



January 2017 Board of Directors Meeting

Meeting called to order at 2:22PM.

MOTION by Andrew Boetto to add the following motion to the agenda:

***“MOTION by Andrew Boetto to appoint three undergraduate members to the Skule Endowment Fund Committee
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Raneem Shammam, Twesh Upadhyaya, and Aron Sankar are appointed the Skule Endowment Fund Committee”***

Seconded by Samantha.

In favour: Milan, Raneem, Samantha, Aron, Twesh, Mahta, Danil, Sneha, Olivia, Kevin R., Apurv, Jason, Andrew

Motion passed.

MOTION by Billy Graydon to add discussion item to the Agenda on the proposed Bylaw 8 as circulated to the Board of Directors

[Minuter's note: Please see meeting Appendix for the drafted Bylaw 8]

Seconded by Milan.

In favour: Milan, Samantha, Aron, Twesh, Danil, Billy, Mark, Sneha, Olivia, Kevin R., Apurv, Jason, Andrew

Against: Raneem

Motion failed.

[Minuter's note: adding motions to the agenda require unanimous consent.]

Muskan entered.

1) ADOPTION of the Agenda

Seconded by Kevin R.

In favour: Aron, Raneem, Samantha, Olivia, Sneha, Muskan, Danil, Kevin R., Apurv, Jason, Andrew, Milan.

Motion passed.

2) APPROVAL of November 2016 Minutes

Seconded by Raneem.

In favour: Milan, Samantha, Raneem, Aron, Mahta, Danil, Olivia, Sneha, Jason, Andrew, Billy



Abstaining: Twesh, Mark

Motion passed.

3) APPROVAL of December 2016 Minutes

Seconded by Andrew.

Kevin R.: Apurv messaged me saying that there is an error in the minutes for something he said in the discussion about the proposed equity director.

Colin: That was from November, unfortunately. I think the best course of action would be him telling me later what the issue is, and me bringing the November minutes to the February meeting for approval if a significant change is required.

In favour: Samantha, Milan, Raneem, Aron, Twesh, Mahta, Danil, Sneha, Olivia, Kevin R., Andrew, Billy

Abstaining: Apurv, Mark

Motion passed.

4) Business arising from minutes

None.

5) REPORTS by Officers or their designates

a) President -- Milan Maljkovic

Aron: Is there any formal process necessary to leave the St. George Round Table?

Milan: The board could vote to leave, that's about it.

Ahmed: How much time does it take up for you to be part of this?

Milan: A couple of hours every couple of weeks.

Twesh: Could the presence of EngSoc move the SGRT toward something more appealing to us?

Milan: It could. One of the concerns I've had previously is that the SGRT is trying to move toward being another student government and the value of the initiative has been unclear.

Billy: The benefit I see of the SGRT is that it provides a single point of contact for all student governments on campus, and I think the cost to us is relatively low.

Kevin R.: Apurv was asking about the CEIE. Do we have info on that besides the arena details? Can we have a floorplan?

Raneem: I'm not sure if we can provide floorplans, but I'll ask the committee.

Muskan: Will the arena be in addition to 256 McCaul as a workspace?

Milan: They don't like this comparison, but it will be like the Pit of the CEIE for work purposes and will be divided up and booked regularly. The lifespan of 256 McCaul and 704 Spadina as a space for student clubs seems like it is under 2 years.

Raneem: Accommodations for all clubs and teams are still being worked out, and is a constant project.



b) VP Finance

Aron: If and when sponsorship is updated with food deals, how will people get informed?

Andrew: We'll update the website and circulate notice.

Billy: How much did the Suds fridge cost?

Aron: \$2200. [Minuter's note: Aron considered the number further after the meeting and clarified as "\$2000 to \$2200"]

c) VP Communications

Billy: I've tested the method of producing "@____.skule.ca" email addresses and can help if you'd like. Also, would you like to elect a new Equity Director Committee chair at this meeting given that you are concerned about having a lot to do?

Colin: I'd rather elect them at the next committee meeting, but I'll think about it.

Muskan: Will the focus groups be promoted?

Colin: Yes, the Faculty members involved are promoting them. I'm also going to reach out to class representatives and potentially circulate notice in the Skule Digest or as an addendum to another email being circulated.

d) VP Academic

Harry: How will SpeakUp be transitioned to future years?

