

ENGSOC February Board Meeting

Feb 26th, 2017

Chair: Benjamin Beelen

Secretary: Min Kwak

Present and Voting: Abdullah Barakat, Rachel Malevich, Awn Duqoum, Jeff Gulbranson, Brain Howe, Ian Holstead, Sarah Martin, Megan Town, Clarisse Schneider

Present and Non-Voting: Mary Bland, Katie Arnold

Absent: Steven Jia

1. Welcome and Call to Order

Time: 6:33 pm Feb 26th 2017

2. Approval of January 29th Minutes

Motion: To approve the minutes from the last board meeting dated January 29th, 2017

Mover: Jeff Gulbranson

Second: Sarah Martin

Result: Motion passed.

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: To approve February 26th agenda

Mover: Sarah Martin

Second: Awn Duqoum

Result: Motion Passed.

4. Review of Document of Stances (Presidents)

Stance 1: The faculty should strive to have wait times of two weeks or less for engineering counselling. Waiting time of 2 weeks or more at times.

- Awn: We can keep it.
- Ian: Why don't we keep a document of current stances (like historical stances)?
- Brian: Are we discussing them, revising them, or what? What's our end goal?
- Rachel: We can suggest revising the stances at council if we need to. I think we should do it on case by case scenario.

Keep stance 1.

Stance 2: Engineering counselling should be available outside of regular class hours.

Keep stance 2.

Stance 3: Society condemns the increase of international tuition fee.

- Abdul: I think the increase was about 9.8%.
- Megan: Are we condemning the action itself? We should bring it to the council anyhow.
- Jeff: It should be revised and rather than referencing it to a particular meeting. We should discuss it as it is. For incoming students, it would be hard to understand if it is referred to a particular meeting.

- Jeff: Can we edit the stance once it's passed or should we create a new one, and retire the old one?
- Rachel: Not sure. I have to ask Kieran.
- Brian: If we edit the stance, do we edit old one? Is it a living document?
- Jeff: We shouldn't be revising it by ourselves. We should contact the council, right?
- Rachel: Correct.
- Jeff: Regardless we have to create a new one and retire, or edit on top, we should talk to Kieran anyways, and I think we should bring it to council.
- Megan: Can you talk to Kieran and clarify this?
- Rachel: Yes, I can.

Stance 3 should be revised.

Stance 4: Discouraging professors from re-using the old exams/tests.

- Jeff: It's a good stance, but it will never happen since there is certain courses that it would be impossible to create new questions/contents every time.
- Brian: Are we looking at whether this is reasonable?
- Rachel: Regardless of whether or not a stance is reasonable, it should be on there.
- Clarisse: This stance still clearly had impact if Peter Douglas is speaking to professors about it.
- Jeff: I think this was passed with strong language (restricting, discourage). I'm fine with it leaving it as it is.

Keep Stance 4.

5. Spending Update (VP OF)

Speaker: Katie Arnold

Sponsorship:

- Katie: I wrote my budget in December so it was a little more accurate.
- Mary: Mine was written in May, so this is correct.

Other revenue: Some purchases EngSoc has made.

Novelties: Purchased new computer, so high expenses.

Bank charges: As expected.

Sponsorship: That's all students claimed so far.

Coffee shop: if we purchase enough soup, we get money back (Campbell's rebate). Debit Machine has a cost for every purchase.

- Jeff: Next meeting, could you prepare what the charges per transaction is for debit? If we put a minimum purchase for debit it might be better. It's trivial to use debit machine for coffee that costs less than a double. Makes the line long, and the cost associated with the machine use can be quite high. Can we put up a sign saying no debit purchase under the minimum amount? I know a lot of places have this for debit purchases.
- Mary: I don't want to put up a sign that says we will charge for purchases on debit below a certain cost.
- Awn: Pre-buying ten coffees? If we can implement this, it would be better.
- Mary: I will look into this.

