



## March Board of Directors Meeting

Meeting Called to Order at 1:30PM.

The board sings Happy Birthday to Twesh, who brought samosas.

**MOTION by Aron Sankar to move motion 6 after motion 12**

Seconded by Apurv.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**

**MOTION by Samantha Stuart to move the officer report for the VP Communications to the end of the agenda**

Seconded by Raneem.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**

**MOTION by Ryan Gomes to add to the agenda:**

**"MOTION by Ryan Gomes to ratify the results of the officer election**

**WHEREAS a report from the Chief Returning Officer is available in the appendix"**

Seconded by Oghosa.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**

**MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to add to the agenda after motion 3:**

**"MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to renew the role of Design Team Association Project Manager as a temporary directorship next year"**

Seconded by Raneem.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**

**MOTION by Andrew Boetto to add to the agenda after Kevin's new motion 4:**

**"MOTION by Andrew Boetto to approve \$10,000 in Special Projects Funding for a Design Team Association vehicle"**

Seconded by Raneem.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**



**MOTION by Andrew Boetto to add to the agenda :**

**"MOTION by Andrew Boetto to approve the 2017 winter budget"**

Seconded by Raneem.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**

### **1. Adoption of the Agenda**

Seconded by Muskan.

No objections.

**Motion passed. Agenda adopted.**

### **2. Approval of the February 2017 Minutes**

Seconded by Apurv.

No objections.

**Motion passed. Minutes approved.**

### **3. Officer Reports**

#### **a. President – *Milan Maljkovic***

Billy: Many project directorships didn't have candidates. Have you talked to the outgoing directors yet?

Milan: Not yet, but we will make sure something happens going forward.

#### **b. VP Finance – *Andrew Boetto***

Billy: Do you have any thoughts on whether direct deposit will lead to more refunds, and what happens if there is a glitch?

Andrew: I expected it would go up with this, but is actually the same as last year. It's easier for students so I haven't heard complaints. Regarding a glitch, if anything goes on we'd have to write and distribute cheques.

Muskan: Does board have to approve Special Projects Funding (SPF)?

Andrew: The board doesn't have to approve SPF or finance, but I felt that because it was so much money it should be brought to the board and approved.

Sam M.: Is there a policy on what should be brought to the board?

Andrew: Yes.

Kevin R.: I don't think that the VP Finance does enough to ensure that when students are asking for SEF refunds that students understand what the fund is used for, and why you should only get this refund if you really disagree with fund or are in particular circumstances.



Andrew: I see your point but I kind of disagree. All the info is out there and all the website info is linked in the forms before they go through the steps for the refund. A lot of students just don't likely see the value or how it affects them. I will put this in my transition report as an area of emphasis.

c. VP Academic – *Samantha Stuart*

No questions or comments.

d. VP Student Life – *Raneem Shammis*

Billy: Why are there staff supervisors in design space?

Raneem: Because the faculty wants rules and regulations. They want more staff supervision of space.

Kevin R.: It's like a machine shop/design space; direct student space won't be supervised by faculty.

Billy: I have some questions on awards ceremony. It conflicts with a lot of people's capstone finals and there wasn't a whole lot of notice. Why was this and how can it be mitigated?

Raneem: Milan asked me to work with Sonia planning it, Sonia was out of town, they were trying to get GB202 booked, and it was so full they had to try and exchange spots with other clubs. I got too busy and needed to get others on board, and by the time anyone was on board Sam sent out invites on Friday. It was one of the only times it could fit. In future, I think it's not that beneficial to work with the alumni office.

Milan: The last two years, the awards ceremony has been branded as a heritage event for EngSoc members from decades back. The feedback from alumni is that it's difficult to come back to an event like that every year, and so I discussed with Sonia. What makes sense is to hold it on an anniversary, but this year given the cost and feedback it made sense to scale it down. In my second year it was a pizza social where people handed out awards, this is built out from there but less than the Faculty Club event. Scheduling and ownership was odd and fell into weird places.

Billy: You mentioned you talked about conflict between UTSU and EngSoc?

Raneem: That was me and their VP Campus Life during the summer.

Billy: Is the parking pass worth it?

Raneem: It's been booked off every weekend, clubs are using it, and it's great for frosh week. It's worth the investment.

**4. MOTION by Harry Jiang to amend Bylaw 2 to update the role of the Webmaster**

**WHEREAS** the current bylaw on Webmaster is outdated and does not reflect the full responsibilities of the Directorship;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 2, Article 1.9.1 which currently reads:



1.9.1 There shall be a Webmaster, who shall be responsible for maintaining and regularly updating both the Society Web Page, the Plasma Screen, and the SF Atrium Projector.

be amended to read:

1.9.1 There shall be a Webmaster, who shall be responsible for maintaining and regularly updating the Engineering Society's Websites, including the Society Web Page, the Courses Database, and the Skule Digest. The Webmaster shall be responsible for assisting clubs with hosting websites on the Society's servers.

Seconded by Milan.

Billy: One potential difficulty I see is the assisting clubs thing. I found it difficult as the computer systems administrator to manage all that work while developing my own initiatives.

Harry: Nikola [minuter's note: ex-Webmaster] did assist with design but he also had a webmaster committee, mostly worked alone, and the only time he really assisted in a website which was outside of his scope was the Blue & Gold website and SpeakUp. Blue & Gold partly because of desperation, and SpeakUp because it will be integrated into the role of webmaster in future. With hosting, it is the webmasters duty, and it hasn't been mentioned in the bylaws.

Apurv: Does this amendment imply the webmaster will no longer be responsible for plasma.skule.ca and projector.skule.ca?

Harry: EngSoc has a dozen websites but the core ones are the ones listed. The projector and plasma are in recent years not as important as Courses and the Skule Digest, and I wanted to change to reflect this.

Aron: It might be worth clarifying "assisting" in terms of focusing only on hosting and developing club websites rather than providing maintenance.

Harry: Heuristically, I think that assisting is a good word that doesn't imply responsibility.

For: Raneem, Milan, Billy, Andrew, Mark, Mahta, Kevin R., Olivia, Muskan, Aron, Twesh, Apurv, Sneha, Kevin Z., Danil, Oghosa, Samantha

Abstaining: Ryan W.

**Motion passed.**

**5. MOTION by Samantha Stuart to move the Mental Wellness Project Directorship from the portfolio of the Vice President Student Life to the portfolio of the Vice President Academic**

**WHEREAS** the Vice President Academic has far fewer Project Directorships to oversee than the Vice President Student Life,

**WHEREAS** Mental Health and Wellness is directly connected to Academics in the Engineering Community, and the VP Academic as such is better suited to oversee such a directorship,

**WHEREAS** the Equity and Inclusivity Director will increase the load of the VP Student Life this upcoming year and moving this Directorship will help balance this change,



---

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Mental Wellness Director be overseen by the Vice President Academic effective after the 2017 Joint Council Meeting.

Seconded by Apurv.

**AMENDMENT by Samantha Stuart to change the last clause to:**

"**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** bylaw 2, section 1.22.2 be amended to:

1.22.2 The Mental Wellness Director shall be overseen by the Vice-President Academic."

Seconded by Raneem.

For: Milan, Billy, Andrew, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Muskan, Oghosa, Sneha, Kevin, Danil, Apurv, Ryan W., Aron, Jason, Twesh, Samantha

Against: none

Abstaining: Kevin Z.

**Amendment passed.**

Kevin R.: I spoke to Shivani [current Mental Wellness Director] and she said awareness and advocacy should be the priority, and awareness is also important. Shivani trusts our judgement, but wants to emphasize that both should be addressed.

Raneem: I will make sure to emphasize that with Mahsa [incoming VP Student Life] and Sofia [incoming VP Academic]. This just made sense for work balance.

For: Samantha, Raneem, Milan, Billy, Andrew, Mahta, Danja, Kevin R., Oghosa, Kevin R., Apurv, Danil, Ryan W., Aron, Jason, Twesh, Sneha

Against: none

Abstaining: none

**Motion passed.**

**6. MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to renew the role of Design Team Association Project Manager as a temporary directorship next year**

Seconded by Raneem.

For: Raneem, Milan, Mahta, Samantha, Olivia, Danja, Andrew, Billy, Kevin Z., Muskan, Oghosa, Sneha, Kevin R., Danil, Apurv, Ryan W., Aron, Twesh, Jason

Against: none

Abstaining: Mark

**Motion passed.**

**7. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to approve \$10,000 in Special Projects Funding for a Design Team Association vehicle**



Seconded by Raneem.

Andrew: This was an SPF application we reviewed in December in the Finance Committee. There was some work to be done, recently discussed at least meeting, and updating the financing structure of the project. Before it was EngSoc paying for most of it; now EngSoc is providing just under half. With this revisit, the benefits of the project are still there but the finance structure is just different, and we should go forward.

Kevin R.: This came up before, and the biggest concerns were pertaining to ownership and legality of the vehicle. There were concerns about how much money is put towards project. SPF is for \$10,000 coming from a \$40,000 fund. We're total using 30k this year from this fund including this. This will affect upwards of 300 students, and it's expected to last 10+ year.

Billy: What have the changes been since December? Can Rhonda deal with the paperwork? Last time, Andrew said we would need to deal with lawyers.

