Purdue Graduate Student Senate (PGSS)

LRC Meeting Minutes

2nd Emergency Meeting
Wednesday, November 22nd, 2023, 2:04 PM
Location: Zoom

AGENDA

- **I. Call to Order**
  - **a.** 2:04 PM
- **II. Roll Call***
  - **a.** Quorum met:
    - **i.** Andrew Mitchell [Parliamentarian, LRC Chair]
    - **ii.** Titiksha Wagh [LRC Vice Chair]
    - **iii.** Jacob White [Recorder]
    - **iv.** James Emery
    - **v.** Christopher Barber
    - **vi.** Victor Gutierrez-Schultz
    - **vii.** Rae Silver
  - **b.** Other attendees who joined later:
    - **i.** Josiah [Senate Chair]
- **III. Approval of Minutes**
  - **a.** Skipped (not a regularly scheduled meeting)
- **IV. Approval of the Agenda**
  - **a.** Skipped (no formal agenda)
- **V. Parliamentarian Report**
  - **a.** LRC send back revisions on 5pg report to PRO on MHAW.
    - **i.** No current objections to discuss from LRC.
- **VI. Old Business**
  - **a.** Skipped (not a regularly scheduled meeting)
- **VII. New Business**
  - **a. Revising LRC Summary of PRO & PRC Duties in Response to PR Protocols**
    - **i.** Chris: Point of information, did someone reach out to Parliamentarian to request to this decision or was there a debate?
      1. Parli: Not officially, but discussed at last Senate meeting.
      2. Clarification needed, and within LRC constitutional duties to do so?
         a. No objections.
    - **ii.** Context of PR Protocols discussion
      1. Parli: See 11/10 PR Protocols here (https://web.archive.org/web/20231231164246/https://purduegradstudents.com/pr-team/)

2. PR duties separately outlined: PRO in Constitution, PRC in FA21-B001.
    a. Parli: 11/10 PR Protocols are still unconstitutional and include clause saying updates must reference Constitution?
        i. Unanimous consent.
    b. Amendments to PRO duties in Constitution may be discussed at a later date.

iii. Rae: Difference between Protocols and Code of Operations (CoO)?
1. Parli: LRC is the only team/committee with established CoO.
2. Protocols are not for internal operations, but for interfacing with external groups within PGSG.
3. Protocols free to set as they wish, but cannot refuse to perform duties required by governing documents.

iv. PRO Duties "Under the Direction of" and formalities of oversight
1. Parli: Section 9 of Constitution states PRO's duties and powers are "under the direction of the President and the Executive Board". 2 interpretations, does this require a written motion to be binding or not?
2. Parli: Formal written motion, or request from E-Board? Even if taking recs, bound by formal resolutions.
3. Jacob: Meaning of formal vs. informal here?
    a. Parli: Any body can pass a motion/resolution. If e.g. the E-Board does so, more formal to compel as voted on in item of business. Informal makes it more of a discussion, not legislative concern.
4. Jacob: Clarify on "vote as an item of business"?
    a. Parli: Not Senate floor (though also empowered to do so), an item internal to E-Board.
5. Titiksha: Opinion, ideally quid pro quo, i.e. general respect to do what is asked without doing what is formally required.
    a. Parli: Agreed this is the best policy, but is E-Board asking PRO a requirement or recommendation?
    b. Titiksha: PRO has duties to ensure PRC duties upheld even if not duties shared as PRO.
        i. Parli: Section of Constitution?
        ii. Jacob, Chris, Josiah concurs with Titiksha – "under the direction…" has some latitude but, when requests from body above them this is binding. Not much discretion when supervisor makes request of your official duties.
        iii. Chris suggests a sentence clarifying transparency of how might be good – upheld by FA21-B001 currently.
    c. James: So recommendation vs. requirement depends on if there's power differential between PRO and President & equality of rank among E-Board? What direction does this follow?
        i. Parliamentarian: President set apart here so has more say/power yes. As Chair of the E-Board, also its leader.

d. Chris: Limitations of President's asking power? Could they command PRO to do something that violates other duty? Adjudication via e.g. the Senate within their binding duties?
    i. Parli: More extreme example, barring PRO from sharing about other teams, a duty explicitly requested to do.
    ii. Legislative. Good faith recommendations taken without legislative pathway, but won't always be the case.
    iii. Jacob: Other hypothetical example, E-Board chairs of other teams offloading their own responsibilities and not giving input to PRO to develop publicity material.
    iv. Parli: "in good faith" not legislatively binding, very much should but not mandated to perform without formal written motions/requirements.
    v. Josiah: Consider something other than legislative so not all on the Senate Clerk / floor for every written motion for PRO or other E-Board not fulfilling duties.

v. Sections ABCHIJ
1. No objections or comments.

