



Purdue Graduate Student Senate (PGSS)

Twelfth Meeting

Wednesday, March 27th, 2024; 6:00 PM - **End Time: 9:00 PM**

Rawls Hall - Room 1062

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

- a. Meeting Called to Order at 6:05 pm

II. Roll Call*

- a. Announcement of Newly Elected Senators and Alternates

- i. New Senator for TLI – Elnara Mammadova

- b. Executive Officers

- i. Present

1. Parliamentarian
 2. Diversity Chair
 3. Senate Chair
 4. Community Team Chair
 5. Treasurer
 6. Legislative Affairs Officer
 7. President
 8. Chief of Staff
 9. Public Relations Officer

- ii. Not Present

1. Career Team Chair
 2. Life Team Chair
 3. Grant Review and Allocation Committee Chair

- c. 46 of 62 Senators present. Quorum is met

- i. Senator attendance will be appended to these minutes. (Appendix A)

III. Approval of Minutes (*General Consent*)

- a. No amendments to the minutes.
- b. Minutes approved by general consent

IV. Approval of the Agenda

- a. Amendments

- i. Motion to amend by the Senator from ECE – To move the consideration of Emergency Legislation above all other

1. Senate Chair – Bylaws state that emergency legislation will follow all new business on the agenda.

- a. This being said, you can still make a motion to move the consideration of emergency legislation after the emergency legislation is read and voted to be considered emergency legislation, but until then it has to remain after new business.

- b. Agenda approved by general consent

V. Consent Agenda (*any item may be removed by a single voice*)

- a. **Committee and Team Reports**
 - i. No Committee and Team Reports
 - b. **Other Reports**
 - i. No Other Reports
 - c. **Reports of University Committees and Boards**
 - i. No Reports of University Committees and Boards.
 - d. **Officer Reports - March 2024**
 - i. Officer Reports will be appended to these minutes (Appendix B)
 - e. No amendments to the Consent Agenda.
 - f. Consent Agenda approved by general consent.
- VI. Officer Report - Senate Chair, March 2024**
- a. The LRC meeting was an adventure – We have 9 legislation, 2 are pending and 3 were considered.
 - b. Elections will be handled at the next meeting, two weeks from today
 - i. Senate Chair was appointed as election coordinator
 - ii. Purdue Indianapolis students are able to run for any PGSG officer positions.
 - 1. One thing that will come up is how the Senate wants to interpret representation of Purdue Indianapolis students in the Senate.
 - 2. Despite this, there is one thing that definitively stands: Purdue Indianapolis Graduate Students can run for any positions within PGSG.
 - 3. The “requirement for previous service” will have to be waived for all Purdue Indianapolis students.
 - 4. This will be a hybrid meeting. It is still expected for Senators to be in person, unless certain circumstances come forward.
 - a. Since we have a completely new set of people who will run, nominations will have to be made at the next meeting by a senator. Potential candidates can submit their interest in the survey and we will handle formal nominations from Senators at the meeting.
 - i. This is also because students from Purdue Indianapolis will not have the same connections to Senators to receive nominations ahead of time.
 - iii. An email will go out about the elections.
 - c. Judicial authority of the Senate
 - i. The Senate has the authority to deal with any dispute that includes any member of the E-board. Anything else goes to the E-Board.
 - ii. Teams and committees are also able to deal with their disputes in house
 - 1. Note from the Parliamentarian – Please call attention to Section 61-63 of Robert's Rules of Order (henceforth shortened to “Robert’s Rules”) are the specific sections that deal with proceedings
 - a. Question from the Senator from TLI– how many people know what that section is about
 - i. Almost nobody.

- b. Question from the Senator from TLI – if nobody knows about the sections in Robert’s Rules that the parliamentarian refers to, how can we proceed with these policies?
- c. Parliamentarian – I am bringing attention to it now because it has been requested. We want to make it more accessible.
 - i. If you want access to Robert’s Rules, you can contact Parli and Senate Chair
- d. Follow-up from the Senator from TLI – This means that none of our Senators are aware of this policy and this is why this is needed in legislation or resolution or whatever.
 - i. This is a conflict. As the Parliamentarian, you never initiated making this process transparent to everyone.
 - ii. Now that we have something, legislation, to bring it to the floor, you are now saying “oh we have this.”
 - iii. Senate Chair – Every senator was on boarded with a document that included a brief overview of the constitution and bylaws in which they are expected to read. They are expected to familiarize themselves with the constitution and Bylaws.
 - 1. PGSG rules come from Robert’s Rules, unless otherwise noted, is in our constitution
 - 2. The Senate Chair, Parliamentarian, and President are not able to know everything. We can’t know what information is needed until it is asked about first.
 - a. The potential legislation is talking about making this transparent
 - b. This being said, Robert’s Rules is available and the rules will be abided by.
- e. Senator from ECE – will this substitute the discussion of the potential emergency legislation
 - i. Senate Chair – No, that discussion will happen at the proper time.
 - 1. The senate does not take up stuff on a whim/drop of a dime. This is important because the senate speaks for the entire student body.
 - 2. Emergency Legislation will need to be sent out to the entirety of the Senate before it will be heard.
- f. Senator from ECE – From what you just indicated here, is there a hierarchy where it should be resolved at the committee level, then the senate level?
 - i. Senate Chair – no, I said it can go to the committee level.

