**Meeting Agenda - Sixth Meeting of the Board**

**Date: March 24th 2019**

**Location: University of Ottawa - SITE 5084**

**Attendance:**

Executive:

* Dean Ferenczy, *VP Internal (Present)*
* Marianne Lee, *VP External (Excused Called in 2:05, left 3)*
* Tae Kim, *VP Administration (Present)*
* Liam Maloney, *VP Communications (Excused)*
* Kimberley Paradis, *VP Philanthropic (Present)*
* Rukyya Badreldin, *VP Academic (Present, left at 12, came back at 12:25)*
* Charbel Choueifaty, *VP President (Present)*
* Travis Davies, *VP Services (Present)*
* Monique Labaky, *VP Finance (Absent, arrived 4:25)*
* Devon Barber, *VP Social (Present)*

Sub-association presidents:

* Heemel Saha, *IEEE (Present)*
* Iris Samputu, *ChESS (Absent)*
* Kivanc Yildiz, *MESS (Absent)*
* David Wen, *CSCE (Absent)*

Year Reps:

* First Year:
  + Olivier Lafleche (Civil), *Section A (Absent)*
  + Toby Easterbrook (Mechanical), *Section B (Absent)*
  + Tony Kim, *Section C excused (Absent)*
  + Kathleen (Katie) Newman, *Section D (proxied by Reese Wunsche)*
  + Cecilia Lou, *Section E (Absent)*
  + Leena Tran (Civil), *Section H (Present, leaves 1:14)*
  + Eda Su Biger, *Section A (F) (Present, Left 12:10)*
  + Liam Roche (Chemical), *Section B (F) (Present)*
* Chemical Engineering Representatives:
  + Lucas Taylor-Erichson, *2nd year (Proxied by Alizeh Rizvi)*
  + N/A, *3rd year*
  + N/A, *4th year*
* Computer Engineering Representatives:
  + Rafi Biouss, *2nd year (Present)*
  + N/A, *3rd year*
  + N/A, *4th year*
* Mechanical Engineering Representatives:
  + Piers Hancock, *2nd year (Excused)*
  + N/A, *3rd year*
  + N/A, *4th year*
* Civil Engineering Representatives:
  + Mary-Kate Jory, *2nd year (Present)*
  + Noah Andrea, *3rd year (Present)*
  + N/A, *4th year*
* Electrical Engineering Representatives:
  + John Zhao, *2nd year (Absent)*
  + N/A, *3rd year*
  + James Lim, *4th year (Present)*
* Software Engineering Representatives:
  + N/A, *2nd year*
  + N/A, *3rd year*
  + N/A, *4th year*
* Co-Op Representatives:
  + Anne Fagnan (Absent)
* French Representatives:
  + N/A, *2nd year*
  + N/A, *3rd year*
  + N/A, *4th year*

**Call to Order:**

1. **Adoption of the Agenda -   
   Motion**: Devon

**Second**:Noah  
**Discussion**:

* Isaac: you can only speak twice per point during constitution review
* Noah: you have two 1’s per topic?
* Isaac: yes

**Votes**:   
 Passes unanimously

1. **Updates**
   1. **Executive  
      Travis**

* All our patches have come in, long sleeved shirts are being designed/made
* We are 1 or two weeks from having these shirts

**Devon**:

* Staged isn’t happening because there were only 2 submissions
* Tickets for stag will be on sale by Monday
* Tae: will the VIP tickets get a drive home?
* Devon: yes

**Dean:**

* St.Patty’s day breakfast happened
* Paper Plane event is this saturday, there has been a lot of interest
* I am planning one last luncheon, before or during exams

**Tae**:

* We had the Apollo giveaway
* I’ve been out of the website recently, haven’t done a lot
* Was supposed to be an admin event but ieee didn’t have the supplies I was looking for

**Kim**

* Our donation for eng ball is just above 4k
* Candy grams will happen next week
* Prom dress drive continues to end of semester

