
ENGSOC JANUARY BOARD MEETING

January 29th, 2017

Chair: Benjamin Beelen

Secretary: Sarah Martin

Attendance:

Present and Voting: Abdullah Barakat, Rachel Malevich, Awn Duqoum, Jeff Gulbranson, Brian Howe, Steven Jia, Ian Holstead, Sarah Martin, Megan Town

Present: Katie Arnold

Absent: Clarisse Schneider

1.0 WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

Time: 4:31 pm

Quorum established: 9 of 10 voting members are present and voting

2.0 APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER MINUTES

Motion: To approve the minutes from the last board meeting dated November 23rd, 2016

Mover: Abdullah Barakat

Second: Brian Howe

Result: Motion Passes

3.0 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion: To approve the January 23rd agenda

Mover: Rachel Malevich

Second: Abdullah Barakat

- BB: The reason we have one motion before the board procedures review is because the outcome of the motion affects the procedure document

Result: Motion Passes

4.0 SPENDING UPDATE

Speaking: Katie Arnold

- Go to the actuals document. You're looking for Actuals 2016-2017. The other documents support this one
- We don't have much in actuals yet because it's only four weeks into the term but things are basically as Mary predicted
- Rigidware and Novelties revenue are as predicted. Not making much because lack of advertising
- Yearbook expenses are a little bit weird. Usually we are invoiced throughout the term, but this time the invoice came in all at once. It will balance itself out throughout the year
- The other odd item is because we sent students to OEC this year as usual. The dean usually pays for this, but we needed money sooner than anticipated this year. We paid for OEC to be reimbursed by the dean later on

5.0 WHAT DO WE STAND FOR?

Motion: What Do We Stand For?

Mover: Steven Jia

Second: Rachel Malevich

Mover Comments: I think this is something board should be taking responsibility for. By passing this we would ensure that the document of stances is kept up to date and publicized to the student body. Adelle was working on this during her term, this will ensure that the document is maintained, up to date, and reflective of what the students want.

- RM: The document of stances does exist, it's just awaiting upload to the website. I'll email it to you all if you'd like to look at it
- RM: I think it's a great idea because the document of stances influences the executive's goals so keeping it up to date would be beneficial
- SJ: There are already several mental health stances, and it is my opinion that if there are too many stances the document can become too crowded and noisy. This would give board the ability to cut down or combine the stances
- IH: I would agree with that, but does that mean that as board we would be able to throw out stances entirely?
- AB: It would go through the on-term president, and be brought to council who would have to approve the change
- RM: I'm not going to read them now, they will be brought up next meeting
- JG: That's fine, the content of the stances shouldn't impact whether or not we pass this

Result: Motion Passes

6.0 REVIEW BOARD OF DIRECTORS PROCEDURE DOCUMENTS

- Keep in mind that part of this document was just changed
- MT: Can someone fix the error bookmark cannot be defined
- RM: I'll add that to the list of things to be changed
- SJ: Are Jeff's changes pertaining to board's role in moderating or arbitrating executive disputes going to be added?
- JG: My thinking is that it doesn't need to be brought up yet because it needs to be passed on both A and B Soc and that can't happen until later on
- SJ: Have you revised it since we last met?
- JG: Yes, there were a couple people who wanted to talk to me about small changes.
- SJ: Can you send it out? I kind of want to read it
- JG: Yes
- BH: Could it go up on a google doc to be shared with all of us?
- RM: Absolutely
- The document begins with formalities, which are at the top of all of our governing documents
- Roles define what each of us does
- RM: Would like to add more information about the secretary. It's kind of up in the air and I don't like that. I would like to have it outlined under the role of president that the president must select a secretary
- JG: What's the difference?

- RM: It's not clear under the role of president that they need to find or appoint a secretary. If it's the role of the president, it should also be listed under the president
- JG: I don't like the president wording very much because some of it only applies to the on-term president. The wording in general needs fixing to reflect that there are two presidents and that they have different responsibilities
- RM: I'm thinking about having two sections, one each for the on term and off term president within section D
- AB: That would avoid confusion about whose responsibility it is between the two presidents
- RM: Add into section one that the responsibility of the on-term president is to find a secretary. Many people on this board were not keen on being secretary because it's hard to contribute while taking minutes
- MT: Can confirm
- RM: I think that we should have an external secretary consistently
- SM: In the summer I was the council and board secretary but I didn't sit on board yet
- MT: It could be added to the role of council secretary so that one person was responsible for both
- JG: That change might make it harder to select a council secretary
- AB: Also because board can call meetings whenever they like, it would be an uncertain time commitment that some people might not be willing to commit to
- RM: Sarah is my council secretary, and this change would make it so that she couldn't do that
- AD: Probably good idea for the president to ask the council secretary if they would be interested
- RM: President should find someone whether or not that person is the council secretary
- AD: Asking the council secretary is a good place to start looking
- AB: I was planning to ask Thomas a little bit closer to the summer term
- RM: I'll bring this up again next meeting with changes to be approved
- Meetings, schedules and agenda gives information about calling meetings, call for agenda items, etc.
- AB: The document says off-term VP Finance, should now read off-term VP Operations and Finance
- Appointment is about selecting a chair and secretary
- RM: Finding a secretary should still run through this process. I have a couple people in mind for the role, once I ask them, we can run through the process to select one
- AB: Why is it the off-term president responsible for appointing the chair?
- JG: They are the on-term society in the fall term, and are on-term for two of board's terms
- RM: It makes sense to have chair on same society as president, or at least available for two of the three terms