Samantha: It will be the responsibility of VP Academic going forward. I'm considering amending bylaws to include it in the Webmaster portfolio as well.

Aron: What was the process on the Engineering Career Centre report? Will it be reviewed by the Board of Directors?

Samantha: The process was iterative based on the research and revisions performed at AAC meetings from October to present. It won't be formally reviewed by the Board of Directors, but I'd appreciate feedback on it. Everyone, please review the report now as we're sending it to them in early February.

Oghosa entered.

e) VP Student Life

Billy: What is the Gradball venue?

Raneem: Claireport Place.

Billy: What caused the scheduling issues with the Orientation election period? Was it just the late start to the semester? Should we transition info about it?

Raneem: Yeah, it was the late start. We'll try to transition information about it so that the January Board of Directors meeting can be scheduled appropriately.

Muskan: What's the DTA?



Raneem: The Design Team Association. The Design Team Association Project Manager is one of our project directors, Kevin Rupasinghe, who is also a Board of Directors member. (*points across room*)

Muskan: Why is there a VIP list for Gradball?

Raneem: It's for invites to faculty members such as the Dean that we are trying to thank for everything they've done.

6) REPORTS by Committees

a) Equity Directorship Ad Hoc Committee

Colin: There is nothing major to report and this was covered in my officer report. Since most of the members present were in favour of creating the position in a similar way, we mostly scoped the position from the original proposal. I'm hoping to get more debate at the next meeting.

b) Policy & Structures Committee

Twesh: We lost two members and are working on filling the roles. I don't think it will delay us too much as the turnaround should be quick. We are focusing on compliance with the Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act as the end of the year is approaching.

7) PRESENTATION by the Ombudsperson of the Society

Sneha: Would you be able to ask the students what should go on the census?

Maheyer: I think that that might be too wide, but maybe. I think the Board would be good stand-ins as the students' voice.

Twesh: How many people said EngSoc was secretive?

Maheyer: A few people.

Muskan: Do EngSoc have any authority to resolve the academic issues or can we only pass the complaints on?

Samantha: The Faculty is looking for problems and we're taking an active role in providing feedback and suggestions.

Oghosa: Was the feedback for Orientation passed on to the Orientation Chair?

Maheyer: I didn't pass that along; the last Ombudsperson might have.

8) MOTION by Andrew Boetto to appoint three undergraduate members to the Skule Endowment Fund Committee

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Raneem Shammam, Twesh Upadhyaya, and Aron Sankar are appointed the Skule Endowment Fund Committee

Seconded by Raneem.

Kevin R.: What does ex-officio means in the context of faculty members on this committee?

Milan: I think that that means that they are part of the committee based on their position.



Kevin R.: I think this would be a valuable opportunity to get students beyond the Board of Directors and Finance Committee.

Andrew: I agree that it should be that way. Unfortunately, this fell on me and got pushed back due to other requirements. I will make sure that I put in my transition document to consider this earlier in the future. I don't think that we have time for an application at this point, though.

Billy: I agree with Kevin's points, and I think that given the degree to which EngSoc has speared other organizations for financial mismanagement we should be very careful to do this properly.

AMENDMENT by Billy Graydon to add to the motion:

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a call for nominations be circulated for three undergraduate members, interviews be held for those members, and the committee restruck with those members by the end of February”

Seconded by Ryan W.

Ryan W.: I think it's bad for us to appoint people already in the thick of EngSoc business considering we've seen from the census that EngSoc is already perceived as exclusive
Kevin R.: Why is the end of February the proposed date? That might not be enough time to actually do the job.

Billy: To clarify, I don't mean that the committee would cease operations until the end of February. It would work and then the new members (potentially the same members) would transition into the role.

Andrew: I think it would be too late. A big bottleneck is that we need to have the Board approve the election process.

Muskan: Are the meetings of the Skule Endowment Fund Committee open?

Andrew: Yes.

Twesh: I think that we should go to the Policy and Structures Committee to develop clear notice periods for this kind of election.

Kevin R.: I think that using the Finance Committee as a second pair of eyes while waiting for an application period to take place would be fine.

Aron: How would the application process work?

Andrew: I would do it roughly how it was done last year, with the President and I holding interviews.