Andrew: I wanted to talk to lawyers. Total cost is ~\$50,000 for the vehicle, and in the initial application EngSoc had a \$40,000 capital cost and didn't have ownership. That was my concern. We didn't end up doing a lawyer consultation as EngSoc isn't paying the majority now. The car would be registered under University of Toronto Insurance.

Aron: Operating expenses will come close to ~\$10,000 per year to run the car, and there are added logistics. I'm not sure how much actual benefit that has with booking the car and limiting usability. I'm not sure if it's the best use of funds.

Billy: There are a lot of ongoing duties involved with owning a car including maintenance and insurance. I assume Rhonda would handle that. For more hands on things, who would deal with that?

Kevin R.: As far as dealing with day to day paperwork, the breakdown proposed that whoever takes on the Design Team Association Project Manager role would deal with maintaining these documents. It's important we don't have a student reviewing these alone, but Tom Coyle is willing to be the adult liaison with the insurance department and update the driver list. For scheduling and maintenance, whoever is in DTA role should be resourceful enough to find someone to do that as part of the portfolio. Long term, I could see it being taken on by staff members in the CEIE.

Billy: What happens if someone is in an accident?

Kevin: In terms of drivers training, U of T's insurance policy limits that you must have a clean driving record. At Waterloo they have an interview to get an experience level. You definitely want to make sure that you're approving drivers that are qualified. U of T does have some insurance money in place however to accommodate students that may be in accidents.

Aron: I'm concerned about \$10,000 operating costs, and the possibilities of double-booking. I don't think that it's worth with risk of owning vehicle.

Andrew: Kevin R. made a timeline of who can use it based on their team. I've sent the file to the board. Kevin also talked to a lot of teams to find that the annual benefit saved is around \$7,000 from all teams.

Kevin: That figure is from 7 largest design teams and doesn't exclude gas. I don't think it's fair to look at something that cuts \$14,000-\$15,000 in expenses to \$10,000 and say it's not worth it. We shouldn't look at this project as a "profit" generator. It is a net benefit, and we shouldn't



necessarily look as if we're breaking even; if it's an annual manageable loss worth it for the amount of students we're helping, it's worth it. \$14,000 in rental, and \$7000 saved. Concerns with fueling will be dealt with by teams running the vehicles. Value to students on these teams is very clear. Design teams have discussed this for many years because of how difficult it is to get a vehicle. Once had to bike out to Scarborough to get a car. Age restrictions on external rentals are difficult. For Blue Sky much of team was under 21, so they needed alumni to drive. This opens a huge window for people to drive the vehicle.

Aron: Two teams can't use it at the same time – we should look at when the competitions are happening.

Kevin: The document will alleviate the concerns, as they already figured out a system where the teams don't overlap significantly. This proves it will be taken every single week. It doesn't nullify the gains to have conflict. That figure is only an estimate of top 7 teams, and doesn't include in kind donations.

Billy: You provided an excellent breakdown of the capital expenditures, is there an analogue of the operating costs regarding the \$7,000 saving figure?

Kevin: There isn't one that's as detailed as this. There are in another proposal. The rough numbers are: parking ~\$2500, insurance ~\$1000, maintenance \$1000-\$2000, fuel distributed/in kind, all of those put together is ~\$7000 in operating. This is a \$10,000 SPF application that will last for 10 years and pay for 300+ students. There's a \$4,000 pizza warmer in the same application. We are not asking for a handout; our design teams are some of the brightest students out there, and we're asking for \$10,000 for a project that's been discussed for many years with clear.

Billy: To put a number on Aron's concerns, have you done an estimate in terms of overlap, there will still have to be some rentals. Of that \$14,000 spent on rental costs, do you have an estimate for savings knowing that not all of it would be saved?

Kevin: It's very difficult to document. I need to sit down with every team over the course of a year, but I'm very confident that you're not going to nullify the savings. A bunch of major competitions that don't line up with each other alone will get the most out of the vehicle.

Andrew: The Finance Committee's perspective is that everyone was on board and no one questioned the benefits. Only the capital cost at \$40,000 was questioned. Now that it's been hacked down to \$10,000, everyone on the Finance Committee sees benefits, and if you look over 10 years it's a \$1,000 SPF application for all design teams, and from that standpoint it's really worth it and gives a crutch to stand on.

Sourabh: Regarding Billy and Aron's questions about how much it costs during overlap, just based on experience I rented a U-Haul for Skule Nite which is .69/km, and the Ontario rate for reimbursement is .5/km. It's like taking fuel and maintenance off at .5/km which is huge savings per km every time a team can use the vehicle.

Aron: Has anyone looked into which teams are using more than one vehicle? If they need 3-4 vehicles anyways, this is only saving the cost of one.

Kevin: We don't have that data as it's substantial to collect. It's something we'll know after the first year.



Aron: If we're condoning the spending on this and ~\$10,000 operating expenses, I think it's worth giving it a year to get the green light.

Andrew: Keep in mind we're only funding capital cost. All operating is covered by design teams. It's a one time EngSoc investment.

Sam M: I think the discussion of cost as been very thorough and, regardless of how much is saved, the value of giving a team a car so that they wouldn't need to rely on external sources can't be quantified but is huge. The benchmarking of other schools does indicate that there is a clear cost/benefit ratio here that provides a huge benefit to students. The intangible benefits of a club having a vehicle are worth it.

**MOTION by Muskan Sethi to call the question**

Seconded by Raneem.

Against: Billy, Mark, Aron

**Motion passed.**

For: Samantha, Raneem, Milan, Andrew, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Kevin Z., Oghosa, Muskan, Kevin R., Sneha, Danil, Ryan W., Jason, Twesh

Against: Aron

Abstaining: Billy, Mark

**Motion passed.**

**8. MOTION by Andrew Boetto to approve the 2017 Winter budget**

Seconded by Milan.

**MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to recess for 5 minutes**

Seconded by Muskan.

None opposed.

**Motion passed.**

Sam M.: Fall budgets aren't up yet. When they will be updated and when this will be updated?

Andrew: Immediately.

Apurv: Are the last year actuals an average?

Andrew: They're just what actually end up being spent put in as recorded for a reference.

Billy: Considering the updates are based on actuals, if we fail to approve this do we have to un-spend the money. What is the significance?

Andrew: It's in the bylaws.

Milan: We need to provide an update on what actually happened as well as have minutes that show that the directors of the corporation are okay with it.

Billy: We're not approving expenditures; we're okay with past expenditures.





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

Against: none

Abstaining: Mark

**Motion passed.**

**9. MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to amend Bylaw 6**

**WHEREAS** Bylaw 6 outlines the Search and Review Committees practices; and

**WHEREAS** errors in language and consistency were noted in preparation for Committee meetings; and

**WHEREAS** it is prudent that our Bylaws have one consistent interpretation; and

**WHEREAS** Bylaw 6, Chapter 1 currently reads:

1.0. "Review Component"

1.0.1. The "Review" component of the Committee:

a. Shall convene at least once annually to review the operations of the society and the duties of those employed by the Society.

b. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair or by a resolution of the Board of Directors.

c. A motion to dismiss an employee must be approved by a Special Resolution of the Board of Directors.

d. The committee shall have jurisdiction over matters pertaining to salary increases beyond yearly cost of living adjustments.

e. The committee shall not have the authority to overturn any resolution passed by the Board regarding salary increases.

f. The committee shall be involved in the creation and amendment of employment positions.

g. Members of the committee shall adhere to a confidentiality agreement.

h. The Committee shall present a summary of the review 14 days after the Search and Review Committee meets.

i. A brief summary of the review shall be read at the next Council meeting after the Search and Review committee convinces.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 6, Chapter 1 be amended to read:

1.0. "Review Component"

1.0.1. The "Review" component of the Committee:

a. Shall convene at least once annually to review the operations of the society and the duties of those employed by the Society.

b. Shall convene for additional meetings as called by the Chair or by a resolution of the Board of Directors.

c. Shall have jurisdiction over matters pertaining to salary increases beyond yearly cost of living adjustments



d. Shall not have the authority to overturn any resolution passed by the Board regarding salary increases.

e. Shall be involved in the creation and amendment of employment positions.

f. shall present a summary of the Review committee meeting at the next regular meeting of the Board of Directors

1.0.2. A motion to dismiss an employee must be approved by a Special Resolution of the Board of Directors.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** Chapter 0, Section 0.0.1.h. and Chapter 1, Section 1.0.1.g. be struck from the Bylaws.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the following be included as Chapter 2, Section 2.0.3. and all items be renumbered accordingly.

2.0.3. All members of both the Search and Review committees shall adhere to a confidentiality agreement.

Seconded by Raneem.

Milan: I was preparing for a review committee meeting and noticed our bylaws sucked. Most of the first change has been updated to be action items. It previously didn't follow the preamble. The striking of 0.0.1h and g removes the requirement that members should adhere to a confidentiality agreement and instead includes this in the general section in a more clear form. I got rid of c, and made it its own section so that it can stand on its own. I didn't change the search committee as that hasn't been struck for 7 years. I focused on the review committee as it changes every year.