7.0 ARE THEY ONE OF US?

- SJ: This is something the ASoc exec have already been discussing. We're seeing several programs starting to create their own societies. If they get to a point where they're running their own events and services I want opinions on how EngSoc should handle that. For instance, at Queens, EngSoc controls the budget and then delegates running events to the other societies
- JG: To be clear, CESS and CEGS both already run events
- SJ: I don't have a specific metric in mind, but if all the programs had their own society how would we want to handle that?

- RM: I contacted McMaster since they've had department societies for a while. All of the sub-societies run events independently but receive funding from their EngSoc. To receive funding they need to send a representative to council to advocate for why they should get money
- MT: Where do the societies currently get money?
- RM: Fundraising or independent
- JG: The new Nano society will also be getting department funding
- AB: The Nano society recently got a post on the website stating that they were a sub-society of EngSoc which is not true. Should we reach out to them about this misinformation?
- BH: They also explicitly say that they are informed to address things that EngSoc can't deal with
- AD: I think we should be pushing for them to be part of us as a sub society but I wouldn't do that yet. The Tron department tried to start their own society in the fall because they feel that they aren't being represented enough
- RM: Right now we also have a lot of overlap in the services we provide. It might be in our best interest to be friends with them or at least work with them. For example, resume critiques
- BH: Looking at the end result, if they are part of EngSoc, we give them money as a budget line item. If not they apply to us as a part of sponsorship. In SciSoc, each department has its own society and it doesn't work well for them. So much of SciSoc's funding goes into funding smaller groups that they can't do much themselves, then the smaller groups don't have enough money to host bigger events or events with more people. I think we should be discouraging these program societies from forming.
- AB: With the establishment of the sub-societies it works out well because people are more inclined to go to the society for their own program, so we'd get more people But also there's the risk of spreading ourselves too thin and having nobody working on the society as a whole
- AD: I agree that they should be approaching EngSoc for services similar to those we already run. On the other hand, it doesn't make sense for EngSoc to host things like program parties
- BH: We kind of already do support them by giving them use of society spaces
- AD: There are also things that don't happen on campus
- BH: Things off campus aren't affiliated with any of the societies. I think services like resume critiques should just be about classes approaching us to run events the events they want to run
- RM: Back when you said that SciSoc has issues logistically, every other faculty society has the same problem and they're trying to work it out with FEDS. They have issues with so many events happening at the same time and the communication associated with having sub-societies is a big task to take on
- JG: Math does it well. Computer science club falls under MathSoc but they charge a membership fee. Because they overlap less and take care of their own funding they do better
- KA: If we affiliate ourselves with these societies it's not like we have to put them in the budget. We're affiliated with Iron Warrior but they no longer get money from us. You also mentioned discouraging these societies, but some design teams rely on their existence. For example, Concrete Canoe relies on CEGS to represent them to the American Civil Society. I get what you're saying because we already offer a lot of services and it's unfortunate that there is overlap in this, but some student teams need these societies to exist
- JG: If we don't give them money, what's different than what we're doing now? We already offer them resources like space.
- RM: The biggest thing would be to initiate the communication because we don't really talk to them about what they're doing. Getting a plan would help us to determine where to go from here. One option would be an independent but affiliated society
- BH: Society Relations Commissioner? One issue we had in the past was that Systems Coffee House was the day before ours. Being able to coordinate these events would be preferable