**Charbel**

* Since the last meeting there was a roundtable with the UOSU that i missed, but they were discussing levies
* UOSU isn’t sure how many people will opt out, so they will have to lower the fee from $11 to $9 per students
* For any fed body that has their own fee, UOSU would not be providing the $9
* I told them we have EEF, and they were unsure, however now we will most likely still get the $9 because the faculty mostly controls EEF, we don’t
* I apologize to everyone for the situation that happened earlier this week, we tried to correct it the best we could (In regards to the event description for the plane competition)
* Liam: regarding the levies, how are we guaranteed any money and how is that negotiation process still going?  
  Charbel: we are waiting on their elections, so they can have a referendum regarding fees. As far as I know, they are planning on paying us fees for everyone, no matter who opts out or not. In the upcoming years they will be able to adjust accordingly. UOSU has money in their account from SFUO. They will be paying out of there to fed bodies for however many students the fed body has.
* Liam: their bank account is zero
* Charbel: this is what I was told by them. They are paying out until they get to zero.
* Heemel: are we going to have to refederate? Have you gotten a contract?
* Charbel: as far as I know we don’t have to
* Devon: we do have to
* Travis: I heard from the UOSU that we’re recieving no money whatsoever.
* Charbel: they can’t pay out levies for the summer. Guarenteed. Fall and Winter we don't know yet
* Liam: I was told 2 days ago that the ess is receiving $0 because of the EEF funding
* Charbel: They told me we should not be affected. Because it seems like we aren’t controlling the EEF money, we should still get levies
* Tae: how does this affect the upcoming 101 week
* Charbel: it shouldn’t affect it, because most revenue comes from kit sales. The only thing would be we don’t have money ahead of time, and have to recoup it after.
* Liam: how is the amount of money we receive from UOSU decided?
* Charbel: I can’t push for more unless we have a referendum. We need to see the trends of people opting out.
* Liam: the readjusting period is a year and a half
* Charbel: as fast as possible  
  1. **Sub-association  
     IEEE - Heemel**
* We had Pi Day, which was popular
* I won for who got pied the most
* We had wine and cheese the same day
* We had meet the exec, last day for nominations is tomorrow at 11:59
* Cookies and cram starts this week, we’re covering most courses for 1st and 2nd year elg seg and ceg
* Tae: for cookies and cram, can i come if I’m not in one of the courses
* Heemel: yes

**CHESS - Iris**  
**CSCE - David (Noah Andrea)**

* I don’t remember exactly when the event happened but we had Sustainability night. It went extremely well. Everyone should go next year. We also had an estimation event this past week. It had a good turnout.
* Concrete canoe casted their canoe, and it’s looking good
  1. **BoA  
       
     Ben King**
* There is a meeting to discuss transition
* Campaigning starts monday, make sure you go vote forever you would like
* Not much else because BoA members are not being informed

1. **Rep Elections  
   N/A**
2. **Constitution Review**

**Motion**: Travis: Omnibus the approval of the new constitution.

**Second**: Liam

**Discussion:**

* Travis:
* We changed the formatting of By-Law #1
* Dean: can we see this somewhere?
* Travis: there was an email sent to everyone
* Travis: we have added m to definitions. Officers means exec and managers. “Officers is now the new blanket term.
* In Corporate Deal, we have changed Admin to Internal
* Kim: the fact that you changed that and it depends on the other document
* Travis: they both conflict so we just have to change us
* Travis: keep in mind that they are all “new positions”, not necessarily tweaks of old ones
* Travis: everything is the same for the rest of section 1. Bylaws has a lot less changes than the other one
* Heemel: is this how we’re going to do the rest of this?
* Travis: we reformatted everything so we can’t really track changes well, because in the eyes of google docs everything is changed
* Devon: the constitution was in PDF so we had to change every bullet point. Everything has been changed so there is no feasible way to track the changes
* Kim: we’re supposed to produce amendments, and everything is one
* Isaac: you can change part of the amendments
* Heemel: did you ask anyone on previous committees on the document
* Travis: You should have come to the review
* Alizeh: You held two of them during reading week
* Travis:

**Motion**: Heemel: Table the constitution review and mandate the committee to highlight exactly what was changed.  
 Second: Kim

Discussion:

* Heemel: When we’re doing constitution review, we should be tracking the changes we are making, and then blaming people for not coming to constitution review when it’s at an inconvenient time. The way we’re doing it now, there is nothing highlighted.
* Travis: I feel like it’s important to get a new constitution out. We had 5 sessions, so there were times you could have prioritized it. There isn’t something that we controlled or were aware of until we were done. I see no problem with going through this side by side and picking out changes.
* Kim: Right now. Going through line by line is an issue that has been brought up before. You’re asking every bod member to have read line by line exactly what was changed. There was less than a week’s notice before the first one during reading week. One of the 5 sessions was held at Maison, which was not professional and may have made people uncomfortable.
* Devon: the logo can be added. I am fairly certain that you can tell the changes. You have the opportunity to go through documents before hand. You should have been self-informed. It’s not up to us individually, the votes were chosen by the group. It’s not necessary to be highlighted before we go through it.
* Isaac: Keep in mind it will be presented the same way at AGM. From my understanding it is not possible to highlight it.
* Liam; throughout the process, anyone could have offered or sent in changes. People that said it wasn’t accessible came by through some of them and chose not to stay. You can still suggest changes now. It was sent well in advance, published a view only option after every single suggestion. If you chose to not look at it, that’s not the committee’s responsibility.

