Purdue Graduate Student Government
Est. 1985

Purdue Graduate Student Senate (PGSS)

LRC Meeting Minutes

10th Meeting
Thursday, April 4th, 2024, 6:28 PM
Location: PGSC 108

AGENDA

I. **Call to Order**
   a. **6:28 PM**
II. **Roll Call***
   a. **LRC voting members – 5 present**
      i. Andrew [Parliamentarian]
      ii. Jacob [Recorder]
      iii. Victor
      iv. Chris
      v. Titiksha [LRC VC]
   b. Quorum met
III. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. Parli: Considering all five (5) minutes within consent agenda, considered together.
      i. Includes November 8th, 2023 minutes.
   b. Jacob: Motion to waive reading of all minutes.
      i. Seconded by Titiksha, none opposed.
   c. Parli: Any amendments to 5 sets of minutes?
      i. None proposed.
   d. Titiksha motions to approve 5 sets of meeting minutes.
      i. Seconded by Chris, none opposed.
      ii. Approved by unanimous consent.
IV. **Approval of the Agenda**
   a. Titiksha motions to approve agenda, Chris seconds.
      i. No opposition, approved.
V. **Special Order New Business: Small Research Grant Bundle**
   a. **Resolution R00X1 – Resolution Establishing the Small Research Grant (Victor)**
      i. Presented by Victor with written permission from authors of the bill, considered together.
      ii. Victor: Fund to support individual's research. Tier 1 $750, Tier 2 $500, Tier 3 $250 for discretionary funds.
      iii. Chris: Unfunded is leading cause of stress of students in academia. When we had discussed this in LRC, re-legislating since it was not re-introduced since last year. Do not recall what had emerged from conversation on this case.
         1. Chris and Victor makes friendly amendment to change "leading cause" to "cause [of stress]" to make it slightly less controversial.

iv. Parli: More for humanities students based on my understanding of research funding.
    1. Chris: Based on my understanding, could roll together but could see utility in taking advantage of this.
v. Parli: Based on what footnote says, we do unfunded research. This is a crucial part of grant application process, needs preliminary studies. This grant might be better geared toward this effect.
    1. Victor: Agreed, this could help you get your preliminary data.
vi. Parli: $750 not much especially not for STEM but…
    1. Chris: Perhaps, could be used to support buying necessary software.
vii. Parli: Paid to PI's account. Disbursement funds by GRAC chair following team voting procedures on funding presented by Small Research Grants VC.
viii. Chris: Voted on as Bundle as well? How are they tied together as enactment legislation?
    1. Parli: Up to Josiah.
    2. Chris: Asking because changing name of Professional Development VC to Professional Development and Small Research Grant VC
    3. Parli: My position is two (2) positions held concurrently – If elected for one, paid for both, responsible for both.
    4. Chris: If done separately, Resolution appealing to VC chair not yet changed in FCO.
    5. Parli: Way around that is concurrence or enactment (Jacob: trigger) clause.
    6. Chris + Parli: Anything is fine but they're referred to by different position titles each time – how do the roles shape up?
        a. Parli: Resolution as one name.
ix. Parli: Aside, combine two…?
    1. Chris and Victor agree.
    2. Parli: We will get to this later, but does ProfDev & Small Research Grant VC title need to change in accordance with this.
    3. All LRC suggests friendly amendment to say Professional Development VC is responsible for managing Small Research Grants as well, and also coincides with rename to above.
    4. Parli: They want name change, and transitions are the hard parts.
    5. Parli: Complicating factor is that Elnara works in GRAC for a grant not being dispersed.
        a. Chris: Accessibility grant.
        b. Parli: Then less concern to combine ones that are not already filled.
    6. Chris: Clarified in Bill, not in Resolution.
    7. Chris + Jacob: Include trigger clause in Resolution with intended names that Resolution only takes effect following the package.
    8. Friendly amendment by LRC to make changes fixing typo.

