SOBGS Annual General Meeting

Minutes taken by: Matthew Turnbull

April 25th, 2013

3:36pm - meeting called to order

3:37pm - ratification of agenda

- Unanimously passed

3:38 - announcements and budget presentation by M. Vankoughnett

- Sources of revenue, expenses, surplus/float, projected budget
- Q: bbq cost? A: ~\$65, included.
- Q: how many people @ lunch? A: ~16-18.
- Q: will this affect department subsidy? A: Probably not + we have things to spend on e.g.
 prizes/poster boards
- 3:44 funds survey presentation by B. Sutton-Quaid
 - Respondents, weighting, results, condusion # 11.04r5() [)-8(u)3(si)-8GETBT/ # 11.04 Tf1 0(11.04r5()1.T11 267.0-

- 13 for, 7 abstentions, none against, motion passes
- 4:01 can't vote on Motion 2, only 6 members present who are not in conflict
- 4:02 constitution and bylaws taken as read
 - S. Colborne: Finance 10.1.2 re "all Society members" for spending of funds
 - o moves to strike the word "all"
 - Q: open to individual abuse? A: 10.3 guards against this
 - Q: strike whole line? A: no, still necessary
- 4:10 amendment to strike the word "all" from 10.1.2: unanimous consent
 - B. Sutton-Quaid: change language to reflect "equitable" among streams
 - o "The Society shall use its funds only for events and initiatives that **shall be** proportionately equitable among streams of the department."
 - Q: define equitable. Proportional? A: open to interpretation
 - One against, equitable is too subjective
 - B. Sutton-Quaid: amend to include "proportionately"
 - Q: could streams still apply for their share of funds even if others aren't using their share? A: yes
 - Amendment passes w/ unanimous consent
- 4:15 vote to pass amended constitution and bylaws (Motion 3)
 - Passes with unanimous consent
- 4:16 committee reports treated as read
- 4:16 -

- Discussion, potential for collecting data w/i department, does appear to be a problem here, could make recommendations to chair if data collected, should a survey be circulated?
- Q: will SOBGS do this? A: no, Chris and Amanda will work w/ teaching center to generate
- Q: only our department? A: start small, see if it works, share w/ other departments
- Q: universities have policies, so hasn't this problem been addressed & protocol already exists?

 A: yes, we've been trained, but this is more specific to our department b/c of field sites where
 it's harder to track/supervise
- Q: will this survey gather evidence that this is an ongoing issue besides policy? A: exactly, anonymous evidence, not individual stories. We do have an ombudsperson.
- Q: keep survey format anonymous, be specific w/ questions. A: good point, open to advice
- Comment: delineate harassment vs assault, contact original study author
- Comment: this is a university-level problem which is being worked on, this is a bigger problem
- C. Austin: proposing to send out email asking for question suggestions, then survey compiled & sent
- Q: should the survey include questions regarding discrimination? A: more data is better, many people don't know that this is a problem
- 4:30 Meeting adjourned.