Votes: Secret Ballot (Tae)

No: 9 Yes: 6 Abstain: 1

**Motion Fails**

* Travis: The only thing we change is Associate members, which is that they can pay fees equal to the membership fees, so they can be active members. This can be voted upon by the BoD. This is too vague, because for example an Arts student can do this. We should reword this so that we can specify that it’s for biotechs/people with engineering degrees.
  + **We are taking out Section 2.01 Associate Members a.i**
  + Nothing has been changed until Absentee voting by Mail Ballot.
* Tae: Can this change occur today?
* Isaac: we can ONLY change the changes, nothing that is from the original constitution
* Charbel: since opt-outs are an option, now, should we define membership fees
* Travis: we don’t know the legislation so we can’t change the constitution for that
* Kim: there is a formatting issue point 3.02 c and 3.03 f
* Isaac: if there is any formatting issue, point it out and they will fix it.
* Travis: Section 5. Read 5.01 on both, the wording is different. It basically says all directors end terms after AGM or after August 31st. Ours is just August 31st.
* Heemel: take out section 5
* Travis: A similar change happened in 5.02
* Devon: formatting issue on 6.02 d
* Travis: Nothing has changed except for the formatting
* Travis: Section 7. We don’t changed much, but we removed admin and phil. This will be discussed in the next document
* Pull out 7.01
* Travis: In 8.01 we changed 20 to 21 to round to 3 weeks
* Formatting 9.01 d
* Travis: we didn’t change anything in 10, in 11 we set ourselves up for if it gets changed
* Policy and Procedures is as following:
* Kim: Pull out 1.3.1
* Charbel: Pull out 1.3.2
* Travis: we replaced that the president should update policy as relevant instead of every year. We added to hold 3 office hours per week per semester while in office (except summer) to every exec
* Noah: pull out 1.3.3
* Travis: added conference selection committee.
* Formatting (and after k goes after l) in 1.3.4
* Isaac: the point J by mandate means we can’t leave the organizations
* Charbel: pull out 1.3.4
* Travis: 1.3.5: finance produces a summary of financial report
* Devon: formatting issue in 1.3.5
* Charbel: pull out 1.3.5 (for point g)
* Formatting error: move bullets up (1.3.6 of old)
* Kim: pull out 1.3.7
* Travis: pull out 1.3.8, 1.3.9, impacted by admin
* Tae: Which constitution would the new exec be under?
* Travis: They would be grandfathered in by the old constitution
* Tae: Could people have ran for admin and phil
* Travis: we had a motion a couple of weeks ago to take those out of the elections
* Travis: in eligibility to run, vp comms has to be bilingual, not under mandate
* Charbel: pull out vp services
* Kim: pull out 1.3.11
* Everything in 1.3 is pulled out
* Travis: they moved 1.4 to the end
* Take out 2
* Section 3 is the old section 2 (The exact same except is effective date)
* Section 4 is the old section 3
* Tae: can biotech students not run for chess anymore?
* Isaac: correct
* Formatting 4.3.2e
* Section 5: reformatted president’s eligibility to say that if no one meets criteria we can still have a president
* Charbel: anyone can pay their dues (i.e. an Arts student) anyone can be an active member?
* Travis: yes, thats why i pulled it out
* Kim: pull out 5.3.2
* MK: is that something you have to pay for?
* Liam: it was from the SFUO so regardless it would be the same
* Take out 4.3.6 (of old)
* Added a tiebreaker policy under (new) 5.3.12 (pull out Charbel)
* Section 6 is the old section 5
* Travis: we have a lot of questions for being 18 years old, it’s because we fall under the NFP act
* Pull out 6.3.2 (Kim)
* Removed submitting a report to VP academic
* Heemel pulled out NEW 6.3.3
* Section 7 is the old section 6
* Formatting in 7.3.3 (new)
* Section 8 is the old section 7 (this trend continues)
* Travis: section 8 has not been changed
* E2 is not there (will be provided by charbel)
* Pull out effective dates from document
* Everyone is going to read both documents and familiarize themselves
* Travis/committee will go back and make changes based on minutes
* Kim: 1.3.1: If you look at 1.3.1 f, I feel like 5 business days prior will force everything into varia, and we will end up with a basic adgenda and a lot of varia. I think this should be established by the board at each meeting.
* Isaac: we are going to vote to change this, and then change and review the whole thing again
  + **1.3.1 f: Ensure the agenda is formed and distributed to the board by a deadline established by the Board of Directors at the first meeting of each academic year.**

passes unanimously with 1 abstention

* Charbel: 1.3.2: It says it has to be someone that can’t vote
  + **1.3.2 a: not a director of the board**

Passes unanimously with 1 abstention

* Noah: 1.3.3g clarification of officers, issue is resolved
* Kim: 1.3.3j: this is very general to have in our policy and procedures manual. Lore and culture is up to interpretation
* Devon: I would object that it is up to interpretation
* Kim: some of the past lore and culture is not what we want to bring back. This could result in the president excusing actions
* Travis: this came from the admin’s mandate
* Liam: mcmaster ryerson carleton and guelph have this in their constitution and by having it so you just have history, the lore is mainly the blackhats, if we’re going to knitpick at the fact that it’s about the non-inclusivity then we won’t get anywhere
* Kim: this is something that can be passed on, now its being mandated
  + 1.3.3 j Remove “lore and culture”

6 for, 9 against, **motion fails**

* Vote to return 1.3.3j into omnibus: passes unanimously
* Kim: 1.3.3 m: this could result in events not being ran/ responsibilities not being upheld because the president may not take over
* Kim: vacancy in office is to appoint someone else and not have the president take over
* Liam: 7.03 in bylaws states that the director may appoint someone if vacant
* Kim proposes:
  + 1.3.3 m: in case of emergency, they assume responsibilities that do not officially fall within their functions, as provided for in the by-laws of the Society

For: 2 Against: 8 Absentions: 6 **Motion fails**

* Tae 1.3.3 can we define emergency?

