



October 2016 Board of Directors Meeting

Part 1

Meeting called to order at 1:26PM.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Seconded by Aron.

Motion carried.

2. Approval of August 2016 Minutes

Seconded by Mark.

Motion carried.

3. MOTION by Ryan Gomes to ratify the results of the September 2016 by-elections for Board of Directors Members and Class Representatives

WHEREAS the Chief Returning Officer has submitted the results of the September 2016 by-elections for First Year Board of Directors Members, First Year Class Reps, and the Electrical Engineering Board of Directors Member

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the results of these September 2016 by-elections are received and ratified in omnibus.

Seconded by Aron.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to amend motion to include first and fourth year chair elections.

Seconded by Aron.

Amendment carried.

Motion carried.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to adjourn the meeting

Seconded by Saarthak.

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35PM.

Part 2

Meeting called to order at 1:35PM.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Seconded by Muskan.

Motion carried.

2. Oath of Office of the recently elected Board Members and Class Representatives

The oath of office was issued by Samantha.

3. Officer Reports

3.1. President – Milan Maljkovic

- A verbal update was provided by Sarthaak, the External Relations Director. Several EngSoc Project Directors are working with external groups. National Engineering Month applications are going to be circulated mid-November.

3.2. Vice President Finance – Andrew Boetto

- A verbal update was provided by a Suds Manager. Patio Suds was attempted but was difficult with licensing complications and poor weather. Halloween Suds was great. A collaborative event with Victoria College was planned but the plan fell through.

- The Sponsorship Director is still silent.

3.3. Vice President Communications – Colin Parker

- Absent.

3.4. Vice President Academic – Samantha Stuart

3.5. Vice President Student Life – Raneem Shammass

- Absent.

4. MOTION by Colin Parker to recall the Sponsorship Director of the Engineering Society

Seconded by Aron.

Andrew: Last meeting, Colin brought this up and I defended the Sponsorship Director as he wasn't able to defend himself, and had been in contact in September. However, since then he has continued to be unresponsive despite email and Facebook messages. At this point I would suggest that we would move forward and recall.

Milan: To outline the scope of what this affects: they're responsible for external representation of the society. Already, having an unresponsive representative means we've lost opportunity. Doesn't just mean we have nothing; clubs now don't know what provisions we *can* offer as a society and how we can support sponsorship deals going on. At this point, it's affecting the

society on a larger level than it needs to be, and would rather have an Officer take on responsibility rather than nothing.

- Andrew currently doesn't have access to sponsorship email, and isn't aware of what requests have been made of the sponsorship director.

Aron: Currently no plan to have an election, and to have responsibilities in officer team?

Milan: Responsibilities for now fall under Andrew and can be divided for the next election.

Aron: Should we have a follow up motion to open nominations?

Andrew: True, that is the eventual plan,

Milan: Not sure if we need to put forward a motion to open election vs actually doing it

Aron: Maybe instead "Be it resolved that a new sponsorship director elected"

Kevin: I wonder if it's worthwhile trying to get another director to fill the position as it's already near the end of the role. If someone's covering the gap to get by and you bring someone else in, we lose quality, might also be better to have someone just perform duties interim until new director.

Sarthaak: Not an election, just reopen nominations. They come to the Board, and it would take a month and happen at next BoD. However, Kevin's point still stands.

Billy: According to our bylaws we can call by election at any point, don't need to be it resolved, perhaps remainder of this year is a write off, but if we don't hire someone new there will be terrible transition. Clubs and directorships use the service, and it will be very unclear if we don't have a person:

Andrew: Don't need to do a motion in this meeting to hold it this time

Eric: Amendment to include a be it resolved clause would be in order.

Sarthaak: Wait, if we wanted sponsorship director appointed at next BoD, we'd need to RON now unless we want to hold another BOD in two weeks we should do now

Milan: Notice of election needs to be provided by CRO. Board can decide today to mandate officer team, or say officer team can take it on. If BoD wants a sponsorship director, they can make us try to find one. Otherwise Andrew can take it on and get things started right away but take things a month from now. Transition, valid, but we also had a stagnant director last year with poor transition, and I would rather have that responsibility taken on by us, not worry about bureaucracy and know that work is being on.