vi. Section D.
1. By recommendation of President and/or E-Board, not explicit approval. Not sure it is a requirement as it is a consultation – not a binding phrase.
    a. Josiah: Suggested comment about giving notice.
    b. Parli: Constitutionally, notice of the creation, but not officially what/how it went out.
    c. Josiah: Agreed, as long as PGSG is not blindsighted.
    d. Parli: E-Board should be made aware.
    e. Chris: What about on finer points that don't need to go through President and E-Board?
        i. Parli: Small edits in good faith, notice goes through PRO updates to E-Board and Senate – e.g. intent to redesign. Granularity to notify shouldn't need to be indicated, but if it does then it should be done so formally.
        ii. Chris: Agreed,hope is to not adjudicate unless necessary.

vii. Section EF
1. PRO: "facilitate" is "to make easier". PRO is not the only person responsible for publicity and, as such, interpreting to mean the PRO cannot gatekeep publicity tools or media. Requesting release of passwords and limited access via website is of particular interest, as PRO has not offered GRAC Chair access to the website.
    a. Chris: Context germane to this decision would re-litigate previous decisions somewhat. Is this part of a broader discussion, and can we add this to the context of the situation? If someone else outside PGSG read this, they might think this section is off-track.

b. Parli: Legislation (FA23-R005?) defines the scope of this ruling, but context might be difficult de-classify for public.
c. Chris: If Senators here thinks it's fine for people handling this to have appropriate context, then it's fine.
d. Rae: Passwords a bit out of nowhere but, if it is permissible to leave in the passwords case in anticipation of future issues, it might be fine to leave this in.

viii. Section G

1. Parli: "such as" implies the list of duties is non-exhaustive.
    a. Josiah: "such as, but not limited to" to clarify as not restrictive.
    b. Parli: Should clarify in future via Constitution, but fine as-is?
2. PRO list of options to communicate with public
    a. Chris & Parli discuss "such as" vs. "including" usage
    b. Chris: Reading Constitution more on how the PRO may facilitate communication with the broader public (Section F). Here, no issue if they can't substitute with other comm. methods.
        i. Titiksha and Jacob and Parli concur.
        ii. Chris: Consider adding "provided it does not interfere with their other duties" wording for this context, certain modes of communication constitutional in some times and not in others.
3. Parli: "Promote and publicize", Protocols interpret "media" as in formats and not "objects" -- misconstrued by PRO / PRC precedent.
    a. Jacob: I interpreted "publicize" differently: as in "help make public and distribute", not always making pieces of media.
    b. Titiksha opposes. Making them public is job of PRO. As head of PRC, they don't have to make them directly.
        i. Jacob concurs, if their only duty is indirect, to oversee & ensure PRC accomplishes its duties.
        ii. Titiksha: Differentiating PRC and PRO roles of PRO is good, but if PRC cannot fulfil duty in time the rest of responsibility does indeed transfer to PRO, as a general interpretation of leadership. E.g. 5-6 members of PR Committee unable to generate flyers, etc. That does not mean that PRO can't offload to other team members, but their hole to help "ease in" too.
    c. Josiah: Agree in part, and at the core of a lot of this dispute -- must note carefully PRO as officer vs. role as chair of PRC. As PRO is not required to create from scratch, up to them to designate duties to complete as such. E.g. with templates of flyers, request of team & committee somewhat responsible for this as well. Correspondents for PR to direct public requests etc.
    d. Parli and LRC discussed edits to clarify this point of 2 roles.

e. Josiah: Add caveat about the "should they not delegate these duties to the PR Committee…" then as a member and leader of that committee it does land on them.
    i. Chris concurs with Josiah.
f. Chris: As far as the other point, balance the clarity of Teams creating flyers and provide some guidelines/recommendations for Constitutional amendments toward the end, regarding to what degree they create flyers themselves, e.g. creating it in-team and sending to PR team to publish. Should be left to Senate, and we can recommend that?
    i. Chris and Jacob concur, Rae dissents.
g. Rae: Depends on timeframe of recommendation (maybe gives latitude for PRO to push work onto teams instead of pushing to increase PR Committee's capacity). Clearly they should be available to take some of the burden off.
    i. Titiksha: Maybe rephrase to say they may "choose" to.

ix. PR Committee duties
1. Parli: To clarify, PR Committee's establishment under FA21-B001 act as their governing documents for defining its duty and scope.
2. Jacob: Add in a paragraph or sentence to our response emphasizing the PRO's duties as chair of the PR committee to ensure the committee completes duties as a committee body.

x. Parli to make grammatical changes and update summary soon, then release to Senate Chair to introduce in next week's Senate meeting.

xi. All those in favor of passing this opinion as written, with grammatical changes and summary updates as needed.
1. 6-0-1 in favor. (LRC Chair abstains.)

VIII. Open Forum

IX. Adjournment

a. Adjourned 3:31 PM