Vote on amendment:

In favour: Billy, Mark, Danil, Muskan, Raneem, Ryan W., Mahta, Kevin, Apurv, Olivia, Sneha, Jason, Oghosa, Colin

Against: Samantha, Andrew, Milan

Abstaining: Twesh, Aron

Amendment passed.

Vote on main motion:



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

Abstaining: Twesh

Motion passed.

8 Other Business

Discussion: Involvement in EngSoc

Ryan W.: Involvement of various groups, particularly international students, has been identified as a problem. Does the Board of Directors have ideas for how to actually address this kind of thing?

Aron: I think that a lot of this starts with Orientation.

Billy: I'd consider merging this issue with the portfolio of the proposed Equity Director, or re-naming Equity director to Inclusivity director to address these problems of getting people involved.

Maheyer: We should be working from the start. The Frosh-EngSoc Mixer was a fair success. An International-Student--EngSoc mixer would be valuable as well. The University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Student Union are more welcoming to international students than EngSoc. Not a problem with students; it's the way we welcome them.

Colin: I've had some exposure to this as VP Communications. I think there's a lot of room to work on this in my portfolio, but I've been working more on making tools available to people that are already invested this year. I have two suggestions for potentially mitigating this problem. First, I think an EngSoc social media person would be very valuable to get the word out about our events, mandate, and culture. Social media is currently too much work for the VP Communications to take on. Second, we could do another mixer this semester focused on getting people aware of what the positions are right before the elections. This is a really good opportunity to put all our eggs in a good basket, and promote to the public so people understand what the roles are. We are talking to project directors but that isn't always enough.

Milan: I'm thinking of a relevant book called "Motivating the middle". In any group of people, you will have a "nominal third" that is highly engaged, another third that no matter what you do will not care, and the middle third, which you need to provide resources with to be more engaged. First, we need to frame what we mean by involvement. Is someone involved in a design team part of EngSoc? I think so, but some students might not recognize it.

Ahmed: I think there are two types of involvement; one when people are around a lot and get involved in the "large audience events" such as Mr. Blue and Gold. Through these events, there are a lot of opportunities for improved engagement. Frosh Week is also a good opportunity.

Ryan W.: At the November board meeting, we talked about having a "media director" for photography and how does that relate to this? They could be in line depending on how we choose to relate these positions.



Twesh: The Policy and Structures Committee reviewed the idea of a photography director or media director and can circulate its thoughts on those. Are we considering people involved in EngSoc as those who are a project director or on the Board of Directors, or are we talking about coming out to EngSoc events? Attending a club's events is just as good as getting involved in EngSoc, as we're getting them connected to something. Having an idea of numbers would be helpful.

Aron: I don't think we should necessarily replace existing events, but creating alternatives for people with different personalities would be valuable. We could create a broader appeal for other types of people.

Billy: One barrier to entry is the elections process. Not a lot of people are comfortable with that. There are some things that don't require electing but aren't terribly advertised. The Joint Council Meeting model tends to result in a lot of runners-up that are qualified but don't get involved. For one thing, overseeing officers can sit down with project directors to talk about how to get the people who didn't win involved. Focus groups are one way we can also get feedback about how things can be improved. Echoing others' comments, I don't think it's a problem of lack of other types of events; it's that Frosh Week and other groups of events put an emphasis on the rowdy events, and we don't put an emphasis on the quiet events. Making that change starting from Orientation Week would put a great spin on things and allow people to continue feeling involved.

Katherine: I'm the second year electrical engineering class representative. We talked about getting international students a bit in ECE club. These students are paying a lot more money at a difficult university, there's more pressure on them to succeed academically. I think we should keep in mind that many of them may not focus on EngSoc events and that's fine.

Jonathan: To expand on the "Suds Douchebags" observation in the census, there are a lot of cultural and intangible factors at play. We've seen in the past how much of a difference leadership in EngSoc can make. If you lead with hate and anger it will trickle down, and leadership needs to ensure the people coming in can help move the culture forward as we have been doing in recent years.

Milan: I'm mostly interested right now in getting something actionable. Do you want to strike a committee?

Ryan W.: Not now. I want to get more information, and prepare something for the next board meeting.