Billy: Is the officer team willing to take that on?

Milan: I am.

Zaid: Why don't you find an existing club that does sponsorship and work with them?

Milan: would like to see who has skillset and bring them on with a volunteer basis. Find someone with that skillset to get work done and not worry about election. However, some level of trust required, and that person needs to be impartial to a degree.

Andrew: If we don't pass anything now to RON, we can't possibly bring on at next meeting?

Milan: We still can, would talk to Ryan and get it circulated. The decision is left on officer team to determine operations.

Jonathan: Transition mentioned for next year - person that would be coming into this position, new person will be dealing with a lot of issues and would need their hand held.

Ryan Williams: This is a directorship that has struggled in the past, as ex-Toike-Oike-Editor I wasn't even aware we had sponsorship director. I don't mind the idea of just pressing "reset"

and making it new and having more control over what it starts out as. Messy to bring someone in at a stressful time rather than having officer team take on what they can, we're already deep enough only so much we can do, draft transition materials and press reset.

In favour: Milan, Ryan W., Sneha, Olivia, Danja, Aron, Muskan, Oghosa, Danil, Billy, Mark, Andrew, Jason, Kevin, Sam
Abstain: Twesh

Motion carried.

5. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to approve the changes to the Operating Budget of the Engineering Society;

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

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

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the changes to the Operating Budget of the Engineering Society as outlined in the appendices be approved.

Seconded by Milan.

Andrew: Budget in appendices; changes and updates from summer budget. (e.g. things that have come to light since then). No revenue or income changes. Orientation been updated. Lost ~\$4,000 this year, some checks coming in as they are still being signed. This is about what we're on budget for. Changes in the handbook from their budget. Summer budget included numbers that were initially budgeted by me, approved changes are from July/August finance committee. Other than that, change to UTEK more recent, \$1,000-\$2,600. Skule documentary was nixed from the budget, will all be done through special projects. Increased special projects to \$44k as we have enough leftover money in budget.

Milan: Orientation minus 4k. Does it include 10k from Faculty?

Andrew: Yes - haven't received that money - but budgeted for it.

Muskan: Wondering why TrackOne got money?

Milan: Every discipline club gets funding. TrackOne committee is their "discipline club" as they plan 8 ball. Theirs is a lot smaller as the funding is based on number of students.

In favour: Milan, Sam, Ryan, Sneha, Olivia, Danja, Twesh, Aron, Muskan, Oghosa, Billy, Danil, Mark, Jason, Andrew, Kevin

Motion carried.

6. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to approve the 2015-2016 Auditor's Report for the Engineering Society;

WHEREAS in order for the findings of the Auditor's Report to be finalized they must be reviewed and approved by the Board of Directors;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the 2015-2016 Auditor's Report, found in the appendices, be approved by the Board and signed off on by the Vice President Finance.

Andrew: Don't need to describe in detail as it's in the appendices. It has the statement of financial position, operations, changes. Net income: ~56k, generally what they get in previous years. Main difference from last year is UTSU money. Stores and Cafe had higher revenues but lower profit, Stores selling most of inventory and Cafe different products. Fees - got 1.3M, 150k levy, 400k endowment, 550k temporary levy, 260k operating budget. Audit is for 2015-2016. Textbook credits leading to lowered 30k technically but it's just based on cash/credit equivalency.

Twesh: Is textbook credit still valid?

Andrew: Yes, 75k purchase credits, we'll use it to buy textbooks next year, last year just didn't get cash. Stores has less expenses this year as they used the credit from last year.

Billy: 10k from investments, where did they come from?

Andrew: Potentially Gradball GIC they get every year, can check with Rhonda and get back to you.

Aron: Whenever account change by more than 10k - different audit, same things apply if they get more money?