**MOTION by Milan Maljkovic to capitalize "Shall" in f, "Committee" in 2.0.3, "Committee" in f**

Seconded by Raneem.

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

Against: none

Abstaining: none

**Motion passed.**

Sam M.: What is the search and review committee?

Milan: The search committee investigates an employee if needed. The review committee is meant to evaluate the performance of employees and operations of the society and whether there's room for improvement.

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

Against: none



Abstaining: none

**Motion passed.**

**10. MOTION By Billy Graydon to Clarify how Bylaw Ambiguities are Resolved**

**WHEREAS** there ought to be some procedure for handling ambiguities in the by-laws

**WHEREAS** the debate last meeting regarding whether the Board could post-date the creation of temporary internal directors brought the issue fully to light

**WHEREAS** the Board voted informally at that time that the Board is a reasonable body to resolve such ambiguities and, more generally, to interpret by-laws

**WHEREAS** it is reasonable to extend this to any body that has the right to amend a by-law or policy

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the following be added to Bylaw 1 section 0.1:

0.1.4. In the event of any ambiguity in a by-law or policy, its interpretation shall be ruled upon by anybody with the authority to amend or repeal that by-law or policy

0.1.5. An interim ruling may be made by the Speaker or a vote of the Policies and Structures Committee, in increasing order of precedence

0.1.6. The Speaker shall rule out of order any vote on an interpretation that is not reasonably plausible in the existing by-law or policy or that would contravene any act of Parliament

Billy: For those present at last month's meeting, the reasons for this should be obvious. What we wanted to do was to create the equity director as of the end of this Joint Council Meeting (JCM). Bylaws were ambiguous so we ended up having an informal vote saying the board could deal with such matters, and then that it would be created post-JCM. These clauses address this problem. Many other student societies and corporations have similar rules. The reason the last point is included is because when resolving a bylaw ambiguity a majority of the board is required. This is to prevent someone from passing something on a simple majority. The speaker should rule out of order in these cases to prevent this.

Aron: To be clear, speakers ruling can be overturned by 2/3rd majority?

Billy: Yes.

Sam M.: Regarding the first comment, which group has the authority to make such calls in the bylaws?

Billy: The powers of the board versus the executive committee versus members at the Annual General Meeting is outlined in the bylaws.

Eric: Would the speaker's ruling have precedence?

Billy: The speaker could respond to an email with a general interpretation. If brought to the board it could be put to the Policy and Structures Committee.

Muskan: In the last board we suspended the rules -- with this we would be follow Roberts Rules?



Billy: At the end of the day, we follow Robert's Rules as it's in our bylaws, but can suspend it in the board. What we have to obey is our bylaws which at the end of the day is the most important.

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

Against: none

Abstaining: Sneha

**Motion passed.**

**11. MOTION by Aron Sankar to amend Bylaw 3 of the Constitution**

**WHEREAS** the Constitution does not explicitly limit the candidacy to elected officials of the society to current members:

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Chapter 0 - General of Bylaw 3 be amended to include the following:

0.0.13 - A candidate's nomination for any position elected by members is only valid if the candidate is a current full-time or part-time Member of the Society.

Seconded by Sam M..

Aron: This is to clarify what I think is already general consensus on the board, and explicitly state it in the bylaws.

Billy: I would like to move to lay this on the table until original motion 9 is taken care of. If this and that passes, it creates a problem as the two are fundamentally incompatible. It makes more sense to consider original motion 9 first.

**MOTION by Billy Graydon to move the current motion to after original motion 9**

For: Samantha, Raneem, Billy, Andrew, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Kevin Z., Oghosa, Muskan, Kevin R., Ryan W., Jason, Twesh, Mark

Against: None

Abstaining: Aron, Milan, Andrew, Danil

**Motion passed.**

**12. MOTION by Aron Sankar to amend Bylaw 1 of the Constitution**

**WHEREAS** currently Bylaw 1.1.3 states:

1.1.3. Alumni Members shall have previously been registered as full time students in the University of Toronto Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering or its precursor, the Ontario School of Practical Science.

**WHEREAS** by this definition any current member of the Society can be defined as an Alumni member:

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 1.1.3 be amended to state:



1.1.3. Alumni Members shall have received an undergraduate degree from the University of Toronto Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering or its precursor, the Ontario School of Practical Science

Seconded by Oghosa.

Aron: Technically, we're all alumni members under the current bylaws. I want to make sure that this is updated.

**MOTION by Billy Graydon to table the current motion until original motion 9**

For: Samantha, Raneem, Milan, Billy, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Kevin Z., Oghosa, Muskan, Kevin R., Danil, Ryan W., Aron, Mark

Against: Twesh, Jason

Abstaining: Apurv, Andrew

**Motion passed.**

**13. MOTION by Billy Graydon to Allow Membership Rights to be Extended to Alumni Members and Nonmembers**

**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; and

**WHEREAS** many members choose to take time off to work for a year rather than doing PEY; and

**WHEREAS** many individuals from other faculties have found a home in the engineering community; and

**WHEREAS** all of the foregoing contribute in very meaningful ways to the community, and it seems silly to exclude them over a technicality; and

**WHEREAS** many valuable comments were received since this was originally circulated in February, and it has since been amended to fix the concerns and to give the Board much more case-by-case authority to govern these members; and

**WHEREAS** the testimonials presented in Appendix D outline some current real-life cases in which this proposal is needed

**WHEREAS** apparently Engineers cannot count to four:

**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 four (4) types of Members:

- a. Full Time Members



- b. Part Time Members
- c. Alumni Members
- d. Ex-Officio Members

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** bylaw 1 Section 1.0.1, which currently reads:

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

be amended to read:

1.3.1. An Alumni Member shall enjoy no rights of Membership other than the right to speak at General Meetings and at meetings of the Board of Directors, unless other rights are extended to him according to section 1.4.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the following be added to Section 1:

1.4. Alumni Members on Academic Break

1.4.1. An alumni member shall be deemed to be on an academic break if he:

- a) Was a full-time or part-time member not more than eighteen (18) months ago
- b) Is eligible to become a full-time or part-time member not more than eighteen (18) months after having previously been a full-time or part-time member, and intends to do so

1.4.2. An alumni member on academic break may be given some or all rights a full-time or part-time member upon a resolution of the Board, which shall specify:

- a) The rights to be extended, subject to 1.4.5
- b) The maximum duration of these rights without renewal by the Board, which shall not exceed eighteen (18) months
- c) Any conditions of the alumni member must meet or continue to meet, subject to 1.4.6.

1.4.5. No alumni member shall be afforded the right to vote in any election or referendum held online without the consent of the CRO

1.4.6. No alumni member shall be charged a fee without the consent of the business manager and the VP Finance. No fee shall exceed the amount of the full-time membership fee.

1.4.7. Any special rights under this section or section 1.5 shall expire upon the person becoming a fulltime or part-time member

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the following be added to Section 1:

1.5. Extending Rights to Nonmembers

1.5.1. A natural person who is not a full-time or part-time member may be given some or all rights of a full-time or part-time member upon a resolution of the Board, which shall specify:

- a) The rights to be extended, subject to 1.5.2 and 1.5.3.
- b) The maximum duration of these rights without renewal by the Board, which shall not exceed eighteen (18) months



- c) Any conditions that the person must meet or continue to meet, subject to 1.5.3
- 1.5.2. No nonmember or alumni member who is not on an academic break as defined in 1.4.1 may:
  - a) Serve as an Officer
  - b) Serve as a Director of the Board
  - c) Serve as Speaker
  - d) Vote in any election of the Society, with the exception of votes of Council
  - e) Vote in any referendum of the Society
  - f) Sign any petition or nomination form for which signatories must be members
  - g) Count for quorum in any General Meeting of the Society
- 1.5.3. The provisions of 1.4.4 - 1.4.7 shall apply also to nonmembers and alumni members not on academic break
- 1.5.4. Subject to the requirements of the resolution under 1.5.1, any other clause in these by-laws or policies that uses the word "member" shall apply as if the person were a member.
- 1.5.5. No nonmember or alumni member has the right to notice relating to any meeting under 2.3.2, 2.7. and 2.8.1

Seconded by Sam M..

Aron: Can we change the criteria for valid candidates in the middle of an election?

Eric: Sounds like an interpretation question.

\*laughter\*

Sam M: We would need a bylaw to interpret.

Eric: Would this apply to the current election?

Milan: Generally, it's good practice to use the same set of rules for the whole election.

Billy: For those who have read the email chain on this, this is a very complicated motion with wide-reaching ramifications. For everyone's clarity, I will split it into two sections – one focused on academic break members and one on elective members. The premise is to say that the rights of membership can be extended to academic break members, which is defined as someone who is not currently taking classes, was taking classes, and is taking a break less than 18 months to allow them full membership. The second clause is that an elective member, someone who is a non-member, can be afforded limited rights on resolution of the board. There was considerable discussion on email about the legality of it. I have maintained through the chain that this is legally fine. We're extending rights, not creating a new class of membership. It's in the Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act (ONCA) already that the board can make someone a member of the corporation without making any bylaw amendments. I would like to pose a straw poll about whether or not the board believes it requires more consultation. One reason it could be done sooner is to deal with the VP Finance component. Sourabh was allowed to run for VP Finance, but was disqualified as the CRO misinterpreted as a



withdrawal, which the Election Appeals Committee (EAC) overruled. However, the EAC denied him candidacy based on his not being a member. This potentially would need to happen today to allow Sourabh to run.