Vote: motion does not pass

* Vote for president being added to omnibus

15 for, 0 against, 1 abstention

**Motion**: Liam: Bar the minutes from when we started talking about external.

Second: Charbel

Votes: 12 for, 2 against (dean notable), 2 abstentions Motion passes

**Motion**: Liam: go in camera

Second: Ru

Votes: 12 for, 2 against (dean and travis notable), 2 abstentions motion passes

* Liam, seconded by Noah
  + **1.3.4 j i: to leave or change status of the Society in reference to the aforementioned organizations will be determined by a student vote at a meeting of members**

9 for, 1 against, 5 abstentions (notable by Travis), **Motion Passes**

* Rukyya: In bylaws, it mentioned that you can be in co op and hold office hours, but doesn’t specify outside of Ottawa. Can we add to all of the office hours that they can be outside of Ottawa and can’t hold office hours.
* Kim: can we propose that the board votes on it
* Travis: so if the board says no, they will not fufill their mandate?
* Isaac: correct
* Liam: The vote should be by exec not by board so that you don’t have to have a meeting
* Heemel: in the IEEE constitution, it has a statement about what happens if someone is not in Ottawa for co op. We could take this verbatim
* Kim: we can’t propose a whole new policty we can only amend
* **Motion** (Liam): at the end of every office hour mention for exec, add hold office hours **“unless otherwise voted upon by the executive”**

Second: Charbel

Discussion:

Votes: 8 for, 1 against,5 abstentions **(passes)**

* Marianne: having the VPX write a report about each conference and then writing one for each semester is redundant.

Remove 1.3.4f and in 1.3.4g “Write a report each semester outlining a summary of each conference and how different engineering student societies operate.

Charbel: We should keep as is because VPX can just put the conference report in their summary report

Liam: these are two different things, one is what each conference is, the other is research of how each eng soc works.

* 1.3.4 is back in the omnibus
* Kim: I want to add that the report be added the the website at every board meeting.

Second by Liam

* + **1.3.5 e present a summary of the financial report at each meeting of the Board of Directors and have it published to the website within 7 days of the meeting**

Votes: unanimously passes

* 1.3.5 is put back in omnibus
* 1.3.6: Travis: we too the roles and responsibilities and distributed to internal and communications. Manager of IT is more responsible for the website.
* VP admin will be returned to
* Kim: 1.3.7 clarify point i, what is the meeting with the members of the board each semester?

Second: Noah

* + **1.3.7 i Meet with the year representatives on the Board at least once per semester to discuss academic issues.**

Vote: 9 for, 0 against **Motion passed**

* 1.3.7 is added to omnibus
* Heemel: we pulled the rest of them out because they reference each other, so I think we should discuss it as a whole
* Rafi: you could talk about what was taken out and discuss from there.
* Heemel: if we start with changing the structure and the reason for taking out execs and adding managers
* Travis: formerly 10 exec, 6 managers, now 8 exec 9 manager. Motivation is to increase opportunities for students to get involved, as well as funding. A lot of our funding is a variable by a large margin. A lot of the motivation behind redistributing tasks is because funding is not guaranteed. It is good to promote charities, however an event has the potential to increase our own funding if we need it.
* Tae:what does ground floor mean
* Travis: entry level, don’t go through campaigning and decide on exec later
* Isaac: we are going to open the floor to discussing VP phill exec as a whole and discuss.
* Kim: I have an issue of reducing philanthropy to making money, but there is no clause anywhere else. You are just removing events and hoping social will take over.
* Alizeh: travis is saying he wants more people on the ground floor to get involved. I don’t think running eng ball is a ground floor responsibility.
* Travis: the manager also has a mandated committee, in which an exec sits on with other leads. From here they can get more people.Our current VP phil was there when we were discussing this
* Kim: I was there after this was already discussed, I added the committee as a safeguard if this gets passed. The Social will also have more financial responsibility through managers that they would oversee.
* Alizeh: I would like to move Manager of Charities to an exec position
* Heemel: The manager of charities was the most difficult way to be a manager, to run eng ball you need access to the office which only execs have. They have to do other events with other fed bodies. Eng ball is not a small task, you need to access the office, set up ticket sales, etc.
* MK: I don’t think having a thin mandate for an exec position is an issue. Having a manager running eng ball is like “the blind leaving the blind”
* Ben: how much does having this position cost the ess?
* Travis: we will have several campaigns that could not be run

**Motion**: Alizeh: Remove the position of Manager of Charities and put the written mandate under an executive position; VP of Philanthropic Affairs.