Raneem: I'll raise a point of concern. Whenever I spoke to project directors that had monthly or bi-monthly events, I really emphasized getting more people involved. One of the directors countered, saying that they wanted to focus on quality and need to treat the people well that show up. Low-quality events can weaken attendance in the future, while high-quality events can make those who show up want to attend again and spread the word. We need to look into the quality of the events, how we're targeting them, and the value we're raising.

Twesh: Answering Ryan's question regarding whether or not we may want to get feedback from students about this, I think that a good starting point would be a letter or policy suggestion to the members of EngSoc. We could present some thoughts summarizing the discussion we've had here, and say that we're trying to get involved to progress it and would benefit from their input.



Ryan W.: I would like to see concrete action out of this year.

Harry: It's important that everyone knows that EngSoc isn't just the people here in the room. EngSoc is everyone, there's a lot of people that don't think that way, and if we could get that message across it would be really good.

Oghosa: This point is a small caution. People are making good points about the amount of people involved in EngSoc, but we tend to easily forget groups that are not as vocal or active as groups like Blue and Gold and Suds. We need to quantify it, because we have no metrics at the moment.

Billy: Just a comment to Milan and Ryan W.: I would encourage you to put this thought out in Skule Digest to get the opinions of those not as involved.

Eric: What brought me here was involvement in the Policy and Structures Committee, and I received a lot of individual mentorship which encouraged me to get involved. I was intimidated at first, and having the help was really beneficial.

Ryan W.: The next steps are contacting student communities via discipline clubs and at large as well as I can.

Colin left.

Discussion: Webmaster section of Bylaw 2

Harry: I want to mention that in the directors bylaw, there is a mistake. The website courses.skule.ca isn't written under the Webmaster's responsibilities. I wanted to raise the point that it should be, because right now none of the Webmaster's bylaw section is substantial. I want to raise another point that there should be a new directorship for web content, such as graphics, social media, etc. There are some things Webmaster and VP Communications do that are overwhelming for the Webmaster, they should be split up to balance the workload.

Milan: For Twesh: can we revisit the new directorship subject in the Policy and Structures Committee?

Twesh: I'll put it on the agenda for the Policy and Structures Committee for January or February.

Discussion: Teleconferencing and Officer Reports

Kevin R.: I've noticed two issues. First, I've appreciated the usefulness of teleconferencing but whoever is teleconferencing is often useless, and is a lot less engaged. It takes more effort to get involved in discussion and is less conducive to being there in person. It could be done with proper audio-visual equipment, and otherwise should be removed as an option. It's possible to come to a meeting where everyone is teleconferencing, which would be awful, and I don't think it's a valuable use of everyone's time.

Eric: I'd like to provide some rationale for the teleconferencing situation. The December problems were partly my fault and partly Faculty's, as there were false promises involved. There are platforms that make this easier that large organizations use. I'm hesitant to go full corporate with WebEx, but there are other options. Technically we are



allowed to use teleconferencing, and once proxies are gone involvement will be really difficult without it.

Raneem: One problem is trying to get on. Calling in from the Middle East in particular was difficult given the time zones. We may want to try a video set-up where everyone was on camera and could put up their hand, and so on.

Billy: One perspective offered is from the UTSU, which does allow teleconferencing. It has a 54 person board which often teleconferences. There, with the full corporate approach, it does not work. They get professional microphones, full time staff, and so on, but being able to hear is a huge problem. You get cases where people try to talk all at once and it's very difficult to maintain a speaker's list. The whole proxying limitation with ONCA compliance won't apply for the next year at least. For now it doesn't make sense to go forward with teleconferencing. The amount of hassle it creates is not worth it for the few people.

Milan: One suggestion may be to do a proper test run weeks before the board meeting, realizing halfway through teleconferencing isn't going to work, and not doing it versus wasting time.

Kevin R.: We should develop a proper way of working on it. It's easy to pretend you're listening to someone on a teleconference, versus a real board meeting.

Teleconferencing should be re-evaluated for the new board coming in. It's way too easy to see problems.

Twesh: I agree. For one meeting a month, you know what you're getting into, and there's a real advantage to having students there. You know when people are having side conversations and such. It's better than teleconferencing, but if the board decides to go with teleconferencing, we should go corporate, not just going half-way with Skype. If a board passes a dubious motion that a teleconferencing member did not hear, they would still be responsible. If we do it, need to go professional, or move away all together.