9. Parli makes friendly amendment that all rights are reserved by the student/**research group** receiving the grant. Is that inclusive to Humanities research?
    a. Others in LRC think research group is most inclusive and least restrictive to humanities majors.
10. Friendly amendment by Parli and Jacob to add trigger clause in Resolution to not go into effect following the passage of legislation regarding the funding and oversight of Small Research Grant.
11. Titiksha: Is this pending approval from BOSO and SAO as well?
    a. Parli: Likely yes, have given input to not be immediately shooting down, but these changes are unlikely to be important. But we should still let them know to ensure it's still consistent across changes and versions.
12. Parli: Any objections to move to vote as constitutional?
    a. No opposition.
    b. Chair is not in doubt, passed with unanimous consent.

b. Bill B00X1 – Funding the Small Research Grant (Victor)

i. Victor: Talking about combining small researc hgrant bills, but maybe keep separate after all? This talks about allocation $10,000, other changes Financial Code.
    1. Chris: Some overlapping language in how much money paid though, superfluous language which might confuse Senate.

ii. Titiksha: How does intent differ from Resolution?
    1. Victor: Resolution sets what it is, this is to set aside funding.
    2. Titiksha: If 6 months along, sure, but don't understand point of one before the other. If same info from in resolution and bills, why not combine into one?
    3. Jacob + Parli: Cannot combine the Resolution and the Bill together, but can combine the two Bills together.

iii. Parli: Resolution includes language for application and review – the point is the Appendices to inform GRAC how it will be run. GRAC does not currently have Code of Operations however.

iv. Chris: Question second Enacted clause, but new one used further down, should we adjust language to allocate responsibilities to "Professional Development GRAC Vice Chair", name change reflected there too?
    1. Friendly amendment by LRC to maintain continuity across bills and remove superfluous enacted clauses already established.

v. Parli: Was intention to double dip with 2x pay for 2 roles going to one person?
    1. Victor: I don't believe that was the intention.
    2. Parli: Payment of $500 per year claim is false and must be stricken, and same for Diversity Officer. Vice Chair of Diversity Committee is elected with no specified pay. Public Relations Vice chair does not get paid. Vice Chair of PRC paid, appointed by PRO. The Vice Chair of PRC elected by the committee as of today on the floor.

3. Parli: We won't know how Senate Floor will change currently introduced bill on the floor to change officer positions' pay, and diligently kept the change $0.
4. Titiksha: Agreed, title already exists and say in amendment of FCO to add this in.
5. LRC and Victor agree that since pending legislation dealing with that clause, agreed to let other legislation handle that.

vi. Parli: Repeat clauses can be kept, allowable as context and safer to say that authored by GRAC chair following GRAC Team voting procedures. This legislates it in lieu of GRAC CoO, more grounded in Bill but still necessary to include in Legislation.

vii. Parli makes friendly amendment to modify final clause of Bill to have amendments to FCO made codify the management of the Small Research Grant, and copy-paste 3rd Bill's clause (also FCO) into 2nd.

viii. Titiksha: What if waiting period, Senate meets, one side gets passed but one hasn't?

1. Parli: We want separate so it doesn't make amendments but calls for them to be made.
2. Parli motions for 5 minute recess (until 7:39p), Victor seconds.
    a. Approved by unanimous consent.
    b. Parli calls meeting back to order at 7:39p.
3. Resolution makes no changes to governing documents and calls for changes to be made – a budget amendment with additional enactments, can be introduced and passed in a single Senate meeting session.
4. By renaming, becomes FCO with that intent. Resolution passed but not enacted until triggered by legislated FCO amendment itself, FCO is the causal enactment.
5. Parli: Can establish and allot budget in single session, but untouchable unless the second piece of legislation passes because the resolution. Won't kick in with the application unless FCO amendments made. Does anyone oppose?
    a. Chris: Does that have bearing on if e.g. bill passes, would be inverting?
    b. Parli: Bill **could** come before. This is slightly against common historical precedent of Resolution calling for legislation but, since waiting for FCO amendments to come into grant, Bill not sufficient for grant dispersal officially. Can establish allocation in budget and define who is responsible at GRAC level (not governing document issue).
    c. Parli: Intent to include trigger clause in 2nd Bill to disperse the clause, in order to establish the grant this year and disperse and figure out details next year if needed. Can put resolution in this year as well, and release