- g. Senator from ECE – resolving an issue at the committee level in which the chair of the committee is in the wrong?
 - i. Senate Chair – mal/non fisceanse can be dealt with on the Senate’s authority.
 - 1. We can talk about what is involved in recalling the election of a committee chair, but it is at the committee level, not at the Senate level.
- h. Senator from ECE – if the aggrieved member has an issue in PGSG, they have no policy as to how to proceed.
 - i. Senate Chair – Out of Order, this is a period of questions about the Chair’s officer report, so please ask a question.
- i. Senator from TLI – If the Parliamentarian claims that all of these policies are in Roberts Rules, why was this not mentioned when he was included in emails about these issues?
 - i. Point of Order – Senator from MSE – these discussions should happen in an executive session, not in public, when about a specific member of our government.
 - 1. Senate Chair – This is correct
 - ii. Senate Chair – Ruled out of order. Are there specific questions about this officer report?
- j. Question form Senator – how many Robert’s rules do we have, even though we do not have access to them
 - i. Parli – *holds up over 700-page book*
 - 1. I have brought this book to every meeting. I am accessible to all students to ask questions about the governing documents and Robert’s Rules, but I cannot know what information students need without them asking questions.
 - ii. Senate Chair – Robert’s Rules is loosely based on how the US Senate runs their proceedings
 - 1. Senators are not expected to know everything in Robert’s Rules. The Parliamentarian is the one who does research on Robert’s Rules so that they can answer your questions, but they also cannot know everything at the drop of a hat.
 - 2. This will be adjusted to fit certain situations.
 - 3. If you are looking for any situation that will be encountered, that will not happen.
- k. Period of questions on the Senate Chair’s Officer Report has ended.

VII. Old Business

- a. No old business.

VIII. New Business**

- a. **Introduction of Emergency Legislation**

- i. No Emergency Legislation at this time.
 1. Point of Privilege – Senator from ECE – what does the Parliamentarian mean that he has not been given legislation?
 - a. Parliamentarian – I have not been given legislation that is constitutional. I was given legislation earlier
 2. Point of Order – Senate Chair – we communicate with whoever submits it to us.
 - a. You have the rest of this session to work with Parli to submit constitutional legislation
 3. Senator from TLI – how do we proceed if parliamentarian has not told us it is not constitutional
 - a. Chair – Either correct the legislation to make it constitutional during this session or submit via normal legislation and LRC review
 4. ECE – Why are we unconstitutional?
 - a. Out of order: Parliamentarian conveyed reasoning to the submitting author. Not in order for discussion before this senate.
 5. TLI – how do we present our case when we were not told about Robert's Rules?
 - a. Parliamentarian can convey proper procedure given proper notice. Should you elect to submit emergency legislation, the onus of ensuring it is procedurally correct is on the submitting author if enough time is not given in advance.
 6. Senator from ECE – The reasons given for unconstitutionality should not be valid.
 - a. Senate Chair – here is how procedure goes for Emergency legislation goes
 - i. Authors submit the Emergency Legislation ahead of time.
 - ii. It is up to authors of the Emergency Legislation to make it constitutional
 - iii. Because it was submitted earlier in the day, the Parliamentarian told the submitting officer that the legislation was not constitutional and why it was, in fact, not constitutional.
 - iv. The sponsor was the point of contact for this legislation.
 - v. Senator from TLI – it was at 6:11 pm.
 1. Senate Chair – yes, and you have remainder of meeting to get the parliamentarian’s okay on this legislation
 - a. Parliamentarian – you can submit and distribute it to this body and try it when there is a call for emergency legislation.

If it is not constitutional, it will be shot down immediately.

