

AGENDA

ENGSOC Semi-Annual General Meeting November 15, 2017 – 6:00 pm – Thornbrough Atrium

1. EngSoc Accountability

1. President's Speech
2. Internal Update
3. External Update
4. Financial Update
5. Academic Update
6. Student Experience Update
7. Social Update

2. Constitutional Amendments

1. Replacing the Constitution and Policy Manual
 - currently unclear and self-contradictory
 - changes have very little change in content, but ensure clarity and consistency
 - newly written one is on engineering website

Motion to replace constitution and policy manual

Owner- Matt Saunders
Secunder- Sarah Rozon

2. Clarifying Implementation of Amendments
 - currently, as written it does not say when the motions being passed are effective
 - motion is to clarify when motions will become active
 - everything passed at a general meeting will be effective at the beginning of the following semester, unless otherwise directed

Motion to clarify implementation of amendments

Owner- Val Bauman
Secunder- Deanna Kerekes

3. Changing number of votes for 3rd and 4th Year Reps
 - make sure all year reps get same number of votes
 - currently, 3rd and 4th years get more representation on council due to discipline-specific reps

- number of votes across all years should be equal

propose:

- first and second year reps each have two positions, each with one vote

- third and fourth years each have four positions, with two votes between the four positions when voting on budget-related items

Motion to change number of votes for 3rd and 4th year reps

Owner- Val Bauman

Secunder- Sarah Rozon

Loretta Chan: Why is it specifically budgeted things or non-budgeted things?

Val Bauman: I don't think there should be anything stopping from voting internally, whereas budget should have equal votes.

Pavel: I agree that there is more representation for 4th years but I trust that 4th years know better so I would rather their voice be heard. If year reps have equal votes, what if the vote comes out equal?

Matt Curtis: When it comes to voting on EngSoc for financial matters, it is not just year reps that get to vote. All executives and president get to vote. This allows equal distribution of say throughout the years.

4. Eliminating 5th Year Rep

- year reps for every year except 5th year

- hasn't been used at all since it has been added

- nothing restricting them from running for 4th year rep

Motion to eliminate 5th year rep

Owner- Val Bauman

Secunder- Ciaran Buckley

5. Changing how disciplinary action is taken

- effectively improve accountability of members who are perceived to be slacking

- current process is tedious, long, and has not been used

propose:

1- president tells the member their concerns → member required to complete journal entry if no improvement,

2: if entries showing they are still not doing their job well → they must resign all material

3: president shares entries with council at least 2 days before meeting and voting by council (must be over 50%) as to whether they're removed

4: will not be able to run for the following term

Motion to change removal of office process

Owner- Val Bauman

Secunder- Julia Foucault

6. Reduce number of Special Events coordinators

- as of now, there are two charity officers

- can run by yourself or as a pair
- want to make it only possible to run as one
- council is large → reducing will help with less members, with more responsibility

Motion to reduce number of Special Events coordinators to one

Owner- Val Bauman

Secunder- Abdullah Al Hayali

Betty Zhao: Council term? → Elected term that the council runs for

Hugh: If we have 2 charity officers now, what happens? → if motion to passes, would become effective at the next council term.

Steph Kotiadis: If someone runs, but is on co-op, could two people run then? → Yes

Annie Krueger: I think it is doable as one person but, don't think you should make it one person. Some events are a lot to take on as one (ex. teeter-totter-a-thon).

Betty Zhao: In current constitution, can have commissioners for specific events.

Steph Walton: I think should be kept open to 2 people. They have a lot of events and if it was down to one person, they would be doing same kind of work load as VP without recognition. Other social officer positions allow two people.

Julia Foucault: It is a position to be done by one person. There are one or two events that are very demanding but it is council's roll to step up. All officer positions should have similar amount of work to do.

7. Eliminate Internal Development Manager

Owner: Val Bauman

Val B: Wants to eliminate PDM, effective end of winter 2018 semester, delete from policy manual and constitution. Role has not been seen to be used to its full position. Role is most responsible for helping VP Internal with lab fund and AGM. These things do not need a full year-long position to tend to them.