- IH: I'm wondering about events that societies run, but also trying to promote more involvement. Would having a representative from the department help classes to run events? I'm thinking of a person that has knowledge of running events and how to work with the department. They could be a good resource for classes in their program. I'm not super in favour of funding these program societies because many programs don't have them
- AD: Isn't that what class reps are supposed to do?
- IH: I think that would be stepping it up a bit more for a class rep. As a rep I don't think I could super easily come to the Exec to say that I want to run an event. I think it needs to be a bit more elevated a role. If I had to run events to be on council that would be a red flag for me
- RM: How about a group chaired by a commissioner with each society president or a representative. This would address all of the concerns under one person
- BH: I think Ian has good points. With the current representative structure, it's hard to run an event for a group larger than just your class.
- JG: Why is that hard?
- BH: It's hard to approach upper year reps who would be able to help you get more people from their classes
- AD: You might not know who they are
- JG: Would having a designated representative be more approachable?
- BH: CRC thought so
- IH: That's where this idea came from. This idea is adding additional responsibilities on top of someone's role, rather than removing responsibility from others
- SJ: I like Rachel's idea about a group run by a commissioner. The way I see this happening is that a lot of programs start to create their own societies. I don't think we should be actively discouraging societies from forming because of the drama it would rewrite. I'd be surprised if these societies didn't start coming to us for funding. At that point we would have to consider changing council's structure. It seems like this group would start replacing council which would be a drastic change. We may require a referendum on funding, but I think that's still way in the future
- AB: If we were to have the program societies fall under EngSoc, do you think that would change the structure of council?
- AD: They shouldn't.
- IH: What is COSP?
- RM: Committee of society presidents
- IH: What does this have to do with changing council?
- AB: Would they then have a vote on behalf of their program's students as well?
- SJ: I envisioned it that each program has its own society with their own rep which would then form council, effectively removing council. Kind of like CRC
- MT: I think that people involved in their department societies may not be involved with EngSoc. I think that not opposing them, instituting a commissioner for communication, and allowing them to come to sponsorship for money would be a good way to go for a while
- RM: The way McMaster does it is they don't have an explicit representative from each program society, the society just needs to send someone to council.
- MT: Representatives from program societies can already come to council if they want
- KA: My point is that these societies can come anyways and talk, everyone has speaking rights. We don't need changes to involve them until each program has their own society. I don't think we should include these three societies because so many programs don't have societies
- BH: If we do affiliate ourselves with these societies, we don't need to change council structure but the role of VP SL might change. For instance, events like resume critiques or first year mentorship

might be better handled by their own program societies. This seems like a good Review Committee topic

- Brian Howe leaves the meeting; quorum remains at 8 of 10 voting members present
- MT: Should we be bringing this to council?
- AD: Not yet
- BB: Some class reps have already incorrectly said that CEGS is a sub-society of EngSoc
- AB: Bringing this discussion to council right now would only make it more chaotic. Until we've lined up our ducks more we should wait to take this to council
- AD: There's only 8 of us here and this is already a long discussion. Before we get all the policy done, if we think they should maintain a friendly working relationship, we should send a welcoming message to these societies with the goal of opening communication. Once we know a little bit more about their long term plan we can bring the discussion back here
- IH: What's the plan for solving this?
- RM: I can send a welcoming message and see how they're feeling about relations. A meeting might actually be more effective, we'll see
- JG: Steven, did you just bring this discussion forward or did someone approach you?
- SJ: I just brought it up because Nano just created a society and we don't yet know how we want to handle this
- JG: CEGS and CESS have both been around for a while and they haven't approached us yet. I think this discussion might be a bit preemptive
- AD: Nano has said they're coming to JAGM anyways to bring it up
- AB: The Nano society seems to consider themselves a sub-society already, so it would be good for us to have an idea of how we want to move forwards with things
- JG: If we decide on something, we still won't have a united stance as EngSoc until the first council of next term. At this point nothing can be decided for another few months
- RM: I think it's still a good idea to figure out what they think they are, what plans they have, and what relationship they want to have with us
- JG: More info would be good, but board can't really decide anything
- RM: I'll reach out and get more info before next board

8.0 CONSISTENCY IS MORE EFFECTIVE... PLUS WE NEED SOMETHING TO DO

Motion: Consistency is More Effective... Plus We Need Something to Do

Mover: Steven Jia

Second: Abdullah Barakat

Mover Comments: I know that this is probably going to be a long and maybe controversial discussion. I want Working Groups (WG) to be a thing for board. I am willing to split this motion and discuss separately forming WGs and forming this specific WG. I have already spoken to Pat and Andrew, and they are for the spirit of this motion. So far, they seem to be on the same page but this may not always be the case. Having a WG to collect data from the students would allow the VPAs to better advocate on our behalf using data. Pat and Andrew did raise some concerns about logistics of this motion.

They wanted to know why three people on the WG? I think an odd number is better for getting consensus and one rep from each society makes sense. Since on board we only have 10 people with 2 presidents that makes the people to choose from only 8. Why did I select the duration? I'm willing to change that and upon reflection it might be better to end their term when our term as board ends. This would have presentations at both JAGM and the July board meeting.

The rest of the motion seems self-explanatory. Currently CFES has established an advocacy working group, and soon they'll be reaching out to member schools to provide data to the national executive and the CEAB. By establishing this working group, we can help them out locally, allowing them to better represent our students. ESSCO is following a similar structure to the CFES.