d. Chris: Only possible objection, small issue, is Senators' choice ot having it all dependant on following those final details.
e. Parli: Hope to see the need and figure out their details as needed. Hopefully they would agree it exists, up to them on details.
f. LRC all in full agreement that 1st Bill is standalone + good idea.

ix. First bill standalone without resolution.
x. No objection move into a vote.
1. All in favor of passage, Chair is not in doubt, referred to Senate.

c. Bill B00X2 – Amendments to the Financial Code of Operations (Victor)

i. Chris: Vice Chair / Travel grant ordered same as FCO, is that fine?
1. Chris + Parli: Yes.
ii. Titiksha: This 2nd Bill to increase bill to scholarship commensurate to Bill since if you're on this bill you are on the other one. In extension to the other one?
1. Victor: The way I understand it, add it to the list of FCO, but contrary to the other bill I am also sponsoring.
iii. Chris: Changes to FCO being made that this Grant is there. Amendment, to make in alignment with deciding not to increase the pay.
iv. Parli: Would it be appropriate to amend to strike positions related to salaries in the event something passes in FCO? Eliminate changes so bill we talked about isn't redundant or made inconsistent, at Victor's discretion. Send to Senate Chair in advance in the event Senate Bill regarding FCO pay passes with satisfactory funding for the Chairs (if not, might still want these amounts :)
1. Parli: Leave in the moment in contingency those changes do not pass.
2. Victor: Focus just striking FCO, to ensure not essential to distribute the small research grant.
3. Parli: "In absence of passage of any other legislation, passage inherently strikes 5th enactment clause, only in the absence of the passage of any other legislation…"
4. Chris: Triggered by other bill currently on floor?
v. Parli: If 1st legislation doesn't pass, different Budget to fund for Resolution to kick in. But budget for 1st year, having allocation for this already suffices for funding with Bill then for Oversight. May need to re-consider if not.
1. Chris: Vice Chair overseeing grant not sufficient?
2. Parli: Could be, but…
3. Might strike many of the Whereas clauses (only 1 and 2 kept)
vi. Parli makes friendly amendment so passage of Resolution intent makes this 2nd Bill go into effect (and vice versa). When you pass one, both immediately enacted / in effect once the 2nd passes.
vii. Titiksha: Will get eliminated once that passes?
1. Parli: Yes, without an amendment or vote due to the trigger term in the clause itself.
2. Parli: Amendment in order, for changing name and not allocation. Once other passes, we'd know amount but not name, so enact amendment to

change line from “Professional Development Grant” to “Professional Development and Small Research Grant”.

viii. Parli and Chris argue trigger clause for the “absence of the passage of other legislation”.

ix. No objection to vote, none opposed to passage.

VI. Parliamentarian Report

a. Keep up good work LRC, 24 points tonight and 1 more round of swag!

b. Points to write legislation off the table, but sponsoring perhaps still viable.

c. 3 categories for LRC – non-team night meetings (2 hr volunteering), authoring requested legislation at Parliamentarian’s legislation, sponsoring requested legislation with executive author (incl. LRC) or other significant contribution.

VII. Old Business

a. Career Team Dissolution (Josiah)

i. Tabled pending an amendment, no such amendment was distributed to LRC.

b. Const Division of Powers in Committees (Andrew)

c. Bylaws Division of Powers in Committees (Andrew)

i. Parli: Division of Powers blurry, mission to fix this. No member of Executive in Legislative and vice versa, but with checks and balances within both.