Eric ran an informal poll on the question "Does this matter require more consultation?":

Yes: 9

No: 5

Abstaining: 6

Billy: We will not proceed with passing the motion today. We would like to discuss it and make the first step of the consultation.

Aron: Can we set up a different meeting time to do this?

Billy: Four subsequent motions are predicated on this, so it would be valuable to get a good idea of where the board sits.

Milan: The email thread got messy for no reason, and I would like to maintain decorum today. We're here to debate so I'd like to debate. I agree that people on academic probation should be involved in the community. That being said, it gets in the way with what's involved with being a member. I sought consideration from higher authorities, and I don't think we're capable of making this decision with our current information. I don't want to rush into this and realize we've fucked ourselves later. We need to be compliant with both the Ontario Corporations Act (OSA) and the University. The lack of compliance with the compulsory non-academic fees policy doesn't automatically mean we won't get fees if we pass this, but if anyone thinks we're operating in a way that isn't democratic or accessible, it's a headache and I question whether it's something we should do without having done proper research. The VP Students encouraged us to seek further consultation, and these changes might be best addressed thoughtfully over the summer months. If we'd like to include more people, constitutional changes might not be the only answer. Until we've spoken to legal, auditors, and further consults, I'm not comfortable with this. The fact the membership isn't aware of this is not okay.

Muskan: As of right now this motion would have a lot of consequences with the constituents. It should be an AGM topic. We need more consultation with members of the society. I definitely agree people on academic break who are still involved are important, but I'm wary of including elective members that aren't engineers. It doesn't make sense for us to come and talk about things that aren't part of our constituency. A lot of people I've talked to are unsure of elective membership. We have exceptions to every rule, and shouldn't make bylaw changes for exceptions. The past presidents brought up a lot of issues, and it seems we're ignoring certain areas and I'd like to explore those before we do this.

Matthew: The motion as I read it doesn't have any provisions for redefining notions of membership, just things other people can do at the purview of the board. It's strictly within the limits of the board and how we decide to grant limited rights under extreme circumstances. I'm not sure in what circumstances this would actually cause legal issues.

Billy: I disagree that this would be huge; this is something that would have motions on it once or twice a year under extenuating circumstances. A big issue is that individuals that have gone





on level 2 academic probation are forced to withdraw for 8 months. If they go on level 2 academic probation after doing poorly in fall, they are withdrawn in winter, which means they cannot enroll in elections even though they'll be in school in September. Most people put on level 2 academic probation then need to be forcefully removed from any positions they currently hold, we've been letting them continue contrary to our bylaws, as it's a lot of work to forcibly remove someone. So as a non-member not only would they lose the half year, they also lose the ability to contribute next year. This is something many members in that position have expressed is an issue, and it alienates members that have other extenuating circumstances. This is not a motion that is meant to allow us to go wild and give rights to people. This is a motion to allow the board to carefully consider that academic break members can continue to do their project directorship and run next year. I don't see this as being far reaching at all in terms of what it will be used for. The concern is the potential for abuse. The reason that it's primarily being brought up has huge implications for student body. We do owe the past presidents some sort of resolution to this as it's affecting people who are members even though they aren't at a time that would affect them most.

Twesh: The fact is that we're not defining membership classes anymore now that we're using alumni members. The definition of alumni members is not totally representative of what alumni are. What this motion is doing is effectively dividing a new membership class. It's using an ambiguity in the definition of alumni members. If the intent is to define a new membership class then it should be prioritized as such. The alumni members clarification should stand and pass to prevent ambiguity. I also disagree that we should be extending rights to artsci students. Do we need to legislate this or is it informal? Having people in the Pit who aren't engineers doesn't mean people should have membership rights that aren't engineers. Moreover, in terms of academic break, I agree in some sense with Billy, there could be extenuating circumstances, but also think we share a heavy workload. It's not as though EngSoc is our only commitment. If two people running against each other and one on academic break and one not, the one on academic break would have fewer classes and more time and that might be unfair. This is kind of a fundamentally different thing where someone on academic break could have potentially no full time commitment and give all of their time to EngSoc. This is interesting, but disingenuous with members that have to cope with other responsibilities like school to remain part of EngSoc.

Milan: Currently, the definition of membership is equivalent to whether or not incidental fees are collected. If we're going to extend rights to other students, how does that look to fee-paying members? If others don't have to pay to be a part of EngSoc, members might get mad as a lot of students question why they pay fees anyway. We don't want cronyism in EngSoc. If EngSoc is giving membership to a board member to help someone elected to power maintain power, it's not transparent and not right. St. Mike's dissolved because of this kind of thing. It's these little things that I want to check off to make sure things are defensible, and that things are the right call. I'm not comfortable moving forward with this today.

Jonathan: I would caution the board about making an external decision concerning members on academic break. If they are on academic break, maybe they should step back and focus on



academics rather than getting involved. It's important to be wary of this, but also to make sure people aren't too restricted in what they can or can't do.

Kevin R.: I would echo Jonathan. We should acknowledge that our profession outputs skilled individuals that are technically competent. We want to ensure our members are graduating without just scraping by. Faculty uses probation because they want students to come back as technically skilled individuals, and if there are other issues in health to give them time to facilitate fixing this. I don't think that we should be encouraging extra involvement until you have a better handle on academics as it's not in the society's best interest to do that for an individual, and if they do have to drop out again may not be in society's best interest. This is not the best avenue to do it, but we should afford some rights to academic break student. It's not right to drop people as a member who are on level 2 academic probation and I would suggest officers and the board address this for the next year.

Eric: I happen to know from my other involvements with the Faculty that, probably at some point early in the next academic year, the 8 month withdrawal may be removed or reduced, or some sort of alternative to it may be provided. There is a good possibility that it will be removed at some point in next academic year

Sam M.: Extending membership to people who make contributions for fun do not reflect that the people in engineering and in EngSoc are reflective of engineers. I don't think elective members are a good idea. Academic break members should be a part of the community despite probation -- missing out on being able to participate in EngSoc itself is a sad consequence of academic break. Giving them that privilege is not worth jeopardizing EngSoc.

Billy: Twesh, it seems disingenuous to treat alumni members like we are. Creating an alumni class would have taken consultation. The wording wasn't done without full knowledge that people who haven't completed their degree are alumni members. The election case you mentioned is highly specific and can't be legislated. In terms of some people having more time with fewer classes to participate in EngSoc and provide services to students -- why is that a bad thing? Milan, regarding non-fee-paying members and giving them rights, rights are not a full slate. It does not say that we give them full right; we give them ones that make sense. We can give them only rights where it does not cost the society's money. We talked about having an executive secretary, to take minutes, and every time it fails because a lack of people willing to do it. If we have an external member willing to do this, why not let them? It allows the board to make an informed decision to give specific rights in specific cases. Jonathan, it needs to be considered that people on academic break could be on break for difficulty with academics, or a medical issue that affected them one term but won't in the future. Passing blanket bylaws is very prejudicial to members that have that issue. As Eric brought up, the Faculty is recognizing that this mandatory level 2 academic probation doesn't make sense, and they are moving towards a more case by case approach for members to best fulfill their academics. As EngSoc, we should be following suit that maybe this mandatory break doesn't always work. Sam M., you mention ex-officio as the "fun things" but we don't govern those elections. The Chief Attiliator could be an artsci under our governance. We have 5-6 positions that have 0 applicants. That's something to keep in mind, and people on academic break might have more time to work on this. It's a case-by-case basis. There's one case that occurs where people who don't want to



deal with the Engineering Career Centre, and just take time off to get a job. There's no difference between them and PEY students, and if we extend the right where they aren't benefitting from fees I don't see problem with that. It's the board's decision in every individual case.

Ryan W: I agree that there should be a way for those on academic break or those on PEY to be formally involved. Further to Twesh's point about someone without an academic load to provide more work, there's a reason we have enrollment requirements for certain positions, and don't think we would want an EngSoc where it's incentivized to take time and run a better campaign by taking time off. We don't want it to become like other student societies to take time off to do work. Further to Billy's point regarding PEY, one thing you said was that there's no down side to have students do work without paying fees, but I think that to say there are positions you can hold in EngSoc where you aren't benefitting from student fees is false. Those opportunities can only exist from student fees in first place. You can only work for society because it exists from student fees. It comes back to what holds our membership together, and being financially invested in it is only one part. It does make sense for academic break members to maintain involvement.

Matthew: People who aren't members of the society will have more time to dedicate to elections and will have more time to commit to studies. I don't think it's in EngSoc's purview to dictate what these people spend time on. EngSoc should be looking at how these people are qualified. EngSoc and whole society would benefit from extending rights, as it's not in our purview to define. On the idea that dropping school commitments would be incentivized to work on elections, I don't think that would be incentivized, as taking breaks is not possible in engineering without disrupting one's degree. I don't think this in particular makes it better or worse for students to do better campaigns.