- b. Senate Chair – Asked and answered.
- 7. Motion to move to executive session by the Senator from AAE
 - a. Seconded by the Senator from Biochemistry
 - b. Ayes have it, we will be moving in to executive session.
- 8. **Executive session minutes are confidential and not included in this document for public release. Should the Senate elect, they may make all or a portion of the Executive Session minutes public at a later time.**
- b. **Back to non-executive session**
- c. **Consideration of New Legislation**
 - i. **SP24-B005 - “To Update the Election Order of PGSG Executive Officers”**
 - 1. Senator from Engineering Management (Sponsor)
 - a. This legislation allows elections to be conducted.
 - b. The LRC reviews our governing documents every 2 years for needed edits and the LAO and Diversity chairs are not in the governing documents regarding elections.
 - c. This will fix that.
 - 2. Parliamentarian – Constitutional. Technically, if you don’t pass this it still happens but it is still weird and confusing.
 - 3. President – great piece of legislation.
 - 4. Discussion for questions for factual clarification
 - a. Senator from MSE – what happens if we do not pass
 - i. Parliamentarian – There is a portion of the constitution that dictates that executive board members are elected in a certain order. It also says these officers are elected in the second to last meeting. This legislation just makes the constitution more uniform.
 - b. Speaker list exhausted
 - 5. Discussion for debate.
 - a. Parliamentarian – motion to table the legislation until the next meeting.
 - i. Point of question from the Senator from ABE — are we tabling because we cannot vote on it during this meeting?
 - 1. Senate Chair – technically we are tabling because we have not finished discussion.
 - ii. Withdraws motion
 - b. Speaker list exhausted, discussion ends
 - c. Tabled until next meeting
 - i. Because this legislation has to do with editing a governing document, it is tabled until the next meeting where it is in line for a procedural vote.

ii. SP24-B006- “To Update the Title of President Pro Tempore to Senate Chair in the PGSG Bylaws”

1. Senator from Engineering Management (Sponsor)
 - a. Senate Chair and Pro temp are essentially the same position, but the governing documents have two positions written about. This legislation will change all mentions of the Pro Tempore to “Senate Chair,” mirroring how PGSG currently runs.
2. Parliamentarian report.
 - a. The Legislation is good, there might be some amendments but they will happen before we vote.
 - b. Pro temp has no duties or powers so needs removed from the constitution
3. President – great legislation
4. Discussion for questions seeking factual clarification
 - a. Speaker list exhausted
5. Discussion for Debate
 - a. Motion to table before end of discussion by Parliamentarian
 - b. Seconded by the Senator from ABE
 - i. Requires a 50% vote
 - ii. Ayes have it. Tabled until the next meeting before the end of discussion.
6. Tabled to be resumed at the next meeting during discussion.

iii. SP24-B007 - “To Update the Title of VP for Operations to Chief of Staff in the PGSG Bylaws”

1. Senator from Engineering Management
 - a. Does not trigger a change of COS, it is just a change of the title within the governing documents to match how PGSG currently operates.
2. Parliamentarian – we good
3. President – great legislation
4. Questions seeking factual clarification
 - a. Speaker list exhausted
5. Period of discussion
 - a. Speaker list exhausted.
6. Tabled until next meeting
 - a. Because this legislation has to do with editing a governing document, it is tabled until the next meeting where it is in line for a procedural vote.

iv. SP24-B008 - “To Reflect the Restructuring and Renaming of the Graduate School”

1. Senator from Biochemistry (Sponsor)
 - a. The graduate school is renaming and restructuring, and our constitutional bylaws need to reflect this renaming
2. Parliamentarian – “yeah, we’re good”

3. President – I find some mistakes on legislation
 - a. PGSG used to be a part of the Graduate School, but we are now under Student life and not under the Graduate Schools
 - b. Amendments are needed or some of these changes are null
4. Questions seeking factual clarifications
 - a. Senator from ABE – is there anything including Purdue Indianapolis that we need to consider?
 - i. Parliamentarian – they are under the same umbrella as us. We do not know the details yet on what this looks like
 - b. Speaker list exhausted
5. Discussion
 - a. President – motion to amend the legislation
 - i. There are 2 places where the “ Office for Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Scholars” is appropriate, and those can remain.
 1. Every other instance should be replaced with “Vice provost of Student Life,” or other specific offices now that we are not under the Office for Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Scholars.
 2. Basically wordsmithing to make this legislation align with who PGSG is working with
 - ii. Point of inquiry – Senator from Civil Engineering
 1. Can this be tabled until the next session?
 - a. Parliamentarian – it can be tabled, but we still have to hear amendments as a legislative body.
 - b. Senate Chair – The other pieces of legislation with potential amendments will have their amendments ready ahead of time to be presented to the Senate.
 - b. Amendment Seconded by the Senator from Engineering Management
 - c. Discussion on the amendment
 - i. Motion to amend amendment – Senator from AAE
 1. There is a double “in”
 - a. Vote on the amendment to the amendment – amendment carries.
 - d. Vote to consider amendment
 - i. Motion carries, amendments are successful
 - e. Speaking list is exhausted.
6. Tabled until next meeting