6. Sub-Societies

- Rachel: As per last meeting, I've met with all department societies to see what they wanted (Nano (NESS), Chem (CESS), Civil Enviro Geo (CEGES)). The reason NESS is putting forward a motion at JAGM to become part of our constitution as a sub society is that NESS has a lot of issues communicating with their department. By joining EngSoc, NESS gains reputation of EngSoc, and their VP Academic can deal with the individual needs of their department so on our end, the burden is less. They will likely to be funded by their department whether or not they are part of EngSoc. NESS office will be in QNC, and they can promote EngSoc in QNC which will benefit EngSoc. Advocating for themselves may be very difficult for Nano since they are part of multiple departments. Also, they have specific focus on getting jobs (since Nano has low employment rate). As for CESS, I explained the situation of NESS. Unlike NESS, CESS already feels they have sway within their department. They seem to be okay regarding being a part of EngSoc, but they want to handle their finance on their own. NESS on the other hand, don't want to.
- Awn: Why?
- Rachel: Not confident, I think they would just prefer it this way. We might have to consider transfer of funds, since they don't have their own account.
- Jeff: Does this interest the society? Since we should be focused on the interest of the society.
- Megan: Shouldn't the society be focused on the students?
- Brian: Yes, but harming the benefit of the general student for the good of few students is not good.
- Rachel: I told them just because you are part of the society does NOT mean you are getting more funding. As for the general pros and cons of having sub-societies, it brings the departments together. Sometimes societies run similar programs so it would be helpful in terms of organization. I spoke with Grant from CEGES, which is a society in between CESS and NESS in terms of where they stand in this situation. They bring in speakers, they hold their own resume critiques (focused on industry), they get their funding from their department, and they do not want to be part of engineering budget.
- CHAIR: They don't talk to anyone outside of their departments.
- Abdullah: Would the inclusion in our general budget affect the auditors' job in any way?
- Katie: I think it would work like how the Iron Warrior and Jazz Band worked. It would stay in our account (like a directorship). Except it's completely funded on their own and we just watch it.
- Megan: What if they fundraise on their own?
- Katie: They should budget extra expenses on their own from the beginning.
- Clarisse: Does this mean that we support having all departments having sub societies? It sounds like we are encouraging it. It can be completely convoluted. It could result in everyone wanting to make a society for the fun of it and requesting money. I think we should support NESS, but we should encourage them to interact with us in a different way. For example, a student liaison, so they have some added legitimacy.
- Rachel: I think the premise of creating sub-societies should include the fact that you would not getting a budget. That's the only way we could entertain the department societies.
- Awn: We can avoid the drama if we have a document clearly outlining.
- Clarisse: It takes too long to create all that and going through the motion of getting it approved.
- Awn: We should have the discussion in the council. We should make the NESS exception until we have a document in set.