Second: Kim

Discussion

Kim: as most of you know, I was VP Phill this year. The mandate would be thinner based in the policy and procedures manual. Having more freedom could allow more fundraisers and focus put into eng ball. My signature is on dozens of contracts, so you would have the Social signing off on things they havent fully read because they have other points, or a manager who has less responsibility signed.

Liam: We have now established a team of at least these people so we have a bare minimum of people. This might not be appealing to the ground level people. If I, who is involved, think it is an acceptable mandate, and saying i couldn’t strive for it is wrong. Saying the social is signing thing that they don’t understand, they should be reading anything they sign under the society. As this stands, 101 week is under 101 coordinator and social.

Heemel: you can bring vp services as manager of merch and lockers, etc. You can still get people involved on the ground floor, and add a committee. An exec could hire managers as they see fit. Other fed bodies, such as FSS have multiple VP’s hosting their charities. Eng ball is not necessarily one event, it is several mini events under it to raise money.

Travis: I don’t think having a manager signing a contract is a contract. Because they fall under the social, and we voted them in. We have received money from a lot of different places.

Last year we got $42000 from SFUO. If we don’t have this money, we might not be able to have an eng ball as successful as before, or make it smaller.

Heemel: Eng ball is a zero profit or deficit event for the ESS so that is false.

Voting: Secret ballot (Dean)

For: 10 Against: 5 Abstain: 1

**Motion Passes**

Liam: during the debates, there were 2 for and 2 against arguments. There was a lot of side chatter and because of this, I feel like whenever there is someone with a different opinion, you aren’t allowed to interrupt or talk because they are making that point.

Travis: Visit the mandate of the VP of Phil as it’s written. I think we should add relevant things to VP Phil.

**Motion**: Liam: move everything from manager of events and removing reporting to the VP social, and adding the office hours clause, remove “assist in the ...:” from c, add a philanthropic arm to points b and c

Second: Travis

Discussion:

Heemel: the manager of events is reporting to the VP Social, this seems strange.

Kim: They also have to assist the Social with 101 week, and in point c

Liam: this has happened a lot this year, and they have been helping social a lot

**Amendment:** Kim:remove “assist in the …” from manager of events mandate if added to VP Phil

Ben: I think that this position is for philanthropic events and so they should only have to coordinate with academic events

Votes: 11 for, 1 against, 3 abstentions **Motion Passes**

**Amendment:** Travis: we should add the philanthropic arm into the mandate to both lines of b and c from manager of events

Votes: 11 for, 4 abstentions

Overall votes for original motion: 12 for, 1 notably against (Heemel), 2 abstentions

**Motion**: Liam: Remove manager of events

Second: Devon

Votes: Unanimously passed

Travis: we should look at social mandate and see if wee need this many events.

Devon: we also need to keep in mind we took away the person to help the social.

**Motion**: **Travis: merge point f and g and get rid of point a, have one of the accessible events be with another faculty.**

**Friendly Amendment**: Alizeh: Change manager of events to Manager of 101 Week in a, merge point f and g and have one of the accessible events be with another faculty.

Second: Devon

Discussion:

Liam: I am completely against this second part, the reason we put two social events for all years is because there weren’t a lot for 17 and 18 year olds. I don’t care if the fed body events be all years or not. There should be two different points and the events shouldn’t be combined.

Devon: it isn’t easy to be social. If we are mandating them to have extra events and removing the extra person, they have a lot

Travis: saying that we can’t have combined events but they have to be accessible goes against it.

Rukyya: academic alone has a lot of mandated events and an issue we had this year is events overlapping

Heemel: it says in the constitution that events can have commissioners as they see fit so they can get someone to help them.

Liam: can we separate these motions.

Votes: Change point a, **passes unanimously**

Combine f&g: 11 for, 1 opposed (Liam), 4 abstentions

**Motion**: Travis: put VP Social in Omnibus

Second: Devon

Votes: 15 for, 1 abstention, **Motion Passes**

Alizeh: Merge manager of IT and social media. Call it Manager of IT and Social Media.

In old version, 1.3.6

**Motion:** Heemel: bring VP admin back

Discussion:

Travis: we looked at their roles and decided that they can be dispersed.

Kim: What is the spirit behind adding the VP admin stuff to internal, when usually it’s VPFA.

Charbel: This was due to the fact that since the VP Admin position has come in, there wasn’t much done with it. Having internal deal with stuff that happens in the school felt like a better fit, instead of having the finance be right behind the president, it be the internal and them speak for the president if the president was absent.

Dean: The work internal implies the internal workings to the society so they wanted to make it more applicable

Heemel: I would argue that we should bring it back, we can’t go off of what they did before

Tae: I think I had a bad showcase of VP admin. When you graduate, you get a database of how much you volunteered for, so I think it has to be brought over whether or not VP admin stays. This is a big role. In terms of IT, you make what it is. IEEE website is nice, however the limits for websites go from 0 to a lot of work depending on how much IT is helping you.

Travis: we aren’t even considering the new constitution and where the responsibilities went.