Aron: Echoing Matthew on the point that people on academic break should focus on academics. You literally can't as people on break aren't in class.

Danja: A lot of the points I wanted to mention have been brought up. The Faculty is recognizing that the laws currently in place are going to change. It's the students decision to decide if they want to get involved. It's not always because of academics.

Apurv: On the idea that non-engineering students who are involved with Skule are mostly in LGMB among other ex-officios, I think it's hyperbole. I know non-engineering students involved with groups such as UTAT, so that blanket isn't universal.

Milan: A claim came up that we shouldn't be dictating who gets involved, but we are responsible for dictating who should be able to represent students. It's not a question of involvement -- it's a question of scale of involvement. There are students involved in certain ways, and there's nothing preventing them from doing that in Skule Stage Band, for example, and no need to place regulations on that. But for larger roles it's more concerning, and if they can't represent the concerns of the constituency, how can they be a board of directors member? Maybe there's a better way to include project directors. If this is something that doesn't have rush, it's something that will be dealt with by the Faculty in the next few weeks.

Twesh: Billy, the definition of alumni may have been intentional, or just overlooked. Let's clarify that by speaking to past EngSoc members as opposed to assuming it's correct. I didn't say that



the difference in time was substantial in my elections comment. However, it's the principle that as a student you have an occupation that takes a significant amount of your time. In principle if you're not a student, you have a different set of priorities and you may have other commitments, whereas academic break members do not necessarily have other commitments. It kind of conflicts the idea about a student organization volunteering time. If we wanted EngSoc to be the best organization it could be, we'd replace us all with hired people. The purpose of EngSoc is to be effective, but to also give students experiences. The goal is for students to have the opportunity to work in EngSoc. Currently representatives for the board do have to be members of the constituency, which is defined as enrollment in the constituency. Billy: The way it's currently written it would allow academic break members to run for the board of directors as they were previously enrolled.

Twesh: It's weird to appoint a member to represent a constituency that they aren't enrolled in. In some disciplines, like EngSci, it's split up but it's the principle that they do attend more classes with their constituency. There's lots of reason why people go on academic break, but some reasons are personal, and I'm not sure we'd be able to get that information for us to make an informed decision. The board should not be making rulings in this area. We shouldn't be asking students to give us this information. Some of your arguments are circular -- the fact that they're not members means we shouldn't be representing them. The total number of semesters you have to be enrolled in is about the same for an academic break student, in which case you do have at least as much opportunity to participate as a student. Finally, I think membership in EngSoc is a privilege not a right, bestowed on you by enrolling in engineering. Even forgetting specific conflicts, it turns something that is a part of the experience into a choice, and can lead to cronyism and makes it less meaningful to be a member. We are re-hashing points and arguing on different levels here, so I think we should end debate.

#### **MOTION by Aron Sankar to call the question**

Seconded by Twesh.

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

Against: Billy

Abstaining: Danja

**Motion passed.**

For: none

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

Abstaining: Aron, Apurv

**Motion failed.**



---

Billy: I'd like to amend the agenda to get a motion on whether or not the board believes this is worthy of going through into the elective members and academic break members, and the executive committee can take that under advisement.

**MOTION by Eric Bryce to include an item inclusive of a straw poll to see whether or not the board believes this motion warrants consideration to extend certain rights to academic break members, and a second item inclusive of a straw poll to determine whether the motion merits consideration in the context of individual who are non-members of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering**

Seconded by Apurv.

For: Billy, Mark, Aron

Against: Andrew

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

Eric: To be clear, this motion to have a non-binding vote to see if at some point in the future we would like to consider this

Eric: Does everyone understand that we're trying to determine if we want to spend money or not?

Re-running the same informal poll:

For: Billy, Mark, Danja, Olivia, Ryan W., Apurv, Danil, Muskan, Oghosa, Kevin R.

Against: Twesh, Jason, Mahta, Andrew, Milan

Abstaining: Raneem, Kevin Z., Samantha

Eric: We will now vote on whether to spend money on legal consultation. First, does the board believe that it merits spending money on lawyers. All who believe that we should spend reasonable lawyer money to figure out whether academic break members, withdrawn students, and PEY students can be society members, vote yes. This is not binding.

For: Billy, Mark, Olivia, Aron, Samantha, Muskan, Kevin Z., Danja, Kevin R., Sneha, Twesh, Jason

Against: Andrew, Mahta, Oghosa

Abstaining: Samantha, Raneem, Milan

Eric: The second poll: the same question, but for people who are external altogether. Those in favour?

For: Billy, Mark, Danja, Kevin R., Sneha

Against: Samantha, Raneem, Apurv, Milan, Andrew, Mahta, Olivia, Kevin Z., Oghosa, Muskan, Ryan W., Jason, Twesh, Aron,

Abstaining: Danil



**14. MOTION by Aron Sankar to amend Bylaw 3 of the Constitution**

**WHEREAS** the Constitution does not explicitly limit the candidacy to elected officials of the society to current members:

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Chapter 0 - General of Bylaw 3 be amended to include the following:

0.0.13 - A candidate's nomination for any position elected by members is only valid if the candidate is a current full-time or part-time Member of the Society.

Motion brought back from being tabled.

Billy: In light of what just happened, I'd encourage the board to vote this down as this consultation process will take until the end of the summer likely. Another few months after dealing with it will not matter.

For: Aron, Twesh, Jason, Ryan W., Milan, Muskan, Kevin R.

Against: Samantha, Billy, Mark, Sneha, Oghosa

Abstaining: Mahta, Andrew, Olivia, Danja, Apurv, Kevin Z.

**Motion failed.**

**15. MOTION by Aron Sankar to amend Bylaw 1 of the Constitution**

**WHEREAS** currently Bylaw 1.1.3 states:

1.1.3. Alumni Members shall have previously been registered as full time students in the University of Toronto Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering or its precursor, the Ontario School of Practical Science.

**WHEREAS** by this definition any current member of the Society can be defined as an Alumni member:

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 1.1.3 be amended to state:

1.1.3. Alumni Members shall have received an undergraduate degree from the University of Toronto Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering or its precursor, the Ontario School of Practical Science

Motion brought back from being tabled.

Kevin R.: I want to clarify whether or not we wanted it to be an undergraduate degree. If you were registered as full time masters or PhD, you would be considered an Alumni Member.

Aron: EngSoc is for undergraduate students.

Kevin R.: is that included in the bylaws?

Billy: According to our bylaws, masters and PhD students are alumni members. First, for the same reasons against the previous motion, I don't think this should pass. I think there's a lot of value to have people on academic break as alumni members to speak at meetings. This change is not particularly substantive. Rishi brought up a member that was in the Faculty for 7 years, was Speaker, and didn't get a degree. There is still a lot of benefit to giving that person speaking



rights at meetings. There are members who are in positions like that will be stripped of their rights if this motion passes, and this agenda was not made public at all, so I don't think it's right for a lot of reasons to pass this at this time or at all.

Matthew: Echoing Billy, people on academic leave and people who didn't receive a degree should be considered.

Aron: I was going to move to lay it on the table indefinitely to be figured out after consultation.

Eric: You could go through your whole degree and graduate as a part time student and not be an Alumni Member afterward under the current bylaws.

**MOTION by Aron Sankar to table this motion indefinitely**

Seconded by Muskan.

For: Samantha, Raneem, Apurv, Milan, Mahta, Olivia, Kevin Z., Oghosa, Muskan, Jason, Twesh, Aron, Billy, Mark, Danja, Kevin R., Sneha

Against: none

Abstaining: Ryan W., Andrew

**Motion passed.**

**16. MOTION by Billy Graydon to Clarify the Jurisdiction of the Election Appeals Committee**

**WHEREAS** an appeals body should consider and rule on only the question of law or of fact upon which an appeal to it was rendered

**WHEREAS** the threshold of unanimous consent required to ignore or amend any recommendation of the Election Appeals Committee is incredibly high

**WHEREAS** it is wise to limit what the EAC may mandate subject to the unanimous consent requirement

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 3 Section 7.0.4 onwards, which currently reads:

7.0.4. The Election Appeals Committee's recommendations shall be binding, unless opposed by an unanimously approved motion of the Board, wherein any member of the Election Appeals Committee shall not have a vote.

be amended to read:

7.0.4. The Election Appeals Committee's jurisdiction on any appeal shall be limited to the election(s) which the appeal concerns

7.0.5. The Election Appeals Committee may consider only those arguments submitted to them by the Office of Returning Officers and by the appellant in making their ruling. If the EAC wishes to consider any additional argument they shall either remit the decision to the CRO or give both parties reasonable opportunity to submit additional evidence and arguments.

7.0.6. Any ruling of the Election Appeals Committee that upholds the ruling of the CRO in part or in full, or grants the requests of the appellant in part or in full shall be binding, unless opposed by a unanimously approved motion of the



Board, wherein any member of the Election Appeals Committee shall not have a vote.

7.0.7. Any other ruling of the Election Appeals Committee shall be binding unless opposed by a regular motion of the Board

7.0.8. Any recommendation of the Election Appeals Committee that does not pertain directly to the submitted Appeal, or any ruling beyond its jurisdiction shall not be binding

7.0.9. No ruling shall be binding when any provision of this Chapter of By-law 3, or any principle of natural justice was breached during the appeal process, as determined by a majority vote of the Board

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the provisions here listed shall apply retroactively to any appeal that has not been fully disposed of. For greater clarity, 7.0.9. shall also apply to any appeal for which these provisions were not followed or can not be retroactively applied.