- Jeff: Good point by Clarisse. Seems like everyone wants different things. I think three societies should talk to each other to bring something forward. I want to see them all talk to each other. Figure out what they have in common since there is lots of stuff going on.
- Rachel: I've mentioned that. If they want to make this happen, it should be fully united front.
- Jeff: Would it be possible to sit down in a meeting and see what they have in common? What is the minimum you need from EngSoc? And from there we can try to put down something in place. Rather than having NESS putting things forward.
- Rachel: Possibly. How would we like this to be done if they want to make a motion together?
- Brian: Do it inside Board. Or we can critique the motion beforehand.
- Abdullah: How does Board feel about inviting them to the meeting? (mixed votes)
- Rachel: I won't be able to answer every question from them. Information can be lost. I would like a representative if we do it.
- Awn: How about 2 meetings?
- Jeff: Can we compromise and meet with them/email them, get the core stuff, and bring them in to talk about the core stuff rather than starting from the scratch.
- Rachel: Notes before board, distribute it to everyone, we come together and talk about it, right?
- Jeff: Yes, that's what I meant. It would go easier.
- Mary: Everyone is going to want their own little thing. It's not good, in my opinion.
- Katie: There is concern saying some people might want their EngSoc money to go to their sub societies.
- Ian: ECE doesn't need a sub societies. We don't struggle with employment. But for Software, they need it since they are so divided. I don't think we should encourage or discourage their existence. We can happily coexist. I think they handle do it alone.
- Jeff: Looks like Nano is the one that needs us the most. I feel like their department should welcome the societies so this is a bit weird to me. I'd like to see them make a considerate effort to their department because that looks like that's the biggest part for me. If it can be solved outside of EngSoc, it will be nice. We are not a magic society. I want them to put in some effort.
- Awn: Other departments have similar concerns though. Faculty is not taking us seriously (ex. Tron). It would be nice if EngSoc backed them up. I can see why NESS want EngSoc to back them up. Faculty doesn't listen in some cases.
- Clarisse: It sounds like Nano needs their society. I think there is a way to avoid total overhaul of the society. Advocacy and support is key in this.
- Brian: I understand that some faculty doesn't take things seriously. There is way to make events happen while not making things hand in hand with ENGSOC.
- Rachel: Them getting funding doesn't depend on NESS being part of ENGSOC, by the way. Nano already started running a conference and with this they established a pathway for fundraising.
- Awn: They can be okay with giving you money but not taking you seriously.

[General mention of NESS in UWATERLOO website.](#) Refer to Appendix in this document.

- Brian: This article says they are already the sub-society. Based on what they say here, they shouldn't be part of EngSoc. We don't want to host faculty events, we don't do anything with alumni stuff (beyond our scope). It's weird.
- Clarisse: The website says they WILL be confirmed in the board meeting, which is not necessarily true.

Taking 5 minute break

- CHAIR: I'd like to mention something from this website. First of all, they say that they are already a sub-society of EngSoc...
- Mary: If all they want is to have EngSoc behind them, as EngSoc, we should be strong and direct them (have another directorship, perhaps).
- Jeff: There has to be some accountability if we were to endorse for them.
- Megan: I feel like there is hands-off way to do this. This can be not as involving as what NESS wants it to be.
- Rachel: We could have a Department Commissioner, to handle relations.
- Clarisse: It can be something like department commissioner, and under them a director (CHEM director, TRON director, etc). In that way, we give them legitimacy. We still let them do what they want. We won't take their money.
- Jeff: I generally agree with that. Only concern is that running events and academic/co-op side are two different portfolios, how does that fit in to the current structure?
- Rachel: Put it under president.
- Clarisse: We don't care about their events. We only care about their academic side of it.
- Jeff: I like that. They shouldn't just form their society. They should contact VP Academic or something.
- Awn: I think the reason why students form their own societies within the faculty is that the students don't feel comfortable enough to come to us.
- Ian: Also, people might not know that EngSoc exists. Not everyone knows going to EngSoc is an option.
- Clarisse: They might just want to make their own sub-society still and wanted to be a sub-society under EngSoc.
- Brian: NESS having a place in QNC and advocating ENGSOC. What does that actually look like? We are not going to buy them things.
- Rachel: Advertising only.
- Brian: Can we put posters in QNC?
- Mary: We don't have poster boards in QNC.
- Rachel: I would assume they do their advertisement in their society office.
- Clarisse: Can we do straw polls? Accepting their idea as it is (*general down thumb*) How about supporting their advocacy in some way? (*general up thumb*) Do we want to touch their money? Do we want to be involved in their events? (*mixed*)
- Rachel: In case of events, there can be some communication all around (esp. resume critiques, and students want to get their resume critiqued in their department). Sub societies could be beneficial in that case.
- Clarisse: Association, but not having them as sub societies? (*general up thumb*) How about going back and ask them to recreate their proposal?
- Awn: I'd like to meet them at some point anyhow.
- Brian: If they want to bring the motion forward, I'm willing to support outside of my position on Board.
- Jeff: We don't handle their money, support events (booking spaces).
- Katie: I don't think it would be super difficult to handle their finances. We just hold it for them, not budget it for them.
- Mary: I think EngSoc should be more involved. They should bring everyone together. Try to work with them, bring them back, so that they don't go away. I don't mind working financially with them.
- Rachel: Nano is the only one who wants their finances being handled by EngSoc though.
- CHAIR: An hour has passed. Do you think this is enough? Summarize? (*YES*)