Charbel: It’s not because who’s in office does or doesn’t do a good job, it’s because since its inception, there is a president and we could bring the roles back the right way.

Votes: Secret Ballot (Rafi)

10 against (Devon, MK), 4 for, 1 abstention (**Motion Fails**)

**Motion**: Kim: move 1.3.8g from VP Internal and into VP Finance.

Second: Heemel

Discussion:

Kim: under the finance portfolio, we already have that only members are participating and we have to see who is a member so we can streamline this

Travis: point g is more than just having a list of members. We could suggest an amendment: Add a line to finance stating that they have the list of all members instead of moving g.

Kim: its already there

Travis: then I am speaking against what youre saying

Kim: the internal is going to document and have, and the finance is going to have to overlap on it. This would also remove tasks from internal who has the largest mandate from what I see.

Travis: what line are you referring to in the finance’s mandate

Kim: g

**Amendment:** Alizeh: move point 1.3.8g to chair profile.

**Friendly Amendment:** Noah: Make it the chair’s responsibility when they are present, otherwise Internal.

Discussion:

Charbel: this is risky because the chair starts at the first meeting and ends at the last, so someone would have to take care of it in between

Isaac: for reference, the chair has this responsibility for ESSCO and CFES

Votes: 8 for, 3 against (Travis), 4 abstentions **Motion Passes**

**Motion:** Liam: table the current discussion

Second: Travis

Votes: 7 for, 2 against, abstentions: 5

**Motion:** Travis: amend the agenda to add rep elections

Second: Liam

Votes: 11 for, 3 abstentions

**Motion:** Liam: I nominate Quinn for 4th year Chemical Rep

Second: Travis

Discussions:  
 Liam: according to the CEO she was eligible to run, therefore they decide that she is eligible to run therefore a precedent set.

Charbel: this was in collaboration with me, we discussed, she paid a fee with monique

Charbel: theoretically, in the constitution, an active member is someone who paid their fees in full though their tuition.

**Motion:** 2 minute recess

Second: Kim

Votes: **Motion Passes**

Isaac: the motion is out of order, however you can vote to make anyone a member of society by a special resolution.

**Motion**: Liam: Make Quinn an active member of the ESS.

Second: Travis

Discussion:

Isaac: this opens the precedent that any biotech student can do this.

Travis: if the only reason we didn’t let this happen in the first place is because she isn’t an active member, then we should let it happen now.

Isaac: The precedent would be erased if the new constitution passes

Kim: there is also a double degree in electrical engineering and physic, so that is also opening a precedent for that

Charbel: there will be a new program for data science, which will have the same precedent

Devon: they don’t automatically become a member of the board, they are just a member of ESS and run in elections, attend AGM, etc.

Noah: to clarify, this precedent is if they pay the ESS fees and are voted upon, we can’t vote no because they have a dual degree.

Votes: Quinn leaves, Secret Ballot (Isaac)

12 for, 3 against, 2 abstentions **Motion Passes**

**Motion**: Liam: Nominate Quinn for 4th year Chem Rep

Second: Leena

Discussion:

Charbel: Can we not do questions:

Approved by board

Votes: **Passes Unanimously**

Heemel: What is left to discuss?

**Motion**: Travis: take out Eng Ball committee

Second: Liam

Discussion:

Kim: the committee wanted to create more positions, this committee does that

Travis: because we moved it to VP, I don't think we should keep that

Ben: it has been a precedent that we have a committee, so now it’s mandated

Rafi: if a committee isn’t mandated, can they make it anyways?

Isaac: yes

Travis: They can if they make that decision

Votes: 8 for, 5 opposed, 5 abstentions, **Motion Passes**

**Motion**: Charbel: 2.3.1 g: the selection committee works with the VPX to select proper delegates to go to conferences. The spirit was to make sure there aren’t too many exec or managers. Take out g

Second: Kim

Discussion:

Travis: I think we had way too many people involved with the ESS using the student’s money to go to conferences. I don’t disrespect Marianne’s position.

Alizeh: I don’t think it’s fair to say we took the opportunity away from someone else, we were selected.

Kim: I’m uncomfortable with the fact that we are basing it off of fees this year. They could change based on VPX.

Liam: We want to make officers pay 25% of what everyone else is paying

Heemel: I agree with Alizeh, we shouldn’t be penalizing the exec if they are the best fit. They don’t have the option to opt into these extra perks, they’re just there. It’s not accessible if the best students happen to be on the ess.

Dean: I am in favour of this point but there is room for costs to become greater, so I would ask whoever’s motion it is to change it to 25% or a max of 25$.

Noah: to say that this VPX in the future will do the same as any other isn’t fair

Quinn: I like the idea of a cap on this

Charbel: maybe the cap is okay but I don’t think we should get the execs to pay more regardless. We aren’t getting the fees that we are normally getting. Because you have a committee, who knows how to pick and choose and not take people twice.

Liam: execs get free lockers, which is $25 so that is like paying for a conference. Last year, this is the price point.