- a. Because this legislation has to do with editing a governing document, it is tabled until the next meeting where it is in line for a procedural vote.
 - v. **SP24-R003** - *“Holiday/Winter Pay Contingent to Position(s) Revision”*
 - 1. Motion to table by the Senator from Civil Engineering
 - a. Second by the Senator from Political Science
 - b. Requires a 50% vote to carry.
 - i. Motion carries.
 - 2. Tabled until next meeting
 - a. Legislation tabled until the next meeting, beginning with the Author’s Report.
 - vi. **SP24-B009** - *“Bill to Amend Policies of the Transitional Housing Grant”*
 - 1. Senator from MSE – I am happy to report that the grant has been given the go ahead after being stuck in legal for a year.
 - a. This approval is contingent on changing specific wordings within the grant.
 - b. As per the University’s policies, we have to get rid of “financial need” and other wordings.
 - c. All edits have to be seen by Senate
 - 2. Parliamentarian –Workshopped by LRC. It is good now.
 - 3. President – As an original co-author on this grant, I am very happy that this has come to this format.
 - a. I know we have approval from all parties to proceed with all grants, but need to make sure that both our policies and the University’s and what we do adhere to each other
 - 4. Period of discussion for questions seeking factual clarification
 - a. Speaker list exhausted
 - 5. Discussion
 - a. Motion to amend by the Senator from Chemical Engineering – “Dispersal” to “disbursal”
 - i. Seconded by the Senator MSE
 - ii. Voting on amendment – 50% required to pass
 - 1. Amendment approved.
 - b. Speaker list exhausted. Move to procedural vote
 - 6. Voting
 - a. Ayes: 35
 - b. Nays: 0
 - c. Abstain: 0
 - d. Ayes have it. SP24-B009 passes.
 - vii. **SP24-B010** - *“Mandating that all PGSG minutes be made public excepting executive sessions and updating the constitution appropriately”*
 - 1. Senate Chair – I am the author of this upcoming legislation. If the Senate feels that there is a conflict of interest, you can ask for me to recuse myself.

2. Senator from History
 - a. This legislation puts the PGSG Executive Board in line with the Senate and the committees and teams where they will release their minutes to the public, unless in an official executive session.
3. Parliamentarian – Robert's Rules says that executive sessions can be voted into. This has not previously happened in Executive Board meetings.
4. President – great legislation
5. Period of Questions Seeking Factual Clarification
 - a. Senator from Math – Is Fall 2024 the earliest we can get this done
 - i. Parliamentarian – it is open to be changed.
 - ii. Senator from History – It can be done earlier, but we are contingent on when minutes are received and the fact that there will be a new Senate Clerk and PRO soon.
 - iii. PRO – It can be done as soon as we get all the minutes.
 - b. Senator from ECE – Who defines what a reasonable time is? Can we clarify this more?
 - i. Parliamentarian – if someone believes timing is unreasonable, they can claim nonfeasance. This would go through legislation in the Senate.
 1. You can author legislation to do that
 - ii. Senator from ECE – Can we define reasonable time?
 1. Parliamentarian – it can. Such practices can put us in precarious positions.
 - iii. Motion to amend by the Senator from ECE – change “reasonable time” to “within 5 weeks of active academic session”
 1. Parliamentarian – business days?
 - a. Senator from ECE, we change 20 business days.
 2. Second by Senator from ASEC
 3. Discussion
 - a. LAO – University is open on some non-school days.
 - b. Senator from AAE – We should keep it as is because a lot could happen.
 - c. Motion to amend to amendment by Senator from Political Science – Reasonable time not to exceed 30 days
 - i. Ruled out of order by the Senate Chair

- d. Senator from Chemistry – Should leave to 20 business days
 - e. Senator from TLI – I support having a specific amount of days, which limits uncertainty.
 - i. Great to stick to exact numbers
 - f. Senator from History – should keep as is because we are about to go into onboarding of new elected officers.
 - i. An overly specific date does not take into account issues like miscommunications and issues with technology that can cause problems.
 - g. Senator – I believe 20 days is enough time.
 - i. So if a meeting that is done today doesn't go to the public in a month.
 - ii. Understand that things can be busy but should still be done in a timely manner.
 - h. Senator from Chemical Engineering – I think we need this ambiguity so that it is not an undue pressure.
 - i. Motion to end discussion
 - ii. Seconded by the Senator from MSE
 - iii. $\frac{2}{3}$ majority required to end discussion
 - iv. Ayes have it, discussion ends
4. Voting on motion to amend
- a. Aye: 19
 - b. Nay: 16
 - c. Motion carries amendment is made
- c. Senator from ECE – I think this is well thought out and well done
 - i. All meeting minutes are released to the public.
 - 1. It is important to see what the E-board discusses to help Senate make decisions
 - d. Senator from Chemistry – We have had a couple of issues based on “he said she said,” so having minutes documented is good to help with that.
 - e. Speaker list exhausted.