Seconded by Aron.

Billy: This was brought to light with Sourabh's case. Aron has submitted a motion to reconsider that, and one of the major grounds for that consideration was that the appeals committee took an opinion on whether the email constituted a withdrawal. They ruled the email wasn't a withdrawal, but then invalidated his candidacy. There are many fundamental flaws with that; if the body is dealing with that issue then they need to hear from both sides. The EAC (Election Appeals Committee) made a ruling where they did not allow arguments to be considered, which is concerning as it takes unanimous consent to overturn it. Wording of current bylaws says that the EAC has carte blanche to make recommendation on any area of the society, which is binding. This is a big flaw in the bylaws.

Milan: I don't understand the notion of EAC doing whatever they want. To me it seems the mandate isn't there.

Billy: If you see section 7.04 in Bylaw 3, any recommendation EAC is put forward is binding in our bylaws.

Kevin: I don't see any issue in this. This gives us the checks and balances we need. If we're not comfortable with changes as in this elections case, this allows the board to give it another avenue to re-examine issues.

For: Samantha, Raneem, Apurv, Milan, Olivia Kevin Z., Oghosa, Muskan Jason, Twesh, Aron, Billy, Mark, Danja, Kevin R., Sneha

Against: none

Abstaining: Mahta, Ryan W., Andrew

**Motion passed.**

**MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to recess until 5:30PM**

Seconded by Muskan





**Motion passed.**

**MOTION by Muskan Sethi to extend the recess by 5 minutes**

**Motion passed.**

**17. MOTION by Billy Graydon to Extend Rights to Sourabh Das**

**WHEREAS** for various personal and medical reasons, Sourabh has not been enrolled in school this year

**WHEREAS** he will be enrolled next year

**WHEREAS** he is interested in the VP Finance position, and is currently prevented from assuming office because of his status this year despite what his status will be next year when he serves

**WHEREAS** that's dumb

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Sourabh Das be given the right to run for and, if elected, serve as the VP Finance under Bylaw 1 section 1.4.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** he shall enjoy no other rights of membership other than being able to run for and serve in the office of VP Finance, to speak at Society meetings, and vote at meetings should he be elected as VP Finance.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** there shall be no conditions of membership

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** these rights shall terminate when he becomes a full-time or part-time member, or on the 1st of October 2017, whichever is sooner

Seconded by Danja.

Billy: 1.4 doesn't exist. This motion is out of order, but what we can do is, subject to the Ontario Corporations Act, admit any person as a member of the corporation. It's the only way we could proceed with this motion, but I think it's probably not a good way to progress.

Milan: I'd speak against this. The framework by which this would operate does not exist, and there is a bylaw requirement that officers must be members. I also question whether it is fair to change the criteria for running after the fact.

[The Speaker ruled the motion out of order.]

**18. MOTION by Billy Graydon to extend rights to Kristian Koschany**

**WHEREAS** engineering stores is refusing to sell him a jacket

**WHEREAS** this is ridiculous for all the reasons spelled out in Appendix D

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Kristian Koschany be allowed to order a jacket from Stores under Bylaw 1 Section 1.5, with no other rights of membership and no conditions. This right shall terminate when his jacket has arrived to specification, or in six (6) months, whichever is earlier.



---

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** in the case that the nonmember-rights bylaw change did not pass before this motion is considered, the Board direct the Engineering Stores managers to let Kristian get his damn jacket

Seconded by Sam M..

Eric: I will allow this, but not the first BE IT RESOLVED THAT clause.

Billy: We have shown in this meeting that EngSoc's services don't extend to non-members, but the Engineering Stores sells patches to non-engineers and the Hard Hat Cafe sells stuff to non-engineers

Robyn: From the perspective of the Engineering Stores, we've had non-engineers ask to buy the jackets. After talking to our overseeing officer we decided that the crests were traditionally associated with engineers, and we decided to offer jackets without those to all non-engineering students. Kristian knew this, and we weren't told that this was a complaint.

Kevin H.: We told our supplier that he could not have the specific patches, but there was a miscommunication and the supplier thought that this applied to all patches. Kristian has an order with us, but we can't refund him or sell him a jacket until he tells us what he wants to do.

Milan: I don't think it's appropriate that the board is ruling on this, particularly as the Stores managers weren't informed that this was an issue.

Raneem: When Colin and I were Stores managers, we had authority over what went over the counter. I think that overruling them on the first concern that has been raised is very inappropriate.

Andrew: I don't think the cafe is a reasonable comparison, and I stand by the decision of the stores managers.

Kevin R.: How is it monitored that jackets aren't sold to first years?

Robyn: We don't check schedules or anything. It could have happened.

Billy: In my understanding, Kristian received an email from Richard and then contacted you. There must have been a miscommunication.

**MOTION by Raneem Shammass to call the question**

Seconded by Muskan.

For: Samantha, Milan, Raneem, Boetto, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Aron, Apurv, Muskan, Oghosa, Kevin R., Sneha

Opposed: Billy, Mark

Abstaining: Twesh, Jason, Ryan W.

**Motion passed.**

For: Billy, Mark

Opposed: Samantha, Raneem, Milan, Andrew, Mahta, Olivia, Muskan, Oghosa, Kevin R., Apurv, Ryan W., Twesh, Jason

Abstaining: Aron, Sneha, Kevin Z., Danja

**Motion failed.**



**19. MOTION by Aron Sankar to overturn the Election Appeals Committee regarding the appeal of Sourabh Das made on Thursday, March 2nd**

**WHEREAS** the CRO's decision overturned by the committee was not the one that had been submitted by the appellant; and

**WHEREAS** while the by-laws do state what kind of candidate submission must be considered valid, they do not provide any explicit exclusions from valid nominations; and

**WHEREAS** the appellant is still considered an Alumni Member of the Society as per Bylaw 1.1.3

**WHEREAS** the Chief Returning Officer was therefore within his rights to make a ruling on the eligibility of the appellant given it does not contradict the bylaws:

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Election Appeals Committee's ruling be overturned; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the CRO be directed to hold another election for the position of VP Finance at the earliest convenience.

Seconded by Billy.

Aron: It doesn't make sense to run an election if Sourabh can't run, but I do think that the ERC is wrong in its ruling.

Billy: We didn't rule that Sourabh can't run. The CRO made the ruling that Sourabh could run but couldn't be an officer.

Milan: I don't think it makes sense to retroactively change the rules of our elections. To the ERC, the question of eligibility was the centre of the appeal.

Eric: Note that I advised the CRO mistakenly when I was consulted. This inadequate assessment of the bylaws led to a ruling that led to a fair amount of concern.

Colin: I think that one of the arguments that is part of this motion is inappropriate – the one stating " WHEREAS while the by-laws do state what kind of candidate submission must be considered valid, they do not provide any explicit exclusions from valid nominations". Our bylaws are for the most part written permissively, not restrictively. I shouldn't be able to say that the VP Communications has the ability to dismiss directors, or any number of things, just because the bylaws don't specifically withhold that ability. Setting that kind of precedent is dangerous.

Aron: The CRO is set to run the elections; that is their call.

Colin: The bylaws don't give the CRO "power over elections". You need to point to the bylaw section that gives the CRO power in this instance.

Aron: 1.0.13

Colin: I don't think that's relevant. Nobody in this case has broken an election rule.

Billy: This would fall under our interpretation motion. This interpretation would need to be a substantive motion based on unanimous consent, or by the Speaker.

Eric: Bylaw 1 is clear that all rights of membership shall apply to full and part time members of the society.



Milan: What provisions do we have for non-members to submit appeals to a body that they don't belong to?

Aron: Would he be allowed to run if this motion passed?

Speaker: I will rule as an interpretation that as someone that is not enrolled in the faculty as a part time or full time student, Sourabh would not be considered a part time or full time member of the corporation and so the rights outlined in the bylaws would not apply. The membership requirement for valid nominations would mean that Sourabh would not be allowed to run.

**MOTION by Aron Sankar to lay this motion on the table and decide interpretation**

Seconded by Billy.

For: Billy, Olivia, Kevin Z., Danja, Muskan, Kevin R., Sneha, Oghosa, Ryan W., Aron

Against: Raneem, Milan, Mahta, Samantha

Abstaining: Jason, Twesh, Mark, Andrew

**MOTION by Aron Sankar to decide interpretation**

Seconded by Billy.

Eric: As Speaker, I rule that this requires 2/3rds majority because someone will challenge me anyway.

For: Billy, Samantha, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Muskan, Kevin R., Sneha, Aron, Ryan W.

Opposed: Twesh, Jason, Raneem, Milan, Kevin Z., Oghosa

Abstaining: Andrew, Mark

**Motion failed.**

**MOTION by Samantha Stuart to call the question**

Seconded by Muskan.

For: Twesh, Jason, Kevin, Sneha, Muskan, Oghosa, Kevin Z., Mahta, Andrew, Samantha, Raneem

Opposed: Aron, Billy, Mark, Danja, Ryan W.