1. Teams and Committees divided, which I had done previously. Many issues within our organization to sort through. Step 1) Establish Senate leadership, as referenced in other legislation and not formally defined who this is. Important for later referencing.
2. Removing from Executive Board all Senate Leadership – not just Senate Chairs and Senate Clerk, but ALSO Team and Committee Chairs.
3. Potential concern, few Executive Board Officers.
4. Specifying internal and external elections, PGSG’s purview is internal elections
    a. External is Senate (if applicable).
    b. Team and Committee chairs not elected by Senate.
5. Duties taken out of election section.
6. Green highlight pulled up from Executive section verbatim to Legislative section, clarifying Senate Chair’s duties defined in Legislative.
7. Pulling up referenced sections of election.
8. Establishing powers of Senate Clerk which do not exist, also Committee Chairs scattered across governing documents.
9. Senate given only power of Legislative not Executive Committees. Is that proper balance of power? A great question…!
    a. Chris: Draft updating based on changes continually?
    b. Parli: A potential logical way to separate Legislative and Executive. Leaders of Legislative currently defined in Executive Branch, Senate Chair being Executive Officer.
    c. Cris: Unlikely to vote on this tonight, but generate feedback, questions, ideas, practicalities deserved for later formatting and discussion.

ii. Parli: Exec Board currently worded that Senate cannot touch Executive Committees (established ad-hoc by Committee or otherwise), Senate can only

affect Executive with approval of Executive Board. Power to abolish executive committees, or overreach?

1. Titiksha: Overreach: Executive Board decided to create new Committee for Indianapolis student representation to figure out how to better incorporate into PGSG. Can create ad-hoc or established as an implied power. Established or abolished not establish for Executive Committees, but different problem.
2. Chris: When it comes to grand policy, Executive Committee itself can make changes, and any bill can go through Senate legislation?
3. Parli: Currently, interpretation of Teams as Executive Committees and Teams and Legislative Committees and Teams. Could hold additional programming committees beyond current. For example, no Career Team fair, but still wants PGSG Career Fair, Executive Committee to hold Career Fair.
4. Chris: Say that E-Board made 5 new Teams like Legislative and spend all their money on food. Would they still have to go through legislation?
    a. Parli: Already has lots of money in budget sitting on, Executive Board $3000 conference, $6000 grad and professional, $1200 grad student pint night programming, $3300 Homecoming and Outreach to use those funds.
    b. Chris: Predicated on approval of budget by Senate?
    c. Parli: Yes, but Treasurer check to set budget.
    d. Chris: If Senate overrules, is this practical oversight / checks.
    e. Parli: Plays a factor, but inherent human laziness (and trust) to not rework since Senate gets ultimate say in this.
5. Parli: Few Small changes, with power to dissolve ⅔ Executive Committee vote, any appointments made by Exec Board members also need Senate Board members. Since Parliamentarian is appointed by Exec Board
    a. Chris: With additional checks and balances, given checks and balances to dissolve.

iii. Titiksha: Could you explain in general (NOT wrt PGSG) duties and responsibilities of Executive Boards in concept?

1. Parli: For example, in US tasked with enforcement to carry out laws passed. Legislative interfaces with administration a lot, President or their designee gets the face-time here. Legislative branch can impact Executive to put out a statement or pass on details to committees, etc. Exec Board interfaces with these various parties.
2. Titiksha: Then why are Teams and Committees part of Legislative? Lfe etc. not making laws and policies, it's from the Senate.
3. Titiksha: Senate doesn't plan grad picnic, but within their powers do so! Defer to committee derived from the blessing of the Senate. Committees send to LRC first simply to cut down work they have to do by delegation.
4. This takes away so Legislative doesn't take a way. A seat and a voice still, but no longer a vote within Legislative. Their vote by their members in the Senate which they may or may not have.

iv. Chris: Not for passage but hypothetical, say many allegations but someone wants to know what happened. How to form an investigation committee…?