6. Tabled until next meeting
 - a. Because this legislation has to do with editing a governing document, it is tabled until the next meeting where it is in line for a procedural vote.

viii. SP24-B011 - “Bill to Empower GRAC Oversight on Grant Policies”

1. Senator from MSE – Referring back to bills ago. We saw the process of editing words and other things in grants.
 - a. Currently, any time we need to change policies, someone has to draft the change, know what it is, draft a bill, and present to Senate
 - i. We have minor edits and things that need to be addressed with urgency.
 - ii. This amends the bylaws in a certain place which allows GRAC to amend current grant policies, present it to the Senate, and then make it public to applicants.
 - iii. Introduces transparency and oversights
 1. The Senate will see the changes as a full verbal report. This is a chance for the Senate to review the changes and overturn them if needed.
2. Parliamentarian
 - a. Constitutional. “I’ll leave it at that.”
3. President – A lot of changes are proposed at administration channels, these minor changes might not be passed by PGSG.
 - a. These minor changes should not delay dispersal of grants.
 - b. This bill empowers GRAC to make the changes themselves.
4. Questions seeking Factual Clarification
 - a. Senator ABE – Curious if the changes from this bill will still give the Senate the power to overwrite the change, or if we lose power.
 - i. Senator from MSE – it is still in the bylaws that the changes still go to the Senate and still leaves the introduction of new Grants to Senate
 - b. Senator from Chemical engineering
 - i. When it says a verbal report to the Senate, will these be announcements or part of the consent agenda?
 1. Senate Chair – Verbal reports go either under “Other Reports” or under “Committee and Team Reports” in the consent agenda.
 2. The word “independent” is in there in that we cannot bury it in the officer reports.
 3. If submitted in writing, it could technically be put on the consent agenda by the Senate Chair.
 4. Follow-up from the Senator from Chemical engineering – So, it’s up to the Senate Chair?

- a. Senate Chair – yes, but anything on the consent agenda can be removed by 1 voice, requiring it to be presented during the Senate meeting.
- b. Parliamentarian – it cannot be on the consent agenda without being sent to the Senate in advance.
- c. Senator from Chemistry – Does this empower GRAC committee to take more actions like scrapping grants, like they did with the childcare grant?
 - i. Senator from MSE – The goal was to make it so that this is not an option.
 - 1. The removal of a grant cannot be done under this legislation.
 - 2. This does not allow GRAC to remove or create grants. That still goes through the Senate.
 - ii. President – the reason the childcare grant was scrapped was because the senate legislation states that the funding comes from the Office of Financial Aid, but the Office of Financial aid was withdrawing their financial support so it ended.
 - 1. This legislation does not change this power.
 - iii. Senate Chair – Do they have power to not award a grant at all?
 - 1. Parliamentarian – not any more than they currently do so.
- d. Senator from TLI – Question of independent verbal report, verbal criteria is based on the interpretation of parliamentarian and Senate Chair?
 - i. How can we make it clear that the future GRAC team members stick to the same interpretation? I suggest we make it more clear. What do you suggest to make it clear that everyone can understand and be on the same page?
 - ii. Senate Chair – Ruled out of order, only temporarily, until discussion. We are currently in a period of questions seeking factual clarification.
 - 1. Senator from TLI – How do we put this in the legislation that it doesn't empower external spending. Need someone to oversee this process.
 - a. Chair – ruled out of order. Not a “who, what, where, or when” question. “why and how” questions need to be in discussion. Encouraged to bring up in the open discussion.

- e. Senator from Civil Engineering – is this proposing any oversight?
 - i. Senator from MSE – Oversight by GRAC for GRAC policies.
 - f. Senator from ECE – is there any clause here that puts any constraints on what policies that GRAC can change. What I find in this is that GRAC can change all of their policies. Are there any constraints on what changes they can make?
 - i. Senate Chair – right now, this is written broadly. The idea that GRAC can make changes as they arise and that future senates can change this
 - ii. Senator from MSE – extend this by saying rather than specify, it might not capture anything. This says that any change can be made, but all changes have to be reviewed by the Senate.
 - iii. Senator from ECE – review does not mean that we make a decision
 - 1. Senator from MSE – The Senate can overturn the changes using the powers they already have.
 - 2. Parliamentary – GRAC is a committee of the Senate, so the Senate can overturn any decision made by the committee.
 - a. Senator from MSE – can you clarify by a motion or...?
 - b. Senate Chair – might be by legislative action
 - c. Parliamentary – Bylaws (3)(A)(6) – Overturning of decisions must be made by legislative action.
 - g. Senator from AAE – Motion to end period of questions
 - i. Seconded by the Senator from MSE
 - ii. requires $\frac{2}{3}$ vote
 - 1. Motion carries, period of questions is ended.
5. Period of Discussion
- a. Senator from ECE – Giving people powers to do what they need to do could end up badly.
 - i. For example, if I am GRAC chair and I have bad intentions and don't get Senate approval, it could be bad.
 - ii. This is very dangerous, regardless of GRAC chair's intentions
 - iii. GRAC should only be able to make changes suggested by higher ups
 - 1. Like if BOSO says they should change something, they can change it.