Secunder: Sarah Rozon

Betty Z: Agrees that VP internal has a lot of responsibility and needs support, but a commissioner can provide that support (e.g. locker commissioner, agm commissioner).

8. EngSoc Scholarship

Owner: Val Bauman

Val B: Motion is aimed at allocating funds toward engsoc to fund a scholarship of \$1000 per year. No students or engsoc members will be a part of the selection process. Based on financial need, curated by student financial services. Val does not remember what else to say about this.

Hugh Peters: What is \$1000 to the annual budget?

Val B: We have about \$18000 per semester x 2 = \$36000 per year

Secunder: Julia Foucault

Matthew Saunders: My bad for not getting the seconder before discussion.

Karine Jarzecki: Is it \$1000 per year?

Val B: Yes. Also, I just forgot what I wanted to say.

Val B: This is not a scholarship for engsoc. On the CPES website, the scholarship would be found, you are automatically considered upon sending in a Need Assessment Form. It is not about engsoc funding its own members.

Alicia Schmidt: Could you reiterate the criteria please?

Val B: Scholarship based solely on financial need with accompanying criterion of not going to somebody who has already won a lot of rewards. Person must have completed ENGG2100, to make sure money goes to somebody who is unlikely to drop out.

Julia gets distracted with microphone

Steph Kotiadis: How many scholarships under CPES already exist with same criteria?

Val B: Zero.

Talha Bin Tariq: Is this a scholarship you have to apply for or are you automatically considered for it?

Val: Similar to other scholarships, you just need to send in a Need-Assessment Form.

Scott Ackerl: Scholarship is not in line with what engsoc is meant to do. Engsoc should not decide who gets money. Maybe this money could instead go toward one of the many ENGG clubs?

Val B: Nobody in the society has any say on who receives the award. Decided entirely by CPES committee. EngSoc would just be sponsoring the award. An initial concern when the award was first brought to council is that there are already a lot of other awards for high performance. Those performance-based scholarships tend to go to a small pool of people, not distributed well amongst student body. EngSoc award would do more than recognize the amazing students in engineering. New award aims to celebrate everybody.

Julia F: Agrees with motion because \$1000 is peanuts. We have never had much money trouble and therefore we can afford to support our students financially. Her husband had to work 60 hours per week and didn't have much free time during his degree.

Stephanie W: Supports people being aided financially but there are better uses for \$1000 from the engsoc budget. We could, for example, put it toward events.

Talha: Understands Steph and Scott, but when you get money from SFS it's not that much. Adding another \$1000 would help significantly in getting people through school.

9. Maintaining the Guelph Engineering Brand

Owner: Val Bauman

Val B: Merchandise Officer has the job of designing new logos without changing the brand significantly. Believes that this job should be removed to create brand consistency.

Secunder: Sarah Rozon

No discussion.

10. Defining responsibilities of Year Reps

Owner: Val Bauman

Val: Goal to give more structure to year rep roles to alleviate confusion. In 4 years of being here, I've been a year rep twice. The role needs structure. Want to mandate year reps to help with banquet, pizza day, corn roast, grad party, and coffee house.

Secunder: Karine J

Steph W: Does this motion mean they ONLY have to help with those events? Currently we just ask them to help.

Val B: Currently the year reps have no obligation to help with any specific events but they are asked to help with some event.

Betty Z: How would it be decided which year reps are assigned to which events?

Val B: Some events are obvious, such as fourth year reps with grad party. Some of them are arbitrary.

Julia F: Fourth year reps are only required to do grad party.

Sarah R: During feedback meetings with year reps, they said a better structure would help them to get involved. Personally I support this motion.

Domenique Mastronardi: I like the idea because, as a year rep, it is hard to know where to get involved. Structure would help give us confidence in where to help.

Talha B: Great to give structure so year reps know what to get involved with. Can ENGG Pub be a first year rep job?

