

Board of Directors May 2017 Meeting

Date: Monday, May 29th 2017

Location: Orifice

Chair: Rachael Schachtler

Secretary: Thomas Dedinsky

Attendance:

Awn Duquom, Steven Jia, Jeff Gulbranson, Megan Town, Abdullah Barakat, Rachel Malevich, Ian Holstead, Brian Howe, Clarisse Schneider

(Ex-officio: Michael Beauchemin)

1.0 Call to Order:

Time: 7:03 pm

Quorum established with 9/10 members.

2.0 Approval of Minutes:

Motion:	Approval of Minutes (March 2017)
Result:	Motion Postponed Until Next Meeting

3.0 Approval of Agenda:

Brian wants the mic trouble noted in the minutes. It caused a sizable delay.

Motion:	Approval of May 2017 Agenda
Mover:	Awn Duquom
Second:	Abdullah Barakat
Amendments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Budget and Actuals” will be added as item 4.0 • “We’re hosting again?! (and again...)” will be moved to item 5.0, directly before Sub-Societies
Result:	Motion Passes

4.0 Budget and Actuals

Presenting: Michael Beauchemin

- The actuals show what we have spent this term.
- Something slightly out of the ordinary is the high amount in purchases already, although this is due to end of year spending from the previous fiscal year done a bit late. This was to be expected.
- Q: Why is the budget for our supplies 10 times higher?
- A: Due to the start of the fiscal year, since we time many purchases with this.
- Q: What is happening with ECIF?

- A: Due to some issues with the university budget, Mary cannot do any purchasing through the university. She doesn't have proper account number/permissions at the moment and is working to fix this with the Dean's office. Currently, if we want to purchase an item like benches, FEDS will have to purchase it on our behalf.
- Q: So how do people buy stuff?
- A: Students can purchase the items themselves be reimbursed. The issues Mary is having is part of a university wide problem, for clarification.
- Q: Why is RidgidWare making so little money?
- A: We are currently understaffed, being open only for one hour a day. We are going to be starting a lot of things that will increase our revenue soon.
- Q: Do we only have one employee for RidgidWare?
- A: Two actually.
- Sections 3 and 4 is just to show that Mary has this financial information in her accounting software.
- Q: For the Iron Warrior, in terms of the budget listed, do we give them money or manage their money?
- A: We manage their money. It used to be on a separate account before it was moved to the general account some time ago.

5.0 We're hosting again?! (and again...)

Title:	We're hosting again?! (and again...)
Mover:	Steven Jia
Secunder:	Brian Howe
Spirit:	To require that all conference and engineering competition bids where the Engineering Society will be held accountable for finances in the event of a deficit be vetted by the Board of Directors prior to their presentation to an external organization
WHEREAS	The Society should ensure that individuals intending to place a conference or engineering competition bid with external organizations like ESSCO and the CFES are prepared with the necessary research, support, and approval prior to bidding
AND WHEREAS	Waterloo's unique situation of having two Societies means it has twice the bidding responsibilities of a regular one-society engineering school
AND WHEREAS	Hosting a conference or engineering competition is a large financial and resource-intensive undertaking that likely affects both Societies
AND WHEREAS	The Society should not be expected to be financially accountable for conferences or competitions that it does not expressly approve
BIRT:	The Board of Directors Procedures be amended to read: <u>Chapter II: Roles</u> <u>Section C: Directors</u> 1. Directors will be responsible for the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Attending Board Meetings b. Participating in on-line ballots c. Approving or rejecting a conference or competition bid using the process defined in Chapter V d. Representing general members of matters of the Board

Chapter V: Conference and Competition Bids

Section A: Scope

1. "Conference" shall refer to any conference of an external organization of which A-Society or B-Society is a member school with conference bidding responsibilities.
2. "Competition" shall refer to any competition of an external organization of which A-Society or B-Society is a member school with competition bidding responsibilities.
3. "Bid" shall refer to the action of entering A-Society or B-Society into consideration for hosting a future conference or competition.
4. A-Society members and B-Society members may only place a conference or competition bid on behalf of their respective Societies.