- b. Senator from ATT – I disagree with some of the particulars of ECE’s points, but understand concerns
 - i. Powers that GRAC will have does not add new grants, but interprets it.
 - ii. There is a line that says that changes need a majority vote from GRAC. I think this should be changed to a unanimous vote.
 - 1. Why? GRAC is composed of Senate members
 - a. Having unanimous consent prevents abuse.
 - iii. Motion to amend the bill so that it says “unanimous consent” and not “majority consent.”
 - 1. Point of Inquiry – Senator from Chemistry – How is unanimous handled? Similar to what is done in the Senate? For GRAC, how do we ensure a quorum?
 - i. Parliamentarian – There should be a quorum.
 - ii. Senate Chair – This is why I have pushed for meeting minutes to get a roll call.
 - iii. – if there is no quorum, technically any votes in a meeting are not valid.
 - 2. Amendment seconded by the Senator from MSE
 - 3. Discussion on the motion
 - a. Parliamentarian – Point of info – unanimous consent is a specifically defined method of voting where you ask “is there any opposition.” This would dictate that the vote is “is anyone opposed” and someone says they are opposed, it fails.
 - b. Senator from TLI – This says unanimous consent, but vote and consent are different.
 - i. Parliamentarian – Unanimous consent is a specific method of voting. Robert’s Rules does not mention unanimous voting
 - c. Senator from TLI – If there are 5 people in the committee and GRAC chair wants to give an amendment, and there is pressure to vote for something since

everyone is, I have to verbally oppose it so that it will not pass.

- i. Parliamentarian – yes, you have to vote out loud.
- d. Senator from TLI – how do we balance this, since I have that experience of pressure?
 - i. Senate Chair – vote the amendment down if you don't want it to be by unanimous consent.
- e. Senator from TLI – I want to add the word anonymous.
 - i. Senate Chair – are you suggesting we place “anonymous” in there?
 - ii. Senator from TLI – yes, “anonymous vote with no opposition”.
 - iii. – Parliamentarian – this amendment is out of order.
- f. Senator from ECE – Responding to members of GRAC – GRAC does not consist of only senators. Of the 80 GRAC members, only 16 are senators. I believe that this does not fix this problem. When we talk about unanimous consent, are we talking about all 80 people, or just the 16 senators? I don't think this is fixing the issues. A better amendment would place restrictions on what they can do.
- g. Senator from MSE – There will be a proposed change given to current GRAC members who are aware of policies that will vote on this and then bring to the Senate
- h. Point of Order – AAE you aren't following the speaker list
 - i. Senate Chair – yes, that is a different list.
- i. President – unanimous consent is not ideal and is hard to achieve.

- i. You can move to more specific majorities (such as $\frac{2}{3}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$ majorities)
 - ii. This makes it difficult to enact something if only one person is opposed to it.
 - j. Senator from Civil Engineering – I don't think this amendment addresses bigger issues, as Senator from ECE has said.
 - i. Senate Chair – motion to amend is on the Senate, but the author cannot get rid of this amendment.
 - k. Senator from TLI – Reason I am opposed is because I fully support what ECE said about empowering GRAC and having that disbalance and there has been experiences of abuse of authority.
 - i. This is why I think we need to add an anonymous component to help remove bias and misuse of authority.
 - ii. We have this issue now and there is no guarantee we will not have similar issues later.
 - l. Voting on motion to amend
 - i. motion fails, legislation is not amended.
- c. Senator from ABE – main problem with this is because since GRAC is one of the largest outward facing initiatives, we should be up to date with what is going on
 - i. I understand the desire to make things go faster
 - ii. Is there a slightly better way to make balance so we can inform our constituents of what is going on?
 - iii. Concerned that we should be able to communicate with constituents what is going on.
- d. President – Question is really if this particular legislation doesn't go through, what are we hampering?
 - i. There is \$10,000 of funding available for the accessibility grant. Passing this legislation allows us to get accessibility grant up and running without writing up more legislation
 - ii. There is potentially another new grant coming through the Senate this year. If these changes are not enacted, it

could be stuck in legal for a year like the Transitional Housing and Accessibility grants were.

- iii. Motion for amendment – Change “majority consent” to “ $\frac{3}{4}$ majority consent”
 1. Seconded by the Senator from ASEC
 2. Senator from Chemistry – We turned down unanimous consent based on the power it gives and uncertainty of how this consent comes to be. We are now making it $\frac{3}{4}$ of quorum to pass this and then we pass \$10,000 to them with no oversight? nah
 3. President – How do we know why we voted down the last amendment? Just because we voted against it doesn't mean we know why it wasn't voted for.
 - a. You're already giving a committee \$80,000 for Travel, \$10,000 each for GSOGA and Transitional and Symposium. This \$10,000 is already approved for the Accessibility Grant.
 - b. How many of us are actively serving on a team?
 - i. These are intense decisions team members are making. These are grad students of Purdue and it is insulting to say they don't know what they are doing just because they aren't senators.
 4. Senator from Computer Science – How many members in GRAC are not Senators?
 - a. Senate Chair – the Chief of Staff makes and sets the roster
 5. Senator from ECE – The president says that GRAC is in control of over \$150,000. This is substantial. They can do what they want without oversight. That is more than 50% of the PGSG budget and this bill is trying to allow them to have power.
 - a. Next year, the money can be chosen to spend it on whatever they want. If you are unhappy with it, you have to write legislation about it.