Kevin R.: My second issue is regarding officer reports. This year, I have noticed a more lax regard to the reports as opposed to previous years. I don't find value in getting a report any later than several days before the board meeting. We've said "we don't really need it" and so forth, but I usually print them out and write comments on them. We can't do that if they're uploaded the night before. It doesn't give me a lot of confidence in the effectiveness of the Board, to make sure no one is being irresponsible. It's important to get them uploaded on time. I would like to see some more rigid guidelines pertaining to what the officers should be doing, and same with the motions.

Aron: There's the hardball approach which is making an amendment to put it in the bylaws that mandates officers to upload a week in advance.

Milan: There's no actual formal thing to report other than the finances, technically. For me, it doesn't make sense to spend a week writing a report only to sit back down a week later to re-write it after more has happened. There's a balance between getting everything written down and giving the Board more notice. Documentation is important, and don't want to sacrifice what it means in terms of the board, and it could be going to other things.



Billy: I see a lot of Kevin's point, but agree with Milan on most of the important points. I would much rather the officers go and do their jobs, and report back to us. I always liked the VP Finance report as they're quite concise. It's helpful for us to hold them accountable but I don't think we need this long length. If they moved over to the point form model, a quick blurb, it's very easy to add things later on. If anyone feels full length is necessary, bring it up now, but it's a better compromise.

Kevin R.: I agree with Billy regarding the length and Milan regarding what is mandated. I think there should be something that does indicate they are mandatory. Points are fine, but the points you're raising about things the week before, unless it's particularly urgent, can be shifted to next board meeting. If the officers know when the meetings are throughout the year, it's much easier to have a cutoff dates on the reports. I will put a motion to make it formal. It's less work and get it done earlier and everyone would win.

Aron: Do think that reports should be mandatory? In theory officers couldn't report at all and be recalled, in a logistical process lens it makes sense for officers to provide mandatory reports for the board to do the job.

Milan: I'd be happy to work with Kevin on this.

Discussion: Creating mandatory notice periods for elections which do not have them

Twesh: Based on the fiasco with the SEF committee, I want the Board to recommend that the Policy and Structures Committee to write a little bylaw for seats to be filled and notice to be circulated for any position open to all undergraduate members.

Raneem: A thing to consider: I had to strike the Club Affiliations Committee in May. I took on the role April 10th and it needed to be struck to do affiliations mid-May.

Aron: It's worth talking to officers to figure out what their dates and timelines are to figure out how that might work for people. The same for ad-hoc committees.

Billy: I don't think it's necessary to mandate a month. People will generally apply on the last day. The issue here was just that it was a nepotistic approach, so we shouldn't really be applying arbitrary timelines. I wouldn't support that motion for that reason.

Andrew: I agree with what Billy said. This was a one-off, last-minute thing trying to find a solution, but I don't think they should set a hard timeline for elections and applications, as various things require different timelines.

Twesh: Another issue that recurs is the Board asking for recommendations, but nothing happens. Earlier, the Policy and Structures Committee reported back to the Board a note about photographers.skule.ca, but that was the end of it. We have to make sure we see that these ideas don't get left in the dust.

Aron: An easy way of doing that is to have the Speaker make a list of resolutions and if there are action items have a list of follow-ups as a result of the previous board meeting.

Eric: The Speaker could take that on in a good-faith basis, but it's not necessarily a legal responsibility of the Speaker.

Billy: I don't think it should be the speaker. It should be the onus of the individual who cares about the issue.

Oghosa: The individual should be responsible for delegating and bringing it forward as well.



Eric: I'm quite surprised about how long this meeting is running, if it's something non-substantive I can't complain, but would generally appreciate a head's up from people who plan to raise topics in advance so that the earlier part of the meeting can be sped through. Also, I don't know if it's fair to review discussion items without having advance notice for Board members to read.

Discussion: Billy Graydon's proposed Bylaw 8 (see Appendix)

Billy: The vast majority of the board wanted the discussion, so I will throw it out there. I would like to talk about it to see what the scope is, and give this upcoming month to think about it so we can have a more productive discussion in February. I think it addresses a number of ongoing concerns. Repeatedly we've come up with the matter of EngSoc being neutral. Student newspapers and such know about it. It would be valuable to codify it as in Article 0.