Section B: Approval Process

1. The A-Society or B-Society member(s) intending to place a conference or competition bid shall be invited to deliver a presentation to Board Members at the next available Board meeting.
2. The presentation shall include:
 - a. A preliminary budget
 - b. A list of potential sponsors
 - c. Potential accommodation and venue options, and their associated costs
 - d. Evidence of support from the Faculty of Engineering or intent to obtain support should Board approve the bid
 - e. A preliminary list of organizing team members
3. The duration of the presentation shall follow the guidelines of the external organization to which the bid is being placed.
4. The duration of the question and answer period following the presentation shall follow the guidelines of the external organization to which the bid is being placed.
5. If the organizing committee intends to ask the Society for financial support in the event that the conference incurs a deficit, the bid must be approved by a resolution of Board.

Section C: Exceptions

1. If both A-Society members and B-Society members intend to place a bid for the same conference or competition and have prepared similar presentations, they may deliver a joint presentation to Board and have their bids be treated as one bid with respect to Section B.
2. The requirements listed in Section B except B.5 may be waived and approval may be automatically granted by a resolution of Board.

Section D: Society Support

1. If a conference or competition bid is approved, the President shall provide a letter of support to the bidding member within two(2) weeks upon the member's request.
2. The Society shall not officially support a conference or competition bid that is rejected by Board.
 - a. The President shall not provide a letter of support.

	<p>b. The Society shall not be held accountable for the conference or competition's finances in the event of a deficit.</p> <p><u>Chapter VI: Amendments</u></p>
Comments:	<p>Presenting: Steven Jia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the March Board of Directors meeting, Steven sent out feedback link. • This situation is only applicable to instances when we're accountable for conference finances. People will have more grounds to ask for support now that we've approved it. • This also changes the wording to be more general regarding the presentation period, matching it up with organization requirements. • Q: Can we have 10 minutes to read this, as you just sent the full version of the motion? • A: You can have two. • Q: Where is the amendment regarding the presentation period? • A: In Section B, specifically points 3 and 4. • Q: If we're following the guidelines, it shouldn't be a bad thing if we want to ask more questions and there's a cap, right? • A: This point wasn't mentioned before, I'm okay cleaning it up. • Point 4 can read "Following the presentation period, there will be a question or answer period". Megan mentioned this as a friendly motion, so no formal amendment took place at this time.
Result:	Motion Passes

6.0 Sub-Societies

Presenting: Abdullah Barakat

- A lot of last term involved planning and interaction based discussion regarding sub-societies. We decided we would hire a sub-society commissioner and we did.
- Abdullah is setting up meetings with all of the different sub-societies over the coming weeks, in order to kick-start the commissioner's relationship with our sub-societies.
- Is there anything that people want from the sub-societies?
- Q: Why are you the one arranging these meetings, isn't that the commissioner's job?
- A: I just want to set up the meeting, and then let the commissioner take over.
- Q: What has the commissioner done so far?
- A: Nothing.
- Q: Are you doing what the B-Soc President did last term with the B-Societies?
- A: We wanted to see what the societies and the board wanted in order to get the ball rolling.
- D: Going back to previous discussions would be helpful (i.e. topics have already been discussed, in terms of our calendar and academic support). Coming to us with bullet points for the next meeting would be good so we don't have repeat discussion. Even in regards to the first point, that was discussed in meeting 2 last term.

- Q: Can you go through the list of things you have noted in terms of the sub-society commissioner?
- A: Specifically the coordination of calendars, what they expect in terms of finances, their plan for academic support, and their role as a liaison between our directors and the societies.
- D: For systems design engineering, you won't get the same communication as there is poor planning for resume critiques, coffee house, etc.

Presenting: Steven

- Can the sub-society commissioner reach out to all of the sub-societies not currently represented by EngSoc? Just ask, it's not a big deal if they don't want to be represented.
- Q: Who would we talk to? Past representatives? What are you offering them?
- A: Basically "Hey, other programs has their own sub-societies, EngSoc will partner with some of them, do you want to partner?"
- D: Please don't tell people, as they might be encouraged to go and make their own sub-societies. But I do support reaching out to them.
- Q: If we don't have a sub-society for every discipline, we don't really have anything to offer them.
- Why do we have a sub-society commissioner? We don't want to propose having more sub-societies though.
- D: This is going to communicate the sub-societies to everyone in a better matter. We're not worried about fairness, it's not like we're saying "screw ECE, they don't have a sub-society".
- D: What might be a good compromise would be to give classes the ability to advertise their events through EngSoc. Programs won't have the motivation to make new societies but the ones that exist it won't harm them.
- Q: Whose portfolio is advertising?
- A: The marketing team. However, their size varies term to terms, so we would need more man power if we want them to advertise through EngSoc.
- D: The way to approach it might be to not do it for them, but give them the avenues to promote themselves.
- Q: Only appropriate events will be advertised, and letting them put their events on the mailing list would probably be relatively trivial.
- I don't know if mailing list is trivial. We've been actively trying to minimize it, adding more stuff will make it more cluttered.
- Q: A lot of what B-Soc was looking at was minimizing our advertising output. We only has one advertising director, as we really struggle in getting them. It's a lot of weight to put on the small advertising team. If we are advertising sub-societies, what are we cutting?
- Q: We already hired a commissioner: what were they told they would do?