Andrew: They didn't actually mention SUDs, you guys should be fine.

Milan: not concerns about the amounts, but more about why the amounts change. (e.g. need to justify the practices that led to the change)

Billy: In last 3 pages, itemized breakdowns is marked unaudited and has most congruence to budget, to what degree have our actual expenses been audited? Why were the last 3 pages unaudited and what level has been done to those items?

Andrew & Milan: Reading through notes, I think the reason they might so it unaudited is because it's based on our financial records. I don't remember that coming up in meeting, not super sure. Don't know why it says unaudited. Letter to the VP finance where it said they recommend that we update general ledger more often as there have been discrepancies by the end of the year, which is likely the reason why it's unaudited.

Muskan: Page 3, says we have been unaudited

Milan: Auditors also only have limited time in the week that they're there, they don't have the time to go through every single thing. If you want we can call Rhonda and have her clarify the details.

MOTION by Aron Sankar to move this motion to the end of the agenda.

Seconded by Billy.

In favour: Sam, Milan, Danja, Twesh, Aron, Muskan, Oghosa, Danil, Billy, Mark, Jason, Kevin:

Abstaining: Andrew, Ryan W.

Motion carried.

7. DISCUSSION ITEM on working with representatives on Faculty Council & Governing Council

Billy: This is something we discussed briefly in September. We have class reps here today so this is good. For background - for many years now, we've had poor coordination of our representatives within university and faculty (beyond EngSoc to UTSU and GC). AAC has done some advocacy on the academic side of reps, however even that has not pulled in class reps to their full potential and scope is limited to academics. Previously we had a student group that dealt with purely advocacy, which is sorely missed. We're looking to create a body to coordinate advocacy initiatives that the Society would like to push through. We had a pre-Faculty-Council meeting with class reps to brief, nothing controversial, but if there had been we'd all have an understanding of what is going on/our opinions as students. To allow student reps to have their voices heard this would help. Questions to the floor - in terms of the involvement with Class Reps, there's ~40, too many to give seats on for all of them. For AAC, created Academic Directors, so many people appointed to so many positions makes logistics complicated. We would like to hear from class reps: If we created a body for general advocacy - do you like the idea, would you sit on it, would you like to be a part of it or to sit on lower body?

Sam: Wasn't aware of the Faculty Council briefing - could go to Faculty Council as it was during the midterm hour. Would appreciate having better accommodations. So far only job has been SpeakUp promotion and selling dance tickets. People on that committee should be pulled from class representatives.

Noah: For advocacy council, we don't have that many responsibilities. Really just SpeakUp and advocacy in discipline.

Billy: It would be to coordinate class rep responsibilities. Want to make sure students are all clear on issues and history behind issues. Ultimately it's up to individuals

Sam: Potentially drawing pool of members from bigger pool of class reps, allot positions and decide what spread of representatives we'd like to see, and having high level meetings, and then briefing people.

Aron: Electing people might be overkill - maybe having 5-10 who are interested in being a part, depending on demand see who's willing to come out, and if you have a good number of people then go forward.

Saarthak: Two points: (1) for Governing Council, we were coordinating with Faizan, now that we don't have an Engineering Student on Governing Council we lost our link Could you define advocacy for the current board.

Billy: Pulling up august meetings - (1) don't want to do social advocacy, not necessarily the place for the Engineering Society that is outside the scope, (2) hoping to advocate tangible matters to engineering students, e.g. cutting unnecessary bureaucracy etc. any time students have complaints, having the means to mobilize the representatives that we have.

Zaid: Consider creating groups beyond email to channels like Slack to coordinate class reps and subgroup?

Oghosa: Question for Billy, scope of this committee, what is the line between AAC vs the larger advocacy body? The subcommittees within AAC could be a space to get people who are not involved, things are already being formed on an ad-hoc basis. The fear is that establishing a committee like this to have nothing is happening and if mandates are too similar it becomes overwhelming.