Travis: our eef funding gets affected when we send a lot of execs, so it looks better for eef funding for us.

Alizeh: are they paying an additional fee?

Isaac: yes.

Votes: 8 for, 8 against, 2 abstentions Isaac votes against.

**Motion:** Dean: Set a cap at $25

Second: Kim

**Friendly Amendment: Rukyya: set a cap at $30**

Discussion:  
 Liam: 25% looks good to EEF, that was the point was it. 30 is not a scary number

Charbel: penalizing officers like this isn’t fair

Heemel: when I was EEF chair, I didn’t look at how many officers applied, the percentage is just another number

Votes: 10 for, 4 against, 3 abstentions, **Motion Passes**

Travis: Can we go through the list?

Isaac: this is the last issue

**Motion**: Alizeh: **Add that the Internal will oversee manager of competitions**

Second: Noah

Discussion:

Votes: **Passes Unanimously**

Alizeh: change the roles of VP Comms because too many managers (failed)

Liam: remove the line saying they must have a committee (failed)\

1 and 2 have returned to the omnibus

Kim: making this is going to result in candidates not knowing if they’re qualified or not

Devon: this is how it works not

Travis: this is established in the old constitution and this is just stating it

Quinn: the CEO asked this year, so it’s their job to make sure

Heemel: for c i, isn’t this irrelevant, because anyone that has previously ran should be eligible

Charbel: this means managers too

5.3.2 goes back into omnibus

(5 for, 3 against, 1 abstain)

4.3.6 was taken out:

**Motion**: Kim: motion to put 4.3.6 in the constitution

Second: Noah

Discussion

Travis: because we removed the sucker runs. Is it necessary to have this?

Kim: they have to run an event during frosh week. We could add a clause to say if no other candidate meets this it’s okay.

Devon: you can do a lot of this remotely. As my job, I did a lot of emails and helped planning that I didn’t need to be there fore

Votes: 2 for, 9 against, 5 abstentions **Motion Fails**

5.3.12

Charbel: is it necessary to put it in a locker

Travis: this is to hold the CEO accountable for not changing

Kim: this is conflict because president sees

Travis: they sign and date the envelope. It’s in a locker and the CEO has a key

**Motion:** Travisput 5.3.12 into omnibus

Second: Devon

Votes: unanimously passes

**Motion**: Kim: 6.3.2 “One first year software engineering representative.”

Second: Alizeh

Discussion:

Tae: Amendment to software engineers

Liam: what if I was a first year rep twice because i took GNG 1105 twice

Kim: this is based on your enrollment in university

Devon: the problem with the statement is you can’t specify without excluding groups of people. Overall we would change every point to make sure it’s okay

Noah: is there a first year class that every software engineer takes?

Quinn: Biotechs don’t take 1105.

Travis: so would we rather leave it as written so you could have software or biotech?

Votes: 11 for, 4 against, 2 abstentions (Travis notable) **Motion Passed**

Liam: I asked for clarification for voting and I didn’t get clarification

Isaac: I said the motion twice, then you had a clarification, it was out of order because we were in voting block

**Motion**: Rukyya: 6.3.3: Put back semester report

Second Kim

Discussion:

Liam: we now mandate meetings so this is unnecessary

Rukyya: i don’t think a meeting is enough, a report is more thorough and keeps year reps accountable. I know that this wasn’t previously done but having it mandated is still good

Kim: we have a history of year reps not showing up, but we should mandate them to do something

Travis: I have no issue with this. We shouldn’t look for a reason to remove people

Heemel: talking about what has been done in the past, doesn’t mean that people in the future won’t do that

**Amendment**: Alizeh: we can have them write a report before meeting, then discuss at meeting

Votes: 5 for, 10 against, 3 abstentions (fails)

Votes: 9 for, 0 against, 8 abstentions (Alizeh) **Motion Passes**

**Motion**: Devon: Put 6.3.3 in omnibus

Second: Rukyya

Votes: unanimous 2 abstentions

Heemel: we don’t usually screw with the constitution as much as we have done.

**Motion**: Heemel: put the effective date back under each section

Second: Kim

Discussion

Travis: nick changed the whole thing, did he add effective date or was that there before

Liam: under the not for profit act, any changes needs to be documented

Kim: we haven’t modified everything, so the effective date would make it look like we did

Devon: we changed the formatting of everything

Charbel: we could know under each section who changed it, and when to each one.

Votes: passes unanimously, 1 notable abstention from Liam

Kim: Shouldn’t we be motioning until Charbel is done update?

**Motion**: Charbel: table review

Second: Travis

Votes: unanimous pass, 1 abstention

Charbel: Volunteer appreciation at F&S at 6, AGM is happening next weekend. It is crucial to run through this and see what happens with this. Anyone that is on the board, I wanted to reward you, we made a special board of directors patch, which will be coming in at the start of exams.