Presenting: No one in particular, people who are answering will generally be noted

- A: (Abdullah) They would be working with the president on being in contact with sub-societies once the meeting is in place and work with them and the board on a portfolio.
- Q: How much interest for that position?
- A: (Abdullah) There were two applications. The person who got it, and Awn.

- Q: If it's super undefined, what have they suggested?
- A: (Abdullah) Nothing much to be honest. She hasn't offered much in meetings since nothing has really happened yet.
- Q: If we're giving limited advertising powers, why do we need a separate commissioner? Advertising can handle this.
- Straw poll: Not many people liked the advertising through EngSoc of sub-societies
- A: (Awn) We felt we needed to do this in order for the sub-societies to be taken seriously by the faculty since EngSoc can speak on their behalf.
- Q: We have a VP Academic and a Society president. Why do we need a middle man? Why can't they talk directly?
- A: (Rachel) The commissioner would work with calendar to avoid conflicts and get faculties to take them seriously. We wouldn't be affiliated with them, only supported by.
- Q: Can the presidents of the sub-societies do inter-sub-society communication instead over matters like the calendar?
- A: (Rachel) They don't talk already, they most likely wouldn't as effectively without this method.
- Q: Why do we have a sub-society commissioner? Keep in mind that this is a trial, but we're needing to try hard to think of responsibilities for them. We probably don't need this role in general as it can be filled by other fields.
- A: (Abdullah) I don't think there's a shortage of things. (i.e. Nano already put stuff about our relationship without even talking to us). Coordinating outward facing media, acting as a liaison, etc. We need a point of contact where they can reach us at, like a secretary. We can't rely on outside bodies knowing who to contact.
- We may have jumped the gun by hiring a commissioner without thinking it fully through.
- D: The idea was to offer a service of sorts. People say the presidents can talk to each other, but they don't. We can't come up a reason why the commissioner should exist because we haven't started the meeting, since we don't know the problems since they are so isolated from us.
- D: Abdullah can set up the meeting and they can talk about the problems at the meeting before we talk about it here.
- Q: A good kind of parallel to this is council presidents. What sort of stuff would you talk about at meetings? Would you talk about it anything or do the meetings aid that?
- A: (Abdullah) Currently it's people bringing forward problems that their societies have and the presidents finding a solution (since they are part of a bigger society). If there is something that could benefit all societies, however, they can bring it up at the meetings. This is still a new thing and maybe with this standard we could increase our communication in general (i.e. have more sub-societies group meetings)
- Q: Once this is developed, can this take some load off of the president?
- A: (Abdullah) For sure, but since this is in trial at the moment I want to be involved/
- We'll talk more about this after that meeting has happened.