- Awn: How do we feel about another meeting?
- Megan: Rachel will meet with them, and maybe we will meet with them.
- Rachel: I will tell them we don't see any reason to include them as a sub-society because we could assist outside of that happening.
- Brian: We should tell them that we have faith that they could do a lot of this on their own.
- Rachel: I'll tell them we have faith in them, and we will provide them the resources they need.
- Megan: We should coordinate, anyhow, so that events make sense (calendar wise). (ex. resume critique from EngSoc and Society in same night is not good)
- Ian: We have to hold EngSoc events still since some students go to both, or one.
- Rachel: We will discuss if this will be a motion, and we should discuss if they disagree with what we said.

7. Sub-Societies

See section 6.

8. Potential Creation of an Elections Engagement Committee

Moved to the next meeting.

CHAIR: bullet point 9 (*Board Members should not be Board Secretaries*) is now 10 and vice versa since Katie and Clarisse wished bullet point 10 (*What Novelties Display Case*) to be discussed first. (*Unanimous agreement, agenda modified*).

9. What Novelties Display Case

Motion: What Novelties display case?

Mover: Rachel

Secunder: Abdullah

Clarisse: Will this actually cost \$890.44?

Katie: I'd like to have the money available (new lighting, mannequin).

Awn: We can't reallocate anyway.

Brian: What about the trophies?

Katie: We move the trophies to back counter for now until we find places to put it. Maybe to POETs?

Result: Motion passes.

10. Board Members should not be Board Secretaries

Motion: Board members should not be Board secretaries.

Mover: Rachel Malevich

Secunder: Abdullah Barakat

Rachel: I've written it as Board Members to include VP OF and Business Manager, as they also need to be active members. I think it's a smart move. Current Board Members did not like being secretary while also taking an active role.

Result: Abstain (Awn), Motion passes.

11. Adjournment

Motion: Adjourn the February Board Meeting

Mover: Sarah Martin

Seconded: Ian Holstead

Result: Meeting adjourns at 7:57pm.

12. Appendix

New Nanotechnology Engineering Student Society underway

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 2017

Students from Waterloo's Nanotechnology Engineering program will soon have a new student society to unify its cohorts and graduating classes and represent their concerns within the University's larger engineering community. The Nanotechnology Engineering Student Society (NESS) aims to foster an alumni network, create an official forum for program-specific concerns, and organize and host outreach events for the program's students and faculty.

NESS is a sub-society of the Engineering Society (EngSoc) that will serve Nanotechnology Engineering students specifically. It will give voice to one of the most unique engineering programs in Canada, helping to address pressing, cohort-wide concerns more cohesively than can be done using the current class representative system.

This initiative is supported by the NE administration, including Program Director Shirley Tang and Associate Director Ariel Chan. NESS governing documents will be reviewed and confirmed at the EngSoc Joint Annual General Meeting in late June.

Meanwhile, co-founders Alicia Veilleux, Austin Boucinha, Jatin Patil and Mayuran Saravanapavanantham encourage interested NE students to help build the society. There are many ways to get involved:

- Volunteers – Get involved early and help shape the future of this new society.
- Executive Positions – Stay tuned for information about a formal application process that will be held in anticipation of an election.
- Designers – NESS needs a logo. A competition is underway and submissions are due by January 30, 2017.

For more information about NESS, including any of these volunteer positions, please contact Jatin Patil via jjpatil@uwaterloo.ca.

This article is from: <https://uwaterloo.ca/nanotechnology/news/new-nanotechnology-engineering-student-society-underway>