Val B: Reminder that people may motion to amend the motion.

Motion to amend motion so that Engg Pub falls under first year responsibilities

Owner: Steph W

Secunder: Thomas Coulson

Sarah R: Does this mean deleting engg pub from the 2nd year obligations? Should we have both first and second year reps run ENGG Pub?

Steph W: I think that the committee for ENGG Pub is currently too large, but 2nd years can still help out.

Hugh P: Only thing that matters is who gets grad party. We could, at the start of the year, decide who gets what event.

Matt S: That isn't really relevant to the current motion. Sorry.

Matt Curtis: We can hold up our individual ballots in order to vote.

Matt S: Yes, Matt, that is how we vote.

Clear majority in favour of motion. The motion passes. The original motion is amended.

Bana Salim: Understands that each year rep should be responsible for a project, but it seems like a rush for first years. First years should be able to enjoy ENGG Pub and not run it themselves.

Steph W: Helping does not mean they cannot attend the event. We are mainly looking for help in advertising. Currently very difficult to get into first year Facebook groups if you're not already in first year.

Julia F: Agrees that first years should be involved.

Motion to amend the motion to only have first years run ENGG Pub in 2nd semester of the academic year, ENGG Pub would be run by 2nd years in the first semester of the academic year.

Owner: Julia Foucault

Second: Bana Salim

7 vote in favour

More than 7 vote against

Motion to amend does not pass

11. Improving the O-Week Financial Situation

Owner: Val Bauman

Val B: Goal to increase remaining year end float. Currently the previous year only need to leave \$10000 for O-week, proposal to increase the amount to \$15000.

No Discussion.

12. Change Procedure to Increase Lab Fund Fee

Owner: Jonathan Macpherson

Jon M: Update current constitution to allow for referendum because student body keeps increasing. Fees keep increasing and as student body continually increases, inflation is a thing, it makes sense to be able to increase the lab fund fee as the years go on.

Secunder: Scott Ackerl

Val: This motion is just to mandate that a referendum is required to change the lab fund fee.

Sarah R: Please note that Engsoc can only distribute a finite amount of money to the student body, this motion would help in allowing the lab fund fee to support the student body.

Julia F: Currently there are a lot of classes that make use of lab fund. People should think forward as to what they will need for these classes when they take them.

13. Eliminate the First Year Engagement Coordinator

Owner: Val B

Val B: Motion to eliminate the FYEC. FYEC is primarily there for Oweek, big buddies. This stuff is very focused on the fall semester and does not continue through the full year. This role can be replaced with a commissioner. It would be better to use a commissioner.

Second: Julia Foucault, our current FYEC

Julia: This was brought up last year and it did not pass. This is an excellent opportunity to have a commissioner do work at the start of the semester and then chill afterward.

Betty: When would this motion become effective?

Val: Effective immediately.

Julia: *cutely* Because I'm leaving.

Matt S: Thanks, Julia.

Scott A: Does not believe we should get rid of FYEC until we fix what commissioners can do on engsoc. E.g. commissioner cannot access engsoc drive, no direct communication with year reps who would deliver your messages. It is not yet time to eliminate the FYEC.

Val B: Valid points, Scott. However, all of those things that you are hinting at could be changed at SAGM next semester.

14. Eliminate the Professional Development Manager

Owner: Val Bauman

Val B: Wants to eliminate the PDM. PDM mainly helps with PDC and some professional development outreach things, also mandates to help with GEC but we have a commissioner role for that. Proposing to move GEC to VP External, where it was before.

Second: Sarah Rozon

Matt Curtis: Uh, hi. We're talking a lot about getting rid of many engsoc position and moving them to commissioner positions, but we've only had one commissioner ever [this might not be true, as mentioned by audience interjections]. This could be a bad idea.

Julia F: Important to have positions to be chosen by student body as well as council, so getting rid of officer positions is not that bad.