Kim: it was mentioned that AGM will be next week which is unconstitutional

Isaac: there is no other options, either we have it then or during finals

**Motion**: Dean: AGM next Sunday

Second: Tae

Discussion

Votes: Second resolution

Unanimously passes

**Bylaws**

Removed from the Omnibus

3.02c (Kim): Formatting issue

3.03c (Kim): Formatting issue

Section 2.01.a.i - Membership conditions (Travis)

* Travis: Specify a little more about membership and classes of members. Wants to add specification of “within the faculty of engineering”
* Heemel: Would specifying Faculty of Eng. eliminate Biotechs and Elec Eng. / Physics?
* Liam: How about specify that they must be taking three engineering courses?
* Travis: Ben thought about what would happen if some arts student were brought in as an active member.
* Quinn: “Engineering” is in the name of my degree. What if we had people who had “Engineering” in the name of their degree.
* Tae: What if people had all of their friends in Engineering. However, as jokes as things can be the Board would never approve this
* Isaac: Exec can bring it forward but the BoD can vote it down
* Quinn: Nothing saying that someone running for President had to specifically be in engineering
* Travis: if we’re cool with the way that it is written then we can leave it I just wanted to have it for discussion

**Motion:** Put it back in the omnibus

Motioned by Dean, Seconded by Rafi

Discussion

* Mary-Kate: In the documentation as it stands it does not specify how often they must pay
* Devon: it is specified in point b that it is a yearly re-up
* Heemel: Does that mean they must be approved by the board to be an associate member?
* Isaac: Yes and they must pay their fees to run. Quinn is an excellent example but in the wrong order

**Motion Passes**

Section 5.01 (Heemel)

* Just wanted to clarify that ending the term on August 31 of each year is for the year reps and to give them 12 months on their mandate.
* Devon clarified that it was for year reps only

Section 7.

Will be changed to match the policy and the procedures

**Motion:**Put everything back in the omnibus

* Moved: Liam
* Seconded: Noah
* **Passes unanimously**

**Vote:** Propose the omnibus at the next AGM

Agenda motion

Discussion: none

**Passes unanimously with two abstentions**

1. **Varia**

**Motion (Kim)**: Constitution review committee must highlight changes so that they don”t need to be brought up line by line at AGM

* Moved: Kim
* Seconded: Heemel

Passes unanimously with one notable abstention (Liam)

**Motion:** Change the name of Trivia Night to Paper Plane Night in the budget

Moved by Dean

Seconded by Rukyya

Budget line is $100

Vote: Passes, notable against from Tae

**Motion (Dean)**: Increase the budget line of Paper Plane Night to $300

Seconded by Rukyya

Motivation: Dean has saved money elsewhere and restore original budget. $200 removed from uOEC and put into Paper Plane Contest budget.

Clarification (Heemel): Wanted financial update from ESS including on contingency

Update: (Monique) We have $164 remaining in contingency with all expenses that popped up but some events have run at lower costs than anticipated and more profits were received from certain budget lines. Exact number needs to be recalculated pending funds but contingency should be higher. $200 from contingency should run deficit but movie night event has not been run with $100. uOEC also ran $1000 surplus.

**Motion passes** unanimously with one notable abstention (Heemel)

* Kim: Brief summary of constitution changes in French was promised but did not happen after being motioned at a previous meeting
* Liam: Announcement was made that translation was Pending. Liam did not consent to translating the document.
* Kim: Never brought up that Liam should be the one and he was volunteered by Travis. Kim wanted to make the point that translation was not done.

Heemel: wants better idea of financial status of ESS considering there is talk of a very large deficit. Are we running a deficit right now?

Monique: Yes we are running a deficit in actuals but we are waiting on EEF and levies. After we receive those we are in surplus

Heemel: Have we met our goal in sales and what we sell on merch?

Monique: For coveralls we budgeted $500 in profit and made $769. For hoodies we expected 3k in profit but did restock merch but budget line is -2,200. For equipment rental profit is $98 rather than $300. Overall we are short due to hoodies being re-stocked but there will be a profit once all of the hoodies sell.

Kim: Motion on translating the constitution was not completed.

**Motion:** General outline of changes to constitution be presented in French at AGM, to be written by the constitutional review committee and translated by whoever they see fit

Seconded: Heemel

Passes unanimously, three abstentions.

Monique: Audits for sub associations due April 22nd, and must include from April 2018 to March 2019

* Kim: in our constitution that to be eligible for sub-assoc. levies they must complete a detailed audit by Nov. 1
* Monique: they received levies from last year. The way it was set up is that Sept 1 they get levies from previous audit (April to March) and then hand in another audit for April covering the current year of April to March.
* Heemel: technically we don’t need to submit anything

Rukyya: Google doc will be put up for year reps to put out for performance of the semester. **Want more than just three submissions**.

1. **Adjournment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title:** | Adjournment |
| **Mover:** | Travis |
| **Seconder** | Monique |
| **Spirit:** | We want to leave |
| **WHEREAS** | We are done |
| **Be It Resolved That** | The meeting be adjourned |
| **Result** | Passes unanimously |
| **Discussion:** | N/A |