- b. This bill gives a lot of power to GRAC to handle more than 50% of PGSG budget
6. Senator from MSE – I feel like I am either going insane or entered into a different reality.
yield time
7. Parliamentarian – clarification of points made
 - a. Concerns about amount of money by GRAC
 - b. Currently the Treasurer and GRAC chair can move around \$\$ within the 5 grants in the spring semester as needed. If anything this legislation requires more oversight on this moving of money
 - c. Governing docs require the majority of PGSG funds go to this committee. This has been the case for a very long time.
Not the point of this legislation
8. Senator from TLI – As a person, human being, suffering from the authority of GRAC, I am supporting that we should avoid giving power to GRAC as a committee. Since there is ongoing pressure from the chair to team members, I fully suggest that we add an anonymous element to that.
 - a. We see that team members feel pressured to vote for things.
 - b. Strongly urge you to think about making sure everyone has free choice to make their choice.
9. Senator from ABE – I think that the $\frac{3}{4}$ majority fixes some of the problems people had with unanimous consent in that there is actually a vote and you get to see how many people were there.
 - a. I think that it is not a good idea to assume bad faith by the committee and I think that this is meant to better help our graduate students.
 - b. I think it is important to make this work well.
 - c. The majority of comments I get from constituents is about grants and I

- understand that this makes it easier to get changes that my constituents want.
10. Senator from Chemistry – Parliamentarian said earlier that already the treasurer and GRAC Chair can move money as deemed fit, and the President says that non-senate members of GRAC are important.
 - a. However, because they are not elected, there is a possibility that this is skewed.
 - b. This means that $\frac{3}{4}$ is still a dangerous thing to do.
 11. President – I think one of the things that we forget is that from application procedure to awarding of a grant, it takes 3 months. What you are saying is that the Senate does not get a chance to have any oversight. Once applications come in, the Senate has 3 months to reverse any of these changes.
 - a. I don't know if this provides any ease.
 - b. Particular instances involving abuse, as long as it stands on viable senators, it should not be biased.
 12. Senate Chair – we are speaking on this motion to amend, not on the bill itself only. If you want to go back to discussing the bill, vote on this motion.
 13. Point of order – Senator from ECE – can we motion to end discussion
 - a. Senate Chair – not as a point of order, but when you have the floor you can.
 14. Senator from TLI – motion to amend the amendment to add an anonymous voting component.
 - a. Senate Chair – Ruled out of order
 15. Senator from Engineering management – while many of the senators have certain issues with the amount of power we are giving to grant, we are digressing from this amendment. We need to remember that the previous vote was “unanimous consent.” Maybe there will be future amendments to limit power.
 - a. The President pointed out that it is not ideal to have unanimous consent.

- b. Motion to end discussion and move to vote.
 - i. Senate Chair - All in favor of this amendment?
 - ii. Point of Order – Senate Clerk – the motion needs a second.
 - iii. Seconded by the Senator from AAE
 - iv. Requires $\frac{2}{3}$ majority to end discussion and vote.
 - v. Motion carries, moving to vote.
- iv. Vote on amendment
 - 1. 50% required
 - 2. Aye: 19
 - 3. Nay: 18
 - 4. Motion passes.
- v. Motion to reconsider by the Senator from ABE, as some Senators were dealing with technical issues
 - 1. Seconded by Engineering Management
 - 2. Ayes have it, we will redo the voting.
- vi. Reconsideration vote on Amendment
 - 1. Aye: 17
 - 2. Nay: 21
 - 3. Motion fails. Amendment does not pass.
- e. Senator from AAE – Right now, I like the motivation of this, but I don't like the comments made, such as the powers given to GRAC. Should make it streamlined to be voted by the senate.
 - i. Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Seconded by the Senator from ECE
 - 2. MSE – this is an amendment to bylaws so has to wait until the next meeting to vote.
 - a. Senate Chair – this is a motion to end discussion. This legislation will be tabled until the next meeting.
 - 3. Nays have it, discussion does not end.
- f. Senator from MSE – I want this to be legislation that the entire Senate gets some stock in. I will make amendments to bring to the next meeting
 - i. Motion to table without ending discussion
 - ii. Seconded by the Senator from AAE
 - 1. Ayes have it, Legislation is tabled until the next meeting without ending discussion
 - iii. Point of inquiry by the Senator from ECE – is the next meeting next week or April 10th?