It limits our advocacy to matters that do not directly concern our members as a society, or ideas passed by a vote of the membership at large. It also prevents us from endorsing or condemning particular political parties. It codifies impartial positions we have (e.g. Speaker) and adds responsibility to them that had previously not been written, in that they have to do their job impartially.

The next chapters are the "Advocacy Board." I'm looking to have something instituted from here. This proposes a potential structure for it; if you have alternate structure suggestions I would love to hear them, and will be putting out a formal discussion for that. Appropriate board, committees, and such as well as a bunch of our more advocacy-based project directorships and the like would be involved.

The last part is about committees of the Advocacy Board, which would be like the Academic Advocacy Committee (or a modification of it), creating a faculty council representative committee (we would need to inform them of the issues and student voices), and creating university affairs committee to coordinate our representatives on the UTSU and university governance alike. There was lengthy discussion on Aron's motion in November, and it came out to being an awesome idea but details needed to be hammered out.

Aron: A few points. The Ombudsman is not a position in Engsoc. Regarding endorsements, there are separate chapters: it can be done by will of members, etc. There are also external bodies that do not require consent of the membership. Is that a separate subset of things to endorse? What's the difference there?

Billy: Anything that does not clearly concern the members of the Society isn't worth it. For example, the UTSU defederation campaign in 2012 and 2007 and 2003 -- that's something that is external and does affect who we endorse in terms of UTSU slate and directly concerns members.

Aron: How do we decide what directly concerns the Society?

Billy: Through the Board if they say so by voting.

Aron: That seems a bit loop-holey. The Advocacy Board has a lot of detail-- was it done during the PSC meeting?



Billy: There was not a lot of structure at previous consultations. This is very much me “pulling something out of my ***”

Aron: My personal opinion is that it’s another level of bureaucracy. Temporary commissions could work. This is adding an extra level that isn’t necessary. A lot of time can be spent hammering out the details.

Samantha: We should ensure we’re avoiding a lot of bureaucracy and keeping track of multiple goals.

Oghosa: Great job centralizing this, but it does go on the assumptive that we’re making the Advocacy Board. At previous meetings, it did not feel like adding this level of bureaucracy would be productive. I’m a little worried about being too big to get things done. Before people go into detail with this, at a high level I want to make sure people actually want this.

Twesh: The issue was referred some months ago to a PSC/AAC joint meeting. Criticism is warranted as there hasn’t been a lot of action. Part of the issue was that in the PSC there was some support for the idea, but at the joint AAC/PSC meeting there was a lot more pushback, especially in creating the VP External vs VP Academic. I do apologize for the timeline getting screwy, but would be remiss to make this the discussion based solely on the proposed motion and not consider past discussion. Also, based on the amount of dissent within committees of the Board, I would suggest opening this up to general members, or opening this up to a referendum as you want to have a more specific idea of what students want.

Milan: I’m looking around the room and seeing blank faces. I don’t see purpose on having an uninformed discussion right now. I want to sit down, review it, and provide draft edits.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to adjourn the meeting

Seconded by Raneem.

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

Motion passed.

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 Shammass	Present
Directors of the Board		
At-Large	Ryan Williams	Late with regrets
At-Large	Oghosa Igbinakenzua	Late
At-Large	Kevin Rupasinghe	Present
At-Large	Twesh Upadhyaya	Present
Chemical Representative	Jason Tang	Present
Civil Representative	Sneha Adhikari	Present
Computer Representative	Billy Graydon	Present
Electrical Representative	Danja Papajani	Absent with Regrets
Engineering Science Representative	Apurv Bharadwaj	<i>Proxy to Kevin Rupasinghe</i>
Industrial Representative	Aron Sankar	Present
Materials Science Representative	Mahta Massoud	Present
Mechanical Representative	<i>Mark Chaboryk</i>	<i>Proxy to Billy Graydon</i>
<i>Mineral Representative</i>	<i>Olivia Mogielnicki</i>	Late
First Year	Muskan Sethi	Late
First Year	Kevin Zhang	<i>Proxied to Muskan Sethi</i>
First Year	Danil Ojha	Present
UTSU Representative	Ryan Gomes	Absent
Non-Voting Members		
Speaker	Eric Bryce	<i>non-voting</i>



University of Toronto Engineering Society
January 2017 Board of Directors Meeting Agenda

[MonthName dd, yyyy]

[Time]

[Location]
