

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, conclusions
- Q: is the response to the survey too low to be representative? A: It's what we've got

3:50 – OE3C donation presentation by S. Colborne

- History, grad student role, precedent of grad student donations @ other universities, expectation, request (\$50 to student award), contribution will be put on website & announced, attendance, *not* all E&E

3:55 – OE3C opened to discussion

- Q: representation of Western biograd streams? A: four undergrads, two outside E&E, rest E&E
- Q: point of information re conflict of interest. M. Vankoughnett: cannot vote if presenting at OE3C

3:58 – call the question, voting on Motion 1

- 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 – B. Sutton-Quaid friendly amendment to own report: accidentally pasted exit times for meeting where everyone stayed the whole time

4:17 – B. Sutton-Quaid to social committee: alcohol allowed @ events? A: No

4:18 – C. Austin: Moehring email re possibility of sexual assault @ remote field sites

- 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 .