1. Parli: Supposed to establish committee to handle investigation by enactment of resolution.
2. Chris: Could Executive Committee do this in and among themselves, with resolution for certain guidances for certain parties? Power and enforcement privy to other Constitution, but Legis vs. Exec based on whose idea…?
3. Parli: Constitution dictates Senate conflicts dealt by Exec Board unless dealt by Exec Board, then Senate directly Senate committee for Exec Board allegation. These committee members could also be Senators, no barring from people who chair it but by request of Exec Board only. Senate could not constitutionally establish committee with investigation handling Senate alone. Committee issues report and recommends allegations to levy charges and give notice / recommendations for a trial to be held, with Roberts Rules.
4. Chris: All of enforcement, controversy, group to see what happened, improper to investigate internal to Senate. In theory, handled by impartial third point in Executive Board

v. Parli: Composition of executive branch, strip all non exec board officers of vote, but still position on Exec Board.
   1. Senate Leadership as defined before or their designee as ex officio non-voting members. Of course also full voting Executive Voters, but Parliamentarian non-voting.
   2. Ex officio means only position by virtue of other position. Not appointed, appointed to position default to committee.
      a. Parliamentarian voting ex officio of LRC.
   3. Chief of Staff, since teams no longer Exec Board purview, reestablishes balance. Establishes balance of powers of appointees to teams and takes burden off Senate chair. Lets them focus on what they see most important as well.
   4. Chris: Senate Leadership currently full voting members of e-board – Team and Committee members both toward impartiality, don't vote legislative?
      a. Parli: Why vote on Executive Committee if not member of that branch? Why have power in a branch if not in, but voice is important for Executive Board to have voice.
   5. Titiksha: Regarding team and committee attendance – for Executive Board members only required to attend where serving as chair. But for executive meetings, all voting members required to attend.
      a. If team members non-voting, can we still require them to attend?
      b. Parli: Yes we do and include duties to have all Senate and Executive Board. That is not currently the case.

vi. Parli: Back to chief of staff, directly oversees management of committees besides Exec Board (President), assist Senate Chair in oversight of Legislative Committees. Senate Chair head of legislative.
   1. Titiksha: A lot of responsibility?
   2. Parli: Is REQUIRED to assist – MUST advise and assist. A fight for another day! But outright and explicit.
   3. Titiksha: Currently, if team not functioning the point of blame switches to Senate Chair, but can delegate to say COO neglecting to assist me.

Section 8 subsection E, if needs strongly. Executive Officer overseeing Legislative committee
4. Titiksha: Have one elected to handle this.
5. Parli: Re-instantiate Senate Vice Chair then?
6. Jacob: Then what's the point of COS? Handle Executive Committees that don't exist beyond Exec Board & Elections Committee?

vii. Parli: Finally, trigger clause for Bylaws changes. That's it.
1. Parli: Getting rid of "Or Team" everywhere, reaffirming non-voting executive for committee chairs.
2. Parli: Appoint Directors as needed as distinct from Vice Chairs
3. Parli: Thing reference in Appendix that does not exist. Underlying goal to remove this Appendix, templates for minutes provided by Senate Clerk.
4. Provide committee requirements to COS?

viii. To keep balance of powers, COS still in charge of assigning all Senators to Committees, controlling who goes where so Executive Board to see where priorities lie in terms of Executive Board.
1. Jacob + Titiksha I like that.
2. Parli: Consider adding to Senate Vice Chair.