Billy: One thing to mention - Milan working on JCM task force, and PSC is hoping to get rid of "Council." Getting all our representatives coordinated in a way that takes place of Council. Intersection between this and the AAC – would envision that AAC would be a committee under the Advocacy board to handle *academic* advocacy matters rather than general advocacy board. This would allow us to draw on a larger pool of potential volunteers. Full Advocacy Board doesn't necessarily need to meet as frequently as AAC might, but it would be the mastermind. (Lists all positions in advocacy roles) The scope is beyond AAC.

Sam: Scope might be difficult to obtain, thinks social advocacy should be acknowledged in that scope, and if we're modularizing this board than we need to be including advocacy operations in all aspects of equity as is possible.

Sarthaak: For some students social advocacy is the manner by which complaints are resolved. The scope of these boards often change as years go by. Also mentioned that it should be something that "makes sense" for students to have that issue, and that is hard to quantify from student-to-student.

Twesh: Firstly, as a student organization we do have a lot of influence scattered in various group, and it would be good if reps were aware of everything globally would be good. However, some listed have a narrower scope (e.g. DTA) that would not be as relevant. At best it should be "suggestion" and "information." Don't see this as something being a board structure, people who are already too busy to meet for issues that don't matter to everyone, ensure various parties can meet and discuss with each other. Delegating to various committees may dilute the role of EngSoc's board. Not sure if board is naming or if actual separate body. Suggest: more of an informal committee - keep an email chain, and have class reps do more communication and see how class reps and others can interact with it, give history, advocate, etc. Not in an "everyone get briefed together and vote this way."

Danja: Wholeheartedly agree with Sam & Sarthaak about social advocacy. Might be trying to advocate for it in different ways. There wasn't a lot of advocacy being seen - if you want to keep it as broad range advocacy and ignore one part of it. If we want to do it modularly, we'd have different boards considering different advocacy issues.

Aron: to follow up Sam's point about equity and diversity representation, there's extensive training over the course of the summer about how to handle specific situations, if you feel like there are situations that could have been handled better, talk to orientation or email ombudsperson@skule.ca. Still in process of making changes.

Ryan: Seems as if advocacy board is centralized around unifying many separate small advocacy groups. Issue with that is not everyone is interested in advocating for the same things, and you can't make everyone on board with the same issues. Good to get a better idea of what things Engineering is interested in advocating for. There are a variety of other groups that would like to do other things. Would be beneficial to see which categories of advocacy work together.

Sam: Would love to advocate for his domain of mineral engineers, which is why we need something like a large advocacy board to tell people about the issues. We need organizations to put that scrutiny upon them. Scrutinizing UTSU/Policies/Laws are separate from Social Advocacy as they are inherently separate. Needs to be constant & ongoing. In regards of doing a comprehensive survey about what people care about - logistics of that are difficult.

Samantha: Motion to bring this to the AAC for greater discussion - invite interested class reps as guests

Billy: A lot of the time general students aren't aware of issues that are affecting them and their various constituencies. The purpose of the board is to get an idea of what exactly the issues are that might be worth advocating for. Encourage everyone in the room to see how the AAC meetings are run, in a very similar manner and see how you can understand scope. Trying to scope this proposal based on what works. To Twesh's point - getting nomenclature from Governing council, strongly encourage you to attend GC boards and see how they do it. Their scope is to align what these committees are doing and how to align it. Last thing- concerns brought up about proposal to exclude social advocacy: here's why, in Engineering from a statistical perspective we do not have an equity problem. I'm sure people complain about anecdotal issues, there are some things that should never happen, and that should be looked into, however according to census data, (included inclusiveness) and kept it very open, and few comments were on race, some comments are on sex, most are on shyness. One of the reasons why engineering is so good is because we don't look at people by their sex/skin colour, there's no quotas or tokenization, and despite that we still have a very diverse representation on our student societies, and in trying to push anything artificial the way other student bodies would be very detrimental, and would alienate a large percent of the student population. UTSU hated by both left and right wing based on taking stances. Modularizing our *clubs* to take stances. If we take a stance on social issues it has the potential to polarize our own body, which we should avoid.

