

EngSoc Board Meeting F16 - October

October 15, 2016

Chair: Rachael Schachtler

Secretary: Adelle Vickery

Present and voting: Ian Holstead, Brian Howe, Adelle Vickery, Jeff Gulbranson, Awn Duqoum, Sarah Martin, Steven Jia

Remote and voting: Megan Emily Town, Rachel Malevich, Clarisse Schneider

Present and not voting: Abdullah Barakat, Mary Bland

1.0 Welcome and Call to Order (Information)

Time: 1pm

Quorum met.

2.0 Approval of September Minutes (Vote)

Moved to table until November: Adelle

Secunder: Jeff

Passes unanimously.

3.0 Approval of the Agenda (Vote)

Mover: Adelle

Secunder: Megan

Passes unanimously.

4.0 Spending Update

General overview of term actuals given. No concerns.

CS: Is it possible to show line items that have changed since the last meeting? Instead of going through all items every meeting, it would be nice to be able to focus on what has actually changed.

MB: Yes. I can highlight the cells that were changed since the last update.

5.0 Taxes, Not Discounts (Take 2)

Now that feedback from MB was received about what's possible, time to determine path forward.

MB: What we can do is advertise a fee for using a cup from the C&D. We can put advertisements in the C&D for the travel mugs sold in Novelties, and give a free coffee with purchase.

6.0 Development of Communication Policy (Discussion)

Tabled from the September meeting.

AV: General idea is that it would place accountability on the Executive teams and provide precedence for what types of disagreements could be brought to Board for moderation/arbitration. Ties in well with

the Board Role discussion later on the agenda. Currently we have “Communication Guidelines” that outline how Executive should communicate with each other and how information should be shared with general members. It covers inter-society communication, the poster policy, mailing lists, and social media. This discussion is intended to be about whether or not we want to make this a “Communication Policy” that is governed by Board. Right now, nothing happens if an Executive doesn’t follow this document, and there’s no one to provide rulings on interpretation. Disputes on this are handled by the exec themselves, and often isn’t resolved at all; the different exec interpret it differently and think they’re right. If it were a policy managed by board, board could be the body that provides interpretation rulings and actually enforce the outlined rules. Not all aspects need to be in Policy, but things like inter-society communication might benefit from it.

Q: Would this be added to the Policy Manual?

- AV: No. It would be a separate document that is governed by Board. It wouldn’t be managed by council. Right now, the guidelines are changed by an agreement of the presidents.

Strawpoll: board generally feels it should not be made into a policy.

7.0 Looking forward to ECIF

Mover: Jeff

Jeff: Purpose is to discuss how we’re going to ensure we receive enough ECIF proposals. For the past few terms, they have mostly be submitted by Exec, not the general student body. How is it going to be promoted this term?

- AB: Will be sent out on the mailing list. That was one of my goals as finance – to make posters and better advertise things under my portfolio, including ECIF. It will also be in my council update and in an IW article. I’m trying my best to get submissions. Would be helpful to have a deadline to include in the advertisements
- RS: The submissions would have to be sent out with the agenda, which is sent out 5 days before the meeting. November meeting won’t be earlier than a month from today, so November 1st for ECIF deadline?
 - General strawpoll was that that’s too early
- RS: November 10th then?
 - Strawpoll positive.

8.0 Role of Board – Moderator Discussion

Mover: Jeff

Jeff: Came up with some discussion points to give an idea of how Board thinks it should be involved with moderation.

Is Board moderating, or arbitrating?

- AV: Definitions for those who don’t know the difference: Arbitrate would be to make a decision or ruling on the conflict, moderate would be making a recommendation.
- General feeling of Board is that it would be determined on a case by case basis, with input from the exec in question on what they want.

Q: How many people should moderate? What's the split between A and B?

- BH: It should be the max number of people available after those with conflicts of interest are removed
- Especially if its arbitration vs. moderation
- Strawpoll is positive

Q: Should we exclude current exec, regardless of involvement in this specific issue?

- BH: Executive will have more complete knowledge/information; it wouldn't necessarily be fair for both parties involved
- AD: Have them in the discussion, but with no vote in the case of decision making. They only having speaking rights
- AV: Not having voting rights doesn't mean they couldn't influence the decision/discussion
- CS: Have them available for additional information purposes, but not included in the discussion
- MB: Would the Business Manager be included?
 - AV: Yes; they could provide an unbiased opinion, with more insider knowledge of the situation
 - Wouldn't be a requirement

Q: How would these people be picked?

- JG: Might not be as important now that the number is determined to be max with conflicts removed
 - No, it could still be important
- Important for conflicts of interest to be declared.
- What if they're not declared?
 - Board members could call them out if they know of something not declared
- CS: Proposed to have vetoes; if someone is bringing something to Board for moderation or arbitration they should have the power to veto members of Board they don't want included in the discussion
- JG: Maybe it could be more of a veto recommendation, instead of a sure thing
- CS: instead, have Board and the Exec in question list all conflicts (or perceived conflicts) declared at the same time. Board can then discuss the differences between the two lists as "red flags"

Q: Will disputes be handled in person, via email, Hangouts? How's it work with remote?

- AD: Speaking to how Board would convene, thinks the same way that regular board meeting are conducted
- JG: Speaking to how to interact with the exec, thinks entirely electronic is a good system, similar to how the Appeals process is run. Documents and explanations of the situation would be submitted to Board (through the Chair), Board would try to make a decision based on that, and if a decision can't be reached, the exec in question would be spoken to separately.
 - Q: Would the exec be able to see what the other submitted?
 - JG: Yes.
- CS: Don't like it all being online, but agree with getting some sort of documentation ahead of time

- AV: There should always be some in-person aspect
- MB: Agrees. Written word can be interpreted differently than intended or between people reading.
- Q: Would the in person portion be conducted with the exec together or separate?
 - BH: Could be determined on a case-by-case basis

What kinds of things would we NOT want Board to handle? I.e. what should always be handled between teams/across teams

- AV: Might be something to consider including in the Communication Guidelines? Have a section saying if you disagree on *these* things, can go to Board.
- CS: If we get below a certain number of board members (suggestion: 2 per Society involved), shouldn't arbitrate
- JG: Disagrees; 3 people can make a decision.
- AD: Shouldn't specify things. It should be handled on a case-by-case basis. If Board receives something we don't think we should be dealing with, we can decline.
- BH: This could all be done using common-sense. Doesn't really need to be over prescribed.
- SJ: Could we have something in place where they have to show how they tried to work it out themselves?
 - RS: Would theoretically be able to see that in the documents they submit
- AD: Why do we want them to try?
 - JG: Common sense. It's always better for the conflict to be resolved by the people involved; would be case-by-case again.

RS: Is this enough to make a proposal?

- JG: Yes, will be circulated with the agenda in November

9.0 Adjournment Vote

Mover: Awn

Secunder: Jeff

Passes unanimously.