- RM: Going back to the CFES points, my biggest concern is that the group is run out of board. The way that CFES runs it, their BOD don't sit on the WG. The VPA runs the WG, but the BOD don't sit on it. That's just something to consider. On the CFES, positions are filled by nominations and voting. Also, some or all of board may not be passionate about this particular issue. Having a working group controlled and run totally out of board might not be in our best interest.
- JG: I don't think this is something board should be doing; board is too small for this. The content of the motion is basically just saying that VPAs should work together to do their job. They've done surveys in the past; as long as the two VPAs are collaborating that's enough
- RM: The benefit of having a working group would be to take some of the grunt work off of the VPAs and giving it to a group that can focus on getting info
- JG: I would argue that this is their job. As an ex-VP Ed, this is one of their responsibilities. The role should be about advocating for the students. If this goes to JAGM, we could form a committee to do this, but it shouldn't come out of board
- IH: I was a little confused about why we'd want to create a working group at all. I think we should run surveys, but I don't think that offloading the work will help. I don't see faculty welcoming more students to talk to them so I don't see the point really
- SJ: The reason I wanted working groups through board, is that we are among not many students who are highly engaged and care for the society. I mentioned earlier that we might want to establish working groups in the future for other topics even if board doesn't like this topic
- SJ: If we do go the JAGM route to form a committee, then we have to wait to JAGM 2018 for results. I think the timeline might be too long. One of the major reasons for the working group is that grunt work being done by VPAs might not be the best use of their time
- AD: I think this is a great idea. And I think working groups are good but board isn't the place. We are passionate but we also will be at JAGM and council if it goes there to be established
- IH: I would argue that the VPA would better spend their time doing research and gathering data rather than running events. I don't agree that research is a bad use of their time
- AD: Why are we discussing this motion at all? I don't think board needs to tell VPA what to do
- SJ: I get what Ian and Jeff are saying, but I don't see why they can't have a group supporting them. I think they should spend their time using the data to advocate on our behalf
- JG: In my experience, the VPA role comes and goes in spurts. If they're just waiting for data, they have a lot of time. There's nothing in here we need to be discussing. They can already create this group without us if they want to. It feels weird to force this onto them; this is their job
- RM: I would agree with that. If VPAs want a working group, that doesn't need to be overseen by board, it should be overseen by executive. If they want one they could open it as a directorship
- JG: That's generally the route it goes.
- RM: I'm totally in favour of using working groups but they don't need to go through board. It could go through council, board doesn't need to handle this

Motion: Table the Motion Indefinitely

Mover: Abdullah Barakat

Secunder: Ian Holstead

Result: Motion Passes

Result: Tabled Indefinitely

9.0 WEBSITE WEBSITE WEBSITE

Motion: Website Webstie Website

Mover: Rachel Malevich

Secunder: Abdullah Barakat

Mover Comments: Akshay has been making upgrades like new tabs, better search bar, etc. In the past, we have used part of our discretionary to pay for this. Moving forwards, having it under the general budget would be good because it benefits both societies

- Awn Duqoum steps out because of a conflict of interest; quorum remains at 7 of 10 voting members present
- SJ: Do I need to leave too?
- SM: We don't have quorum if you leave
- RM: It's not really a conflict of interest because you only oversee the website directors
- AB: Some features are also recurring costs and this will ensure that there is money for these
- IH: Board can give people money for things?
- RM: We control the general budget, so we can add it as a line item there rather than approving it as a directorship each term
- JG: Why are we going from \$200 to allocating \$600? I'm hesitant to give them what seems like a blank cheque. I'd rather that their requests get approved case by case
- RM: The \$200 figure was in one term, and upgrades happened only in that term
- JG: Can we clarify that in the motion?
- RM: It's not technically wrong, just confusingly worded
- AB: To address Jeff's concern, everything that goes on the site has to be approved by both presidents, so it's not really a blank cheque. It's better to have it as a line item in the budget as it's more transparent than listing it under the others section
- SJ: To Jeff's concern that spending is intermittent, the incoming ASoc directors do have plans to upgrade the website. There are changes that are going to happen and it would be good for them to have funding
- KA: I'd like to suggest that instead of the societies paying 50/50 they pay \$200 per term that they're on term
- AB: At the beginning of the term, we get invoices from Mary on the general account, so I don't see splitting the payment by on term society being a problem
- Quorum lost at 5:51 pm. Quorum reestablished at 5:53 pm
- AB: friendly amendment to make one BIRT reading "each term the on-term society shall pay \$200 into the general account to be allocated towards website improvements"
- JG: We review general spending anyway, so if we see something sketchy on the budget we can ask them about it after the fact

Result: Motion Passes

- Awn Duqoum returns to the meeting; quorum remains at 8 of 10 voting members present

10.0 ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Adjourn the January Board Meeting

Mover: Sarah Martin

Secunder: Jeff Gulbranson

Result: Motion Passes. Meeting adjourned at 5:56 pm.