway, and still ensures that a review of how well it did at the end.

Twesh: I think it would be hasty for us to renew these now.

Aron: With respect to External Relations Director, we could collect nominations and it wouldn't be the end of the world if we discontinued the directorship later, in order to leave the option open in case we do decide to keep it and want to elect someone at the JCM.

31. In camera discussion item

MOTION by Billy Graydon to move in camera with Eden Gough in the room

Seconded by Colin.

AMENDMENT by Kevin Rupasinghe to not include Eden Gough in the in camera discussion

Seconded by Raneem.



Kevin R.: I think that we should be consistent with not allowing people in the room, regardless of whether or not we trust them. They have no legal obligation to be quiet about what is said.
Billy: She already knows what we're going to talk about.

In favour: Samantha, Raneem, Ryan W., Oghosa, Danil, Twesh, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R.
Opposed: Billy
Abstaining: Aron
Amendment passed.

Voting on main motion:

In favour: Raneem, Samantha, Olivia, Ryan W., Aron, Oghosa, Billy, Danil, Twesh, Sneha, Muskan, Kevin R.
Motion passed.

["In camera" discussion occurred. No minutes were recorded.]

32. ADJOURNMENT

Seconded by Colin
Motion carried. Meeting Adjourned.



Attendance

Officers		
President	Milan Maljkovic	Present
VP Finance	Andrew Boetto	Present
VP Communication	Colin Parker	Present
VP Academic	Samantha Stuart	Present
VP Student Life	Raneem Shammas	Present
Directors of the Board		
At-Large	Ryan Williams	Present
At-Large	Oghosa Igbinakenzua	Present
At-Large	Kevin Rupasinghe	Present
At-Large	Twesh Upadhyaya	Present
Chemical Representative	<i>Jason Tang</i>	Present
Civil Representative	Sneha Adhikari	Present
Computer Representative	Billy Graydon	Present
Electrical Representative	Danja Papajani	Proxy to Ryan Gomes
Engineering Science Representative	Apurv Bharadwaj	Absent without regrets
Industrial Representative	Aron Sankar	Present
Materials Science Representative	Mahta Massoud	Present
Mechanical Representative	Mark Chaboryk	Present
<i>Mineral Representative</i>	Olivia Mogielnicki	Proxy to Samantha Stuart
First Year	Muskan Sethi	Present
First Year	Kevin Zhang	Present
First Year	Danil Ojha	Present
UTSU Representative	Ryan Gomes	Present