Anne Krueger: Only been on engsoc for 4 months so take what I say with salt: this seems like an extreme trimming of the engsoc fat. No need to have a very lean engsoc. Why are we trimming to begin with? Are we taxing the student body by being large?

Val B: No, we are not taxing the student body by being large. Currently we have some positions that do a lot and some positions that do not do a lot. People that don't do a lot can give the public the idea that engsoc does not do much. Commissioners are good to have as they allow people to show what they can do before being voted into engsoc.

Hugh P: On the same note, we don't want engsoc to be extremely exclusive.

Karine J: Condensing these positions will help get people involved as people who don't want to contribute too much time can get involved (wrt using commissioner positions).

Julia F: We have a fairly large engsoc for the size of our school. Officer positions are quite similar to our elected positions, which may not be the way to go. Commissioners can work well with co-op schedules, as time commitments are lesser with respect to a full year.

Loreta Chan: About PDM in particular, really doesn't think PDM should be eliminated as VP External already has a lot of responsibility and eliminating PDM would add to this and PDM should be used as a supporting position for VP External. Fix the constitution and policy manual at winter SAGM to aid the support of the VP External.

15. Combine Arts and Special Events

Owner: Karine J

Karine J: Motivation is to condense the arts officers and special events coordinators (renamed from charity officers). Motion would allow for more brainstormed event ideas. Could help to bring about a greater variety of events, as things can get stale.

Secunder: Val B

Steph W: Good point to spice up events, but going from 4 officers to 2 officers is an extreme change, half the manpower. Charity officers have already done 5 events this semester and 2 are coming up for arts. 2 people doing 7 events would be a lot.

Karine J: The number may be smaller, but the scale of events is small and thus doable. VP Socials make it look doable, they do big events.

Julia F: People can collaborate with others to ease the load, good to get others off council to help.

Steph W: As VP Social, notes that doing many small events is more taxing than doing a few large events.

Anne K: Agrees with Steph W, the two roles to be condensed mesh well together.

Matt C: Notes that motion 6 reduces special event coordinators, which affects the impact that the current motion being discussed would have.

16. Reorganizing Club Space in Thornbrough

Owner: Karine J

Karine: Throwing out idea similar to what CSA did, where some clubs had a room and others didn't. Motion is just to add the clause that this is an initiative by the society and VP Student life.

Secunder: Steph W

Sarah R: Currently working with people who had room at the end of the hallway. Does not agree with part that wants to allocate club space as currently club space is not an issue as every club that needs space has space. Currently, all clubs have enough space.

Julia F: All of our clubs have space, it is important to have club-specific rooms. Currently we have at most 2 clubs in each office.

Steph K: Just for clarity, I am a member of GIS. GIS already shares a room with another club. By making rooms bookable, you will have clubs that use rooms and some that don't, will have issues where some clubs don't have a place.

Grant Costello: There are many clubs that share space already. There are clubs that use space not in Thorn, they fight for it. Not having a specific space for clubs could hurt sense of team bonding for your club. If room is always booked out, you won't get that room.

17. Restrictions on EngSoc exec eligibility.

Owner: Karine J

Karine J: Motion focused on the issue having exec positions shared between clubs and engsoc. Adding clause to address issues with conflicts of interest. For voting, there are currently issues for quorum, as voting is restricted by conflicts.

Secunder: Steph W

Sarah Rozon: As VP Student Affairs, agrees strongly. Currently, we have exec engsoc members who are exec members for other clubs. Conflicts of interest regarding sensitive issues currently exist. There are conflicts of interest inherent in the current system.

Anne K: Currently, the motion reads that if you were an executive in a past year you can't be an engsoc exec in the current year.

Motion to change the wording of amendment, to remove the words "run for".

Owner: Anne Krueger

Secunder: Sarah Rozon

Matt C: Currently, engsoc has 3 execs from other clubs. Each of these individuals has kept up with their work and gone above and beyond. Restricting who can run for exec positions can prevent us from getting the best people for the job.