Milan: Structure of social advocacy is inherently creating barriers for students, what comes to mind and what have seen work, is commissions elsewhere - certain organizations have commissions dedicated to certain things, people can come out if they're passionate.

Sarthaak: In response to Sam – the UTSU is severely hindered on its ability to do anything not because of equity directors themselves, but because their focus is on equity, BUT when a *political* board becomes an *equity* board, you lose you ability to do things. It becomes very difficult to get things done.

Muskan: When it comes to social advocacy, we're taking the wrong approach by excluding it entirely. Statistically there may not be an equity issue right now, however to exclude it from the forefront at the beginning may be short sighted. Rationally, there might not be an equity issue, just because there aren't voices coming up doesn't mean there isn't one. We can have a focus on political advocacy, but to ignore it outright seems wrong.

Twesh: Responding to Sam's point; there may be things they can't really do as class reps, and it wouldn't make sense to have them attend issues they can't do anything about. In terms of structures, looking at GC may be useful. Going along the changing the role of council/eliminating role of council. Who generally heads this advocacy board, having an advocacy director or VP external, makes sense that the person in charge can look at issues that

come up as relevant and parse them based on who can help, if you have as many reps as you do may be difficult to have them meet. Difficult enough to have at a board meeting where issues differ. Tough to say - well now you advocate for list - and who should work on them. Every month/couple months, these are the issues that we're working on.

Sam: I think Affirmative Action is what you're afraid of, which is too much to be addressed here. Equity commissions are what we should be looking into, aren't a lot of ways for students in marginalized groups to get together and understand each other. Census results doesn't mean it's accurate, it means there is a culture of silence around the issue. In artsci there's a culture of discussion, isn't even SEC at orientation, it's at every other college. Student groups have already done this independently, e.g. Chinese student association. I think if we had an advocacy board, we should completely separate political board - and having equity as a more peer-to-peer ad hoc less regulated basis.

Aron: Issues that an advocacy board would face in abstract. If we decide we want to create a board, it could be up to the people on that board to decide what's good for students. We could incorporate mechanisms to report to EngSoc BoD. Could go around in circles talking about abstract issues. Having trust that people on that board will have best interest of student populations in mind.

Zaid: Response to Sam - silence in engineering - why not try to incorporate engineers into artsci advocacy groups?

Billy: In response to Muskan - great points. We do want to look at making the board fluid in its mandates so that if we come up with future issues it could be taken on. I think we can draw inspiration from UTSU commissions - BUT should not create regulated commissions, and should keep things ad hoc and flowing. But generally, I would like to keep our advocacy evidence based. Not many people agree with this, but UTSU says we should have "at least one person of colour" or "one woman" on all commissions, it is anecdotal not researched. (e.g. you now need to speak on behalf of this one category). Want to make sure that we use evidence based decision making. Got many aspects of other student life from census. LGBT - have LGBTQbase, LGBTout, there are forums for people to have these discussions, and I don't think EngSoc should be one of them. EngSoc for as long as we can remember, EngSoc has been "chaotically neutral." Other student associations that are not neutral are affected by polarizing issues, and us remaining neutral allows us to act more about what actually matters to student. We have decided to stay neutral, while others can sometimes get forced to take sides and alienate one half of a position. Very important to try and maintain neutrality. Having a commission under board to provide a forum for discussion about what power they have.

MOTION by Sam defer this to a Joint Committee Meeting (Amalgamation of PSC and AAC) - and report back at the next meeting

Seconded by Muskan

In favour: Milan, Samantha, Ryan W., Sneha, Olivia, Danja, Twesh, Aron, Muskan, Oghosa, Danil, Billy, Jason, Kevin

Abstaining: Andrew

Motion carried.

8. DISCUSSION ITEM on the creation of a Skule™ Photography Project Directorship

Aron: A lot of people talking about how frustrating it is to find people to take pictures at events, people just go through their friends. It's an important service, and is something that everyone can use to keep records and promote themselves. (E.g. SUDS events, fee diversion events) would like to get general feedback from board about what responsibilities this person would have.