7.0 Mo' Money, Mo' Consistency

Title:	Mo' Money, Mo' Consistency
--------	----------------------------

Mover:	President 'A'
Seconded:	Steven Jia
Spirit:	To allow both the A-Society and B-Society VPs Finance to be ex-officio members on the Board of Directors at all times
WHEREAS	Board has been increasing its scope within the past year
AND WHEREAS	A lot of the discussion has been related to the finances of the Society
AND WHEREAS	Having both VPs Finance on Board would mean more consistency within Board, as well as the two Societies being represented equally on matters pertaining to finances
AND WHEREAS	Having one of the VPs Finance not sit on Board for the term could lead to a loss in communication on financial matters
BIRT:	Both the VPs Finance of their respective Societies be allowed to attend all Board meetings as ex-officio members
BIFRT:	The Board Procedures Document be amended to reflect this change
BIFFRT:	A proposed amendment to the Constitution be put forward to reflect this change
Comments:	<p>Presenting: Abdullah</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last term there were a few discussion points, like the website being an item on the general account, that VP finance pays into every term. Having both VP finances being at the meeting would be good so both societies would be represented fairly. The on term VP finance would still bring forward the actuals. • D: The spirit of this is good, as Michael wasn't aware of some things that if he was at the previous board meetings he would have. It would be good to have the exact wording of how we'll change the documents (the constitution and the board procedures document). • A: Since JAGM is less than a month away, it has already been submitted, but basically it was that instead of on-term VP it would be both VPs. • D: This could be changed to a discussion as this doesn't have the exact wording, we can have the discussion now and have the wording for next meeting. • Q: Are we approving the JAGM agenda this meeting? • A: No, as the motions have to be in 14 days ahead of time, but the agenda 10 days ahead of time. • D: Awn will send it out and if anyone has extra concerns we can have an emergency meeting. • D: This will increase the number of speaking members on the board, and I'm worried that this won't benefit us in relation to the fact that we're bringing on more and more members. • D: This can be amended so that they can only listen and not speak so they don't have much influence. We can also ban executive from being on board. • D: I'm against bringing on someone to the board and only having them be listeners, since they can't voice their concerns and are just there purely for training. It's a waste of time for them. • D: In terms of banning executives, you can run to be board before being executive, so what would happen there? There's too much extra work.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D: I'm not for banning executives from board. But in terms of finance, the VP won't having much influence and will be another ear that we may not want. • A: Everything we talk about is finances, since the board overseas the finances of the society, so having both societies' finances represented would be better for discussion. It's been especially relevant this semester due to the influx of funds-related initiatives. • D: Some of the stuff that the board discusses isn't finance related, and some wouldn't feel comfortable maybe if the off-term VP finance is attending as some info shouldn't be discussed in that manner. • D: In terms of whether we're comfortable with the VP finance; we're talking to both over the course of the year either way. • Q: The board should be driving these decisions; we can seek opinions from one of the VPs but have we ever needed both in the past? • A: No, but it's more so for consistency. Again, the website concern. • Q: Could we solve this problem with better transitions? It feels weird to have them come to extra meetings to get them up to speed. • D: Maybe they should only come to meetings that they are relevant to. • <i>STEVEN JIA LEFT AT THIS POINT</i> • Q: If our minutes are public, why can't the VP Finance just read them? • A: We could do a better job in communication, but they are on the board of directors email list. I think we're not keeping them up to speed; they have the means to get themselves up to speed but they aren't aware. And there hasn't been a situation where both have been needed. • D: If we have the advance notice whether or not they should come, we can have the advance notice to tell the on term to prepare stuff. • Q: Should we withdraw this motion? • A: We can strawpoll. • Q: Beforehand, is there anything stopping us for inviting them for specific meetings? • A: No • Strawpoll: Mainly down-voting, so we won't go through with this motion. • Q: Shouldn't we vote on whether this is removed from the JAGEM agenda now? • A: Well the agenda isn't made. There's nothing to vote on. • Q: The motion exists though. • A: But we can't. We'll just wait until next time.
Result:	No Vote

8.0 Engineering Society Fee Increase

Title:	Engineering Society Fee Increase
Mover:	President 'A'
Secunder:	Awn Duquom
Spirit:	To increase the Engineering Society Fee as per inflation
WHEREAS	Over the 2016 calendar year, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) increased by 1.4%

AND WHEREAS	The Engineering Society fee should be increased by CPI to allow for equal buying power from year to year
BIRT:	Board approve a fee increase by approximately 1.4% by a special resolution
BIFRT:	A motion be presented at the Joint Annual General Meeting to increase the Engineering Society fee by 25 cents from \$15.90 to \$16.15
	Presenting: Abdullah Barakat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per every year, we need to increase it to have the same buying power. The dollar inflated by 1.4%, that it increases by 1.4%. We need a special resolution of the board in order to increase the fee. • Q: Was this coincidence that it came to \$16.15? • A: No, it rounded up for refund purposes.
Result:	Motion Passes

9.0 Adjournment

Time: 8:07pm

Motion:	Adjourn May 2017 Meeting
Mover:	Ian Holstead
Secunder:	Megan Town
Result:	Motion Passes