Steph W: People who are multiple execs are doing a good job, but there is that inherent conflict of interest in talking about club issues. I think that it is already difficult when somebody is on council for them to not show their bias toward certain events. Having club execs on engsoc makes this issue prominent.

Matt S: We are supposed to talk about the motion to amend.

Majority vote in favour of amendment of motion, motion passes.

Betty Z: As president of WiSE, this is unfair for people who want to do both: be a club exec and engsoc exec. Admits that there are inherent biases for these people, but people should be allowed to decide what they can and cannot say/do, with respect to having conflicts of interest.

Karine J: Nothing stopping you from being super eager from being club exec or engsoc exec and helping people beyond your role, but being both is just a conflict of interest. Separating club and engsoc execs will have the benefit of not stretching people too thin and letting them focus on one thing.

Steph K: I am a club exec and engsoc exec. If I had to choose between engsoc and my club, I would choose my club.

Steph W: Sorry if this sounds bitter, but if you don't have the same level of commitment and you have priorities, that comment of choosing your club shows the problematic bias.

Sarah R: Club issues is a sensitive topic.

Julia F: Agrees that bias is a problem.

18. Clarify how students on co-op hold positions

Owner: Karine J

Karine: Motion is about clarifying the holding of Fall/Winter semester positions by two people due to co-op.

Secunder: Val Bauman

No discussion.

19. Club faculty advisors

Owner: Sarah Rozon

Sarah R: Motion saying all clubs must have a faculty organizer, which is currently the case.

Secunder: Val B

Sarah R: Faculty advisor can be from CPES and not just from ENGG.

Alicia S: Bingo!

20. Club affiliation

Owner: Sarah R

Secunder: Julia F

Hugh P: Are any clubs going to lose funding based on this motion?

Sarah R: No, this is just ensuring things moving forward.

21. Reduce number of third-year reps

Owner: Karine J

Karine J: As long as you do announcements in Thermo, Econ, and Design III, you cover the student body.

Secunder: Abdullah W

Betty Z: Motion is unfair for 3rd years. After 2nd year, courses diverge. Motion would make it harder to get announcements out.

Steph W: Agrees with Betty, is concerned with number of cuts being seen at this SAGM because we need a lot of volunteers for events. Has run events with majority inside engsoc and majority outside engsoc, people don't follow through with commitments when they don't have the accountability that an engsoc member has.

Karine J: On both of the above, engsoc participation issue is okay because there are many remaining engsoc positions. With respect to representing voice as a student, grouped classes mean students are not truly separated.

Kevin Stewart: Currently a 4th year rep, was a 3rd year rep last year for ES&C. It's a small group of people. We don't need many reps to do announcements but having those reps for volunteering is very good as they don't have specific jobs and can float around as needed. Regarding classes in 3rd and 4th year, there is a mix where not all students take Econ, for example. There is no perfect solution as far as announcements go.

Hugh P: If all cutting motions pass then we would be cutting approximately 12% of engsoc's manpower.

Betty Z: Year reps do more than just announcements, they're also a recognizable face for their respective years. Engineering enrolment is going up up up. How do we properly represent the student body if we cut the number of representatives?

Karine: Has made the 3rd to 4th year transition herself, found that in 3rd year she didn't know many people in her program due to taking electives. VP Academic can be the advocate for the students. There are larger schools operating with half the engsoc members we have, we have too many people.

22. Restriction on club budgets

Owner: Sarah Rozon

Sarah Rozon: Motion is about how money for events is used. Need to clarify things for when people are applying for funding, not trying to reduce allocated funds.

Secunder: Steph W

No discussion.

23. Club budget reimbursement timeline

Owner: Sarah Rozon

Sarah Rozon: Clubs apply for budgets every semester, this is to make sure that clubs apply for

money just for the current semester.

Secunder: Steph W

Betty Zhao: Due to current SAGM, clubs could be getting a lot of money.

Sarah: This motion is saying that the last day to apply for reimbursement is the last day of the current semester.

Matt S: Notes that current wording is vague and a motion to amend could be made.