Milan: I disagree in certain regards that this fall under a project directorship, there's now a committee, they need equipment, etc. There's already clubs in/outside of engineering that can take on these roles. Haven't seen too many barriers. What I would suggest instead is "media" in general - as a directorship to push for instead.

Oghosa: Always work under the assumption to work with what we have. Right now, we have an archivist who has access to equipment. This would be something that falls under existing bodies (skulebook, archivist with photos.skule.ca etc).

Sam: about using the archivist and making a media/directorship committee or not.

Photography and media requires a certain skillset, not sure if we can just push this on someone else. Photography too small for a single directorships. Pay a photographer a lot of the time to come to events.

Aron: True, other clubs do fill this role, but that doesn't mean EngSoc shouldn't provide a service. Having someone in charge of just helping document, whether it's just recording things happening for engineering events. Overall I still think it's worthwhile having, some people are willing to do it. Depending on who's available quality changes.

Billy: Agree with aron, no archivist/skulebook/throw it on other directorships. They already have enough to do. There are concerns with us making a new directorship for everything. Like the idea of making it a general media directorship, expand beyond photography, and doing whatever you need to be doing. Need stronger ties with photos to engsoc. Photographers are not given access to the back end of photos.skule.ca and having a directorship close to engsoc could help resolve such issues.

Sneha: Part of Skulebook is to go to specific events and have photographers capture them. I'm in favour like most of us that having a "media" directorship is better. Colin's email hinted at the benefits of having such a directorship as well.

Twesh: Having a single person responsible for photography is not reasonable - it would be a bunch of people who are good at photography. E.g. recent AGM we couldn't get enough people, having a media director who's actively working in getting communications out, having short burst of what engsoc is doing. When election season is happening, we're good at promoting what engsoc is doing, but we don't reinforce it throughout the year. Media director could also relieve some responsibilities of VP Comm.

Ryan: In favour of making it "media" in scope. Extra point that there are more events that happen during the year that are worth having photographers than pages in skulebook.

Useful to all publications. To Billy's point, agree it's very important that we recognize our photographers.

Sam: Regarding using phones/amateur photographers, to be the only people taking photos of events, I don't think that's necessary. I think we can get a student professional photographer, maybe \$100 for event, there's work afterwards as well with paying photographers.

Milan: There's a lot of consultation that needs to be done - talking to Colin, Skulebook, archivist, and reaching out to other people who have done photography and seeing where all the moving parts fit.

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to move this to the PSC to come back to the November BoD.

Seconded by Twesh.

In favour: Sam Ryan Sneha Twesh Muskan Daniel Billy Andrew Jason Kevin Milan Oghosa
Against: Aron

Motion carried.

9. DISCUSSION ITEM on the length of election appeals

Eric: This was previously referred to PSC, but PSC neglected to consider. To provide context, this was discussion between Eric & Ryan Gomes. Ryan felt the amount of time spent waiting before we could ratify BoD meant we had to push until today. Is there anyone who feels strongly about length of election appeals?

Sam: If budgetary things are being discussed before first year reps before being ratified, that time should be shortened so that they can be ratified for that meeting.

Billy: Made the point previously, just because some students keep a 48 hour appeals period doesn't mean we should. We need to give people adequate time if we're providing this option. If CRO disqualifies someone, to not give people enough time and then to argue why not in order is violation of justice. Opens door to corruption - people need time to provide appeals. Propose: have a short period of time with intention to appeal, and then provide longer term if anyone does. Don't think anyone would be enough of an asshole to do it falsely. If no one reports an intention, we'd be allowed to proceed more quickly, and accommodate the few cases where there is an appeal.

Muskan: If we scheduled the meeting after end of appeals period could have avoided issue. First Year - I don't think anyone had an issue, make sure people understand they could appeal. Ratification will be delayed if something happens, and nothing really we can do that.