ix. Clarifying legislative committees – Advisors.
1. Parliamentarian no longer Chair, Advisor to LRC. This is the way where Parli in undergrad operated – Operations Committee for first meeting run by Advisor until Chair took place, got to be a loud mouth. Trained to become presidents :)
2. Titiksha: A way to have one exception for Parliamentarian.
3. Parli: Bad idea – advisor still input on constitutionality and wisdom associated with that.
4. Vice Chair changes struck since no longer Exec Board not this.
5. Victor: If now advisor to LRC, could be incompetent person leading LRC ignoring advice of Parliamentarian.
6. Parliamentarian still gets check on constitutionality in senate, just shooting down its own LRC and threaten for blocks in the Senate.
7. Codifying Public Relations Committee.
    a. Titiksha: Public Relations Officer as head of PRC?
    b. Now advisor of public relations committee – parallel!
    c. All Executive Branch now advisors! Treasurer advises GRAC, Diversity officer diversity, Career Community Life divided Pres, COS, LAO at discretion of those 3 people. One must advise one depending on experience. LRC is Parliamentarian advisor. Senate Chair can advise Elections Committee even if probably also Chair. Senate Chair advises Executive Committee.
    d. Just an idea, not currently in there but Senate Chair.
8. Succession of Duties changes drastically, things around committees don't need to go there….

x. If 3 exec officers vacated in 1 month, special of Senate elected.
1. Expulsion of Legislative Leadership since not Executive but identical wording. Dropped 3 to 2 because Executive Officers drop 12 to 6. Expulsion of Legislative leadership is same thing but for Legislative too.
2. Senate Chair and President check each other for expulsion.

    a. If they both collude, Parliamentarian?
3. Impeachment, what exactly would procedures be? Median automatic grounds for expulsion, vote to complete that? Roberts' Rules. 61, 62, 63 disciplinary. Wise to signpost that.
4. Idea: Buy Roberts Rules of order for Senators?
5. Titiksha po President, COS, LAO, Treasurer, Diversity Officer, PRO.
    a. Titiksha with these officers advising, can we create Community chair for community, etc. to add 3 new to be said advisors? Or, alternatively, if teams no longer needed, 1 position to oversee or advise all teams that do not already have their own advisor.
    b. Really need to be in the room to advise, hard to do multiple. Ideally more officers, but biggest problem is already biggest problem is getting more leadership and doubling it.
    c. Parli: Give it a year, see how it works and, if needed, make changes. Diplomatic answer.
    d. Chris: We can always more positions, can add from afar.
6. Victor: What's the worst that can happen?
    a. Parli: Can still be re-introduced this year. Parli willing to come to meetings where it's discussed to represent as author.
    b. Parli: Must maintain impartiality. Not in defense, but pointed comments on constitutionality. Relies on LRC to defend it in that sense.
7. Chris: Adjustments beyond content, not against voting but fairly long-term. If goes until next semester not worst thing in the world.
    a. Senate Clerk not allowed vote.
8. Parli: Get rid of all the shall's to replace with must or should.
9. Parli: Concerning barring from passage, keeping in mind that barring current docket, no way for Senators to see it. Only benefit is it's in record as failed
10. Titiksha: Motion to mote to a vote on Constitution bill, Victor seconds.
    a. All in favor of passing to senate. Parli abstains.
    b. Passes by unanimous consent.
11. Chris: Motion to move to a vote on Bylaws bill, Victor seconds.
    a. All in favor to passing to senate. Parli abstains.
    b. Passes by unanimous consent.

VIII. New Business

a. Constitution and Bylaw Review report

i. Parli: We are required to make a report on Constitutional and Bylaws review! Parli will start and LRC will all collaborate on for entirety of next team night.
ii. Parli: Due by end of April 24th (final Senate meeting), compiled into Annual Report between Executive Boards with no specified format.
iii. Chris: Will our concerns be reflected?
    1. Parli: Envision as Concerns, legislation and concerns it addresses. This addresses from Chemistry senator. Merged with concerns from LRC on difference between Committees and Teams, on the ground of teams and committees the most mingled and in need of division of powers.
iv. Parli: Will also include what we didn't do that we should do this year – a roadmap. Up to LRC for constitutional review next year.

v. Motion to table by Jacob, Chris seconds.
    1. None in opposition, tabled.

IX. Open Forum

X. Adjournment

- **a.** Jacob motions to adjourn, Chris seconded.
- **b.** ⅔ vote to adjourn, none in opposition.
- **c.** Adjourned 9:30 PM