24. Increasing designated club budget

Owner: Sarah Rozon

Sarah Rozon: Currently clubs can only apply for 8% of the previous year's student's fees, wants to raise this to 15%. However, this is not a guaranteed 15%, applications for funding can be rejected.

Secunder: Julia Foucault

Betty Z: Wants to change the 15% to 20%.

Motion to change the 15% in the original motion to 20%

12 approx in favour

5 approx against

Motion to amend passes

Val B: Is the 20% for the whole year or per semester?

Matt S: as written, this would be 20% per year, but not necessarily an even split between the two semesters of the year

Steph K: It's bad to raise the amount as we have lab fund for equipment fees and such, not a good idea to just raise money allocated to clubs.

Sarah R: Clarification that this is simply raising the cap and no obligation to allocate funding is being stated.

Betty Z: Lab fund is competitive as is and having clubs compete against the students makes it too difficult for students, engsoc should support the clubs.

Julia F: If we were to use this 20%, that would just be on just one fifth of the student body (club students), which is a small number of students. Believes it is partly the onus of the clubs themselves to raise their own money for their own sake

Sarah R: One alternative funding for clubs is CEPS PDR. It is engsoc's responsibility to provide funding for clubs.

Steph W: Supports the amended motion. Has seen that clubs give a lot back to the engineering community. Years ago, there weren't the same number of large scale events run by clubs. Makes sense to dramatically increase budget if it is done carefully.

Kevin S: As mentioned, lots of clubs look externally for funding. As a member of GNCTR, we have petitioned CPES to get funding. It might be a good idea to increase funding, may need to implement a merit system to show that the money is being used to benefit students and not just clubs.

Kevin takes a long time to think of an amendment

Betty Zhao: As it currently stands, the 8% limit is hurting clubs significantly. My name is Betty by the way. The additional funding clubs need can be hard to find, puts a burden on execs of clubs and makes it hard for them to get new members. The point about 1/5 students being on clubs isn't a big deal, as not everything engsoc does benefits absolutely everybody.

25. Change timing of elections

Owner: Karine J

Karine J: This is a loophole I found while reading through the constitution. The current phrasing could apply to winter breaks not corresponding to the current winter semester.

Matthew Horn: As purpose of this is to make things more explicit, the motion should say "Winter semester of that year". It's good to have that explicitly stated in there, but could be redundant.

Motion to amend the motion to say 'Within the Winter semester of that year.' at the end of the motion.

Owner: Matthew Horn

Secunder: Steph W

Majority vote in favour, motion passes.

Hugh P: Do we know originally why election timings were moved?

Val B: The idea was that the person running for president would be elected in the Fall, so they would be in a better position to prepare if they were going on co-op in the Winter.

Val B: As current president, wasn't originally in favour of moving elections to the Fall. However, we are now in the position where we have nobody coming forward for current presidential elections, which will be opened up to student body as a whole. People who want to run for president seem to need more time to think about it.

Julia F: If this passes, will current presidential election occur in the Fall or the Winter?

Steph W: Closing for nominations for presidency is tomorrow. What will happen?

Matt S: Personal opinion is that if motion to have motions at AGM pass immediately passes, then this motion must come into play immediately.

Val B: Immediately does not mean right now, there is still some delay, does not necessarily mean things take effect tomorrow, would take effect next semester.

Motion to amend the original motion to take effect immediately

Owner: Val B

Secunder: Matt C

Val B: Wants to change role because you need an engsoc position to run for president. Currently, the presidential election has nobody on engsoc running and position will open up to student body as a whole. Somebody who is not the best for the presidential position could get the position.

Steph W: Currently we have 2 presidential nomination forms being filled out.

Matt S: There are actually 5 nomination sheets out there, possibly all going to be submitted.

17 vote in favour

None against

Motion to amend the original motion to have the word "Immediately" added in passes.

Julia F: You need to have held an engsoc position previously to run for president, can commissioners run?

Karine J: No.