Abstaining: Milan, Olivia

**Motion passed.**

Vote on main motion:

For: Billy, Mark, Danja

Against: Samantha, Raneem, Andrew, Mahta, Olivia, Oghosa, Kevin R.

Abstaining: Twesh, Jason, Aron, Muskan, Kevin Z., Sneha, Ryan W., Milan

**Motion failed.**



**20. MOTION by Billy Graydon to amend Bylaw 1, the Constitution to allow for no Board meeting in December and to do Some Other Stuff**

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

**WHEREAS** the Board has not held a meeting in December for 3 out of the 6 years it has existed, contrary to that clause

**WHEREAS** the December meeting for one of those years carried no substantive motions;

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

**WHEREAS** the definition of academic year and summer break is not whimsy enough

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 1 Section 4.6.1., which currently reads:

4.6.1 The Board of Directors shall meet at least once a month during the Academic Year.

be amended to read:

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

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Bylaw 1 Sections 0.1.2.m. and 0.1.2.n, which currently read:

m. "Summer Months" shall refer to the months of May, June, July and August;

n. "Academic Year" shall refer to the months of September, October, November, December, January, February, March and April.

be amended to read:

m. "Summer Months" shall refer to those months without the letter "R" in their name;

n. "Academic Year" shall refer to those months with the letter "R" in their name

Seconded by Jonathan.

**AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to remove the second "BE IT RESOLVED THAT" clause**

Seconded by Muskan.

For: Aron, Samantha, Mark, Raneem, Milan, Andrew, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Kevin Z., Muskan, Aron, Ryan W., Sneha

Against: Billy

Abstaining: Twesh, Jason, Kevin R., Oghosa

**Amendment passed.**

Billy: This has been an issue every year I've been involved. We rarely have anything to do, so let's give the board the option of skipping this meeting.

For: Samantha, Raneem, Billy, Mark, Mahta, Olivia, Kevin Z., Muskan, Sneha, Colin, Oghosa

Against: Twesh, Jason, Kevin R.

Abstaining: Aron, Ryan W., Andrew, Danja



**Motion passed.**

**MOTION by Kevin Rupasinghe to postpone original motions 14 and 15 until the April meeting**

Seconded by Raneem.

Kevin R.: Do these need to be dealt with now? The board seems very tired and quiet.

Jonathan: The April board meeting will follow the JCM, so while this isn't time-critical it isn't great to push.

Twesh: This was circulated early, and was reviewed extensively by the Policy and Structures Committee (PSC). I think that this is important because it will make us compliant with the Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act (ONCA) when it is enforced.

Billy: If we postpone this to April, if we have any concerns about the motion it could be pushed onto the next board of directors. We should at least review and discuss this briefly to identify issues now.

**MOTION by Aron Sankar to call the question**

Seconded by Muskan.

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

Against: none

Abstaining: none

For: Andrew, Kevin Z., Raneem

Against: Twesh, Jason, Ryan W., Aron, Samantha, Milan, Billy Mark, Mahta, Olivia, Danja

Abstaining: none

**Motion failed.**

**21. WHEREAS** the Policy and Structures Committee was tasked with reviewing the Engineering Society's bylaws and constitution to ensure compliancy with the upcoming ONCA.

**WHEREAS** the PSC has completed its review of the written documents.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT**

Section 1.1.5. be amended to read:

1.1.5. The UTSU Representative shall be considered an Ex-Officio Member of the Engineering Society.

Section 1.3.3. be amended to read:

1.3.3. Ex-Officio Members shall enjoy no rights of Membership other than the right to speak and vote at General Meetings and speak at meetings of the Board of Directors, unless they have been individually granted other rights of membership.



Section 2.1.2.b be amended to read:

b. The receipt of a requisition by the Speaker requesting such a meeting signed by one hundred (100) Members;

Section 2.2.1.a be added as follows and all subsequent clauses be renumbered accordingly:

Appoint an auditor until the close of the following AGM.

Section 2.1.2.b.i be added as follows:

i. If the directors do not call a meeting within 21 days after receiving the requisition, any member who signed the requisition may call the meeting.

Section 2.2.1.e be amended to read:

e. Perform any other functions specified by the Not-for-Profit Corporations Act of Ontario and other relevant legislation.

Section 2.3.1 be amended to read:

2.3.1. Notice shall be given at least fourteen (14) days prior to any General Meeting.

Section 2.3.2.b be amended to read:

b. In a Society publication which prints within the fourteen (14) days prior to the General Meeting; and

Section 2.3.4. be added to read:

2.3.4. If a General Meeting is adjourned for less than 30 days, notice by the aforementioned means shall be given at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting that continues the adjourned meeting

Section 2.4.2 be renumbered as 2.4.2a

Section 2.4.2.b and c be added to read:

2.4.2 b Every proxy must be in a form that complies with the regulations of the Ontario Notfor-Profit Corporations Act, Section 64.3.

2.4.2 c The Proxyholder shall bring the signed proxy form to the Speaker at the start of the AGM.

Section 2.4.3. be amended to read:

2.4.3. No person shall hold more than four (4) votes at a General Meeting, including their own.

Section 2.5.1. be amended to read:

2.5.1. Quorum is fifty (50) Members present in person, by proxy, or by telephonic/electronic means if the Board makes a motion to allow electronic participation.

Section 2.5.2. be stricken and replaced with the following:

2.5.2. If quorum is present at the opening of a General Meeting, the Members present may proceed with the meeting, even if quorum is not present throughout the meeting.

The following be inserted before the current 2.7.1, and subsequent sections be renumbered accordingly:



2.7.1. The Society's audited financial statements are to be approved by the Board of Directors before they are circulated in advance of the Annual General Meeting.

Section 2.7.2. be amended to read:

2.7.2. At least twenty-one (21) days before the Annual General Meeting, the Vice-President Finance shall cause a copy of the Society's audited financial statements and the auditor's report to be:

Section 3.2.4. be amended to read:

3.2.4. In accordance with the Not-for-Profit Corporations Act of Ontario and generally accepted accounting principles, the Vice-President Finance shall be responsible for the keeping of all accounting records with respect to all financial and like transactions of the Society.

Section 3.4.1. be amended to read:

3.4.1. In accordance with the provisions of the Not-for-Profit Corporations Act of Ontario, the Vice-President Communications shall be responsible for the maintenance of:

Section 3.4.2. be amended to read:

3.4.2. For all purposes of the Not-for-Profit Corporations Act of Ontario or other legislation, the Vice-President Communications shall serve as the Secretary of the Corporation.

Section 4.1.2. be added to read:

4.1.2. All Directors of the Board must be at least 18 years age when their respective term of office begins, as described in Section 4.2.

Section 4.3.2., 4.3.3., 4.3.4., 4.3.5., and 4.3.6. be stricken.

Section 4.5.1. be amended to read:

4.5.1. Every Board Member shall follow the provisions of the Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act, Section 41.

Section 4.8.3. be added to read:

4.8.3. Notice is not required for a meeting that continues an adjourned meeting of Directors if the time and place of the continued meeting is announced at the meeting that is adjourned.

Section 4.10.1. be amended to read:

4.10.1. Quorum of the Board shall be a majority of Directors of the Board.

Section 4.11.1. be amended to read:

4.11.1. The Speaker shall act as Chair of the Board of Directors and shall ensure proper procedure during all meetings of the Board.

Section 4.11.5. be amended to read:

4.11.5. The Speaker shall act as the Chair for Council, where necessary.

Section 4.11.8. be amended to read:

4.11.8. All decisions of the Speaker may be reversed by a two-thirds majority vote of the Board, except regarding applicable law, the Constitution and Bylaws of the Society from which there is no appeal.





Section 4.12.1. be amended to read:

4.12.1. A Board member shall be immediately recalled upon cessation of his membership of the constituency or constituencies which elected him.

Section 4.12.2. a b and c be stricken:

Section 4.12.2. be amended to read:

4.12.2. Upon a resolution to recall a Director, the Chief Returning Officer shall hold a referendum for the recall. Only members of said Director's constituency are eligible to vote.

Section 7.1.2.a be amended to read:

- a. A two-thirds majority vote at a General Meeting; or Section 7.1.2.b be amended to read:
- b. A two-thirds majority vote at a Board of Directors Meeting

Seconded by Colin.

Sam M.: I'm concerned about the lack of first year representatives. I understand that it may be necessary for compliance, but we should consider what can be done to mitigate the change.

**AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to add "2.2.5 No binding resolution can be made at a general meeting without the presence of quorum of the Board of Directors."**

Seconded by Sam M.

Milan: This would suggest that at a general meeting of the membership, a board of directors meeting could pass things.

**AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to change to "quorum of members equaling the quorum of the board of directors"**

Seconded by Billy.

**MOTION by Twesh Upadhyaya to call the question**

Seconded by Muskan.

For: Billy, Mark, Samantha, Mahta, Andrew, Olivia, Danja, Muskan, Aron, Twesh, Jason, Kevin R., Sneha

Opposed: none

Abstaining: Ryan W.

**Motion passed.**

None opposed.

**Amendment passed.**

Billy: This is illegal.