Eric: BoD was supposed to be scheduled after end of appeals, but there was a technical glitch and had to push to Oct.

Kevin: This is perhaps a reactive response to a one-off case. Don't think it's a recurring fundamental problem. This year shouldn't necessarily define how we do this as it's supposed to encompass everything.

Milan: Point about finance - financial report is provided at every board meeting - still under scrutiny by all BoD members. Would be nice to have Frosh. This issue is maybe outside the scope of BoD due to calendar - need 7 days notice and this might be outside the scope. Agree with Billy - best practices we should put forward the intention to appeal to verify.

Aron: Same issue brought up at Sept BoD. Why?

Twesh: Glad to do with meeting timing - board can refer to PSC and Twesh will make sure to deal with it.

Eric: Would like to see this dropped entirely with a new motion put forward after offline discussions.

Twesh: There was a glitch that caused it - not necessarily one off as this has happened previously

Milan: It was Faculty's fault being offset by one year

[Returning to motion 6]

Billy: Is it correct to say it's been audited to the point of sufficiency?

Milan: Information in that section is not determinant of the status of the audit. Yes.

In favour: Sneha, Samantha, Twesh, Aron, Muskan, Billy, Andrew, Jason, Kevin, Milan

Abstaining: Danil, Ryan W

10. Other Business

Sarthaak: Regarding the Sponsorship Director; their position will be filled at the next meeting of the BoD. In case of death, resignation, removal.

Milan: At discretion of the CRO. No provisions to make it happen. You can't continuously keep bringing it up at every BoD with every open position. It's a question of the spirit of the law as well, if it's not filled once it's open, is there a point in continuing.

Aron: Similar thing happened at AGM - bylaws say we need 50 people for quorum, could have done it in theory even though law says we can't

Milan: there is a vast difference between the two. (1) director that does not effectively exist, nothing to do as Ontario Corporations Act (currently in place) (2) others are mandated under ONCA (will be in effect soon, PSC focused on this) - we have to be legitimate for AGM, there is room for grey area with this project director.

Sarthaak: If bylaws say it, members should consider doing it, someone should inform CRO to what decision was made.

Aron: Was hoping past minutes could go to skule.ca from past board meetings, and something to make sure things referred to other committees come back out.

Billy: if we look at precise bylaw clause - there is a reasonable reading of that law that says *if* the position is to be filled in the *manner*, not to say that it *must* be filled. Refer to California Course of appeals - in the case of another situation board has made an executive decision rather than falling bylaws word for word.

October 30, 2016
1:00PM

Milan: Other provision states if director is unable to, that position is to be fulfilled by their overseeing officer 2.1.1.8.

Zaid: Will there be a by-election position?

Milan: Are you interested?

Zaid: Yes

Milan: Will communicate to CRO - will release notice, nomination period, interviews, and recommendation reports for BoD.

11. Adjournment

MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to adjourn the meeting

Seconded by Samantha

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at: 4:24PM.

Attendance

Officers		
President	Milan Maljkovic	
VP Finance	Andrew Boetto	
VP Communication	Colin Parker	
VP Academic	Samantha Stuart	
VP Student Life	Raneem Shammass	
Directors of the Board		
At-Large	Ryan Williams	
At-Large	Oghosa Igbinakenzua	
At-Large	Kevin Rupasinghe	
At-Large	Twesh Upadhyaya	
Chemical Representative	Jason Tang	Proxied to Mark
Civil Representative	Sneha Adhikari	
Computer Representative	Billy Graydon	
Electrical Representative	Danja Papajani	
Engineering Science Representative	Apurv Bharadwaj	
Industrial Representative	Aron Sankar	Proxied to Ryan W.
Materials Science Representative	Mahta Massoud	
Mechanical Representative	Mark Chaboryk	
Mineral Representative	Olivia Mogielnicki	
First Year	Muskan Sethi	
First Year	Danil Ojha	
First Year	Kevin Zhang	
University of Toronto Student Union Representative	Ryan Gomes	