**MOTION by Aron Sankar to call the question**

Seconded by Muskan.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**

For: none

Against: Samantha, Milan, Billy, Mark, Mahta, Andrew, Danja, Kevin Z., Muskan, Aron, Ryan W., Kevin R., Sneha, Twesh, Jason

Abstaining: none

**Amendment failed.**

**AMENDMENT by Sam McCulloch to change:**

"Section 2.5.2. be stricken and replaced with the following:

2.5.2. If quorum is present at the opening of a General Meeting, the Members present may proceed with the meeting, even if quorum is not present throughout the meeting."

**to:**

"Section 2.5.2. be stricken."

Seconded by Aron

**AMENDMENT by Billy Graydon to change:**

"Section 2.5.2. be stricken."

**to:**

"Section 2.5.2. be stricken and replaced with the following:

2.5.2 Quorum shall be maintained throughout the meeting."

Seconded by Samantha.

For: Muskan, Aron, Kevin Z., Danja, Olivia, Ryan W.

Against: Milan, Billy, Samantha, Mahta, Kevin R., Sneha, Twesh, Jason

Abstaining: Andrew, Mark

**Motion failed.**

**AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to change:**

"Section 2.5.2. be stricken."

**to:**

"Section 2.5.2. be stricken and replaced with the following:

2.5.2 At least half of quorum shall be maintained after the meeting has started."



Seconded by Billy.

Billy: I think that this is a reasonable compromise.

For: Samantha, Milan, Billy, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Kevin Z., Muskan, Aron, Ryan W.

Against: Kevin R., Sneha

Abstaining: Mark, Andrew, Raneem, Twesh, Jason

**Amendment passed.**

For: Samantha, Milan, Billy, Mahta, Olivia, Kevin Z., Muskan, Aron, Ryan W.

Against: Kevin R., Sneha

Abstaining: Twesh, Jason, Mark, Raneem

**Amendment passed.**

**AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to add "Section 4.1.2 be removed."**

Seconded by Sam M.

Sam M.: I'm not in favour of removing this section because we will need to get rid of first year representatives eventually. We might change them, or find a solution, but I'd like to discuss it.

Aron: I don't think we need to do this now. We can find a solution.

**MOTION by Eric Bryce to call the question**

Seconded by Milan.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**

For: none

Against: Samantha, Raneem, Milan, Billy, Andrew, Mahta, Olivia, Danja, Muskan, Aron, Ryan W., Twesh, Jason

Abstaining: none

**Amendment failed.**

**AMENDMENT by Aron Sankar to add:**

"Section 4.8.4 be added to read:

4.8.4 For any meeting which as a continuation of an adjourned meeting for which the time and place of the next meeting was announced at the end of that meeting, the time and place of the continuation must be circulated among members of the society at least 48 hours in advance."

Seconded by Sam M..

Twesh: this limits the time of the continuation of the meeting. This is not starting a brand new meeting



Sam M.: I think that the transparency merits of telling people when meetings are important and are necessary for us being held accountable.

**AMENDMENT by Jonathan Swyers to make this an amendment to 4.8.3 instead of 4.8.4.**

Seconded by Muskan.

Sam M.: If we strike 4.8.3 we would have to give them 14 day notice, and 4.8.4 doesn't matter.

Twesh: 14 days notice applies to general meetings only, so it's not relevant here.

Billy: Adjournment refers to any time a meeting ends, including recesses. Passing this would also render recesses of under 48 hours impossible.

**MOTION by Sam McCulloch to call the question**

Seconded by Billy.

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

Against: none

Abstaining: none

**Motion passed.**

For: none

Against: Ryan W., Aron, Twesh, Sneha, Billy, Mark, Kevin R., Sneha, Danja, Muskan

Abstaining: Samantha, Olivia, Andrew, Milan, Raneem

**Amendment failed.**

**MOTION by Sam M. to call the question**

Seconded by Billy.

No objections.

**Motion passed.**

For: Aron

Against: Milan Billy, Mark, Samantha, Andrew, Danja, Kevin R., Sneha, Muskan, Twesh, Jason, Ryan W., Olivia, Raneem

**Amendment failed.**

**MOTION by Sam McCulloch to defer original motion 14 to the Policy and Structures Committee for additional consultation and refer the topic back to the Board of Directors by the April Board of Directors meeting.**

Seconded by Muskan.



For: Raneem, Kevin R., Sneha, Billy, Mark, Milan, Olivia, Danja, Aron, Ryan W.

Against: Muskan, Twesh, Jason

Abstaining: Andrew, Samantha

**Motion passed.**

**22. DRAFT MOTION FOR CONSULTATION by Billy Graydon to Expand Engsoc's Advocacy Framework**

**WHEREAS** the Board has indicated that they believe a new Advocacy Board to be too ambitious; and

**WHEREAS** there remains a gap in Engsoc's ability to provide non-academic advocacy

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** bylaw 1 section 4.13.6, which currently reads:

4.13.6. The Academic Advocacy Committee shall consist of the Vice President Academic, other members of the Board that may be appointed, one representative from each Discipline appointed by Discipline Club Chairs, and Faculty Council Standing Committee Representatives.

a. The Vice President Academic shall serve as the Chair of the Academic Advocacy Committee

be amended to read:

4.13.6. The Academic Advocacy Committee shall consist of the Vice President Academic, other members of the Board that may be appointed, one representative from each Discipline appointed by Discipline Club Chairs, and Faculty Council Standing Committee Representatives.

a. The Vice President Academic shall serve as the Chair of the Academic Advocacy Committee

b. The Academic Advocacy Committee may advocate for non-academic matters also as directed by the Board and their own initiative. The VP Academic may delegate another officer or member to Chair the committee while it is dealing with non-academic matters

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the following be added to bylaw 1 section 4.13.1:

4.13.1.g. The Council of Representatives

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the following be added to bylaw 1 section 4.13., and all subsequent sections renumbered accordingly:

4.13.8. The Council of Representatives shall provide a forum for the Society's external representatives to co-ordinate their efforts.

4.13.8.1. The Council of Representatives shall comprise:

- a) Class Representatives and others with a seat on Faculty Council
- b) Faculty Council Standing Committee Representatives
- c) Governing Council Representatives
- d) Representatives on Governing Council Boards and Committees
- e) UTSU Board of Directors Representatives
- f) The UTSU Representative on the Engineering Society Board



- 
- g) The UTSU VP of Professional Faculties
  - h) Representatives on UTSU Committees and Commissions
  - i) Student representatives on Departmental Advisory Committees
  - j) Student representatives on special Decanal Committees and Task Forces,
  - k) Student representatives on the ESSCO Executive and the CFES Executive
  - l) Any other Member of the Society as the Board may from time to time appoint
- 4.13.8.2. The The Council of Representatives shall have as ex-officio members:
- a) The President
  - b) The Vice-President, Academic
  - c) The Vice-President, Student Life
  - d) The Ombudsman
  - e) The External Relations Director
  - f) The Community Outreach Director
  - g) The Mental Wellness Director
  - h) The Design Team Association Project Manager
  - i) The Professional Outreach Director
  - j) The Alumni Outreach Director
  - k) Members of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee of Faculty Council
  - l) Members of the Examinations Committee of Faculty Council
  - m) Members of the Academic Appeals Board of Faculty Council
- 4.13.8.3. The Council of Representatives shall be chaired be the Speaker of the Board by default, however they may appoint any member of the Society as Chair in his stead
- 4.13.8.4. Meetings shall be open to all Members of the society.
- 4.13.8.5. Meetings may be called for a subset of members only
- 4.13.8.4. The Council of Representatives may be called to meet by a resolution of the Board, the Academic Advocacy Committee, the Executive Committee, any Officer or their Chair
- 4.13.8.6. The Chair shall call a meeting for all Faculty Council voting representatives before the first Faculty Council meeting of the year, but after the Agenda has been circulated.

Seconded by Colin.

For: Samantha, Colin, Billy, Mark

Against: Aron, Twesh, Jason, Ryan W., Kevin R., Sneha, Mahta, Muskan, Milan, Andrew

Abstaining: Danja

**Motion failed.**



### **23. OTHER BUSINESS**

Twesh: I'm not sure if the PSC can meet before the April board meeting, which is scheduled for April 8.. Is everyone okay with everything in the ONCA motion except the points already raised? If so, I would suggest passing those now.

Aron: I think it would be good to discuss via email with interested parties and the PSC.

Kevin R.: I understand that you might not be able to meet, but I think that if we push it to April we can pass it quickly.

Sam M.: I don't think we're at a state now where we can think about this very clearly.

Twesh: I think that this has had enough review.

### **24. Report by the VP Communications – *Colin Parker***

### **25. MOTION by Ryan Gomes to ratify the results of the officer election**

**WHEREAS** a report from the Chief Returning Officer is available in the appendix

For: Samantha, Raneem, Milan, Andrew, Kevin R., Sneha, Olivia, Danja, Muskan, Ryan W., Twesh, Jason

Against: none

Abstaining: Aron

**Motion passed.**

### **26. ADJOURNMENT**

Seconded by Ryan W.

None opposed.

**Motion passed. Meeting adjourned.**



## Attendance

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