1. Senate Chair – April 10th
 - g. Tabled until next meeting.
 - i. Discussion will continue when picked up from the table.
- ix. **SP24-B012** - *“Amending the Financial Code of Operations to provide equity in PGSG member incentives”*
 1. Senator from Biochemistry – We are all here on a volunteer basis. Taking officer position is a volunteer position
 - a. The Bylaws and other governing documents do not say anything about officer payments.
 - b. This legislation gives proper incentives to the officer positions and provides more equity in the monetary incentives.
 2. Parliamentarian – Financial Code of Operations amendments follow the same rules as amending the constitution and bylaws, except when self imposed by the bylaws. The legislation is constitutional.
 3. President – really good legislation, when it goes to show the responsibilities that have increased for the role of president. It is difficult for people to act with all of these roles and it can be difficult to split those responsibilities.
 - a. Important to empower vice chairs to take on these responsibilities.
 - b. When it comes to GRAC chair and vice chair, there is a lot of work that goes into it, which is sometimes more than other officers and vice chairs
 - c. Being President used to be a Graduate Assistantship appointment. The requirements continue to be the same and it is time consuming and exhausting, without the official appointment.
 4. Period of Questions for Seeking Factual Clarification
 - a. Senator from ABE – curious about the reasoning for getting rid of the stipend for PGSG director positions?
 - i. President – PGSG does have above and beyond awards and sometimes directors do great jobs with what they do.
 1. Some students go above and beyond, while directors might not do what they are appointed to do. So this might be one of the reasons.
 - ii. Senator from ABE – who chooses who gets above and beyond award?
 1. The President – the executive board
 2. ABE – should this be included?
 - b. Senator from TLI – since I am vice chair of accessibility grant, I noticed that this position is not in this legislation.
 - i. President – because it is not currently an active grant yet, and will not be this year. It was not approved for a few grant vice chairs

- ii. Senator from TLI – I received an email from the GRAC Chair that this has been officially approved
 - 1. Parliamentarian – at the time of this legislation’s writing, it was not yet approved.

- 5. Adjournment time has been reached.
 - a. Motion to extend by the Senator from Biochemistry
 - i. No second, motion fails.
 - b. Discussion tabled until next meeting, where discussion will resume.
- 6. Tabled until next meeting.
 - a. Discussion will continue when picked up from the table.

d. Consideration of Emergency Legislation

- i. Tabled as adjournment time has been reached.

IX. Announcements

a. PGSG Elections - April 10, 2024

- i. An email will go out about the elections

b. Senator Confirmation for 2024-2025

- i. An email will go out about Senator Confirmation for 2024-25. If your GSO will decide that, let the Senate Chair know when emails go out.

X. Adjournment (9:00 PM)

- a. Meeting adjourned at 9:01 pm



APPENDIX A
SENATOR ROLL CALL

[SEE ATTACHED TWO (2) PAGES]



Present (46):

Aeronautics and Astronautics (AAE) - Josue N. Rivera
Agricultural and Biological Engineering (ABE) - Daphne Fauber
Agricultural Economics - Diamilatou Kane
Agricultural Sciences Education and Communication (AgSEC) - Mathew Smith
Animal Sciences - Opeadura Timileyin Osunbami
Aviation and Transportation Technology (ATT) - Luigi Raphael Dy
Biochemistry - Victor Gutierrez-Schultz
Biomedical Engineering - Mikayla Roach
Botany and Plant Pathology - Pascal Okoye
Chemical Engineering - Isaac S. Wheeler
Chemistry - Temitope Olayemi
Civil Engineering - Jose Capa Salinas
Communication - Husen-Chi Chiu
Comparative Literature - Marisa J Bryans
Computer Graphics Technology - Sanjeevani Patankar
Computer Science (CS) - Ethan Dickey (Acting)
Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) - Jacob Mishne
Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences (EAPS) - Michael Oyelakin
Ecological Sciences and Engineering (ESE) - Jamie Klamerus
Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) - Paschal Amusuo
Engineering Education - Ayerson Cuervo (Acting)
Engineering Management - Titiksha Wagh
Engineering Technology - Shiva Shokouhmand (Acting)
English - Jeeyoung Choi
Food Science - Elma Kontor-Manu
Forestry and Natural Resources (FNR) - Desmond Sosu Mensah
Health Sciences - Jessica George (Acting)
History - Secret Permenter
Horticulture and Landscape Architecture (HLA) - Vera Vukovic
Hospitality and Tourism Management (HTM) - Chang Ma
Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS) - Inga Nordgren
Industrial and Physical Pharmacy (IPPH) - Shambhavi Borde
Industrial Engineering - Mohammad Ahmadi Gharehtoragh
Interdisciplinary Biomedical Sciences (IBSC) - Tuba Marjan
Languages and Cultures - Roseline Adewuyi
Materials Engineering - Daniel Sinclair
Mathematics - Patrick Henry Debonis
Nuclear Engineering (NE) - Stepan Ozerov
Nutrition Science - Qianyue Wang



Philosophy - James Emery
Physics and Astronomy - Soumik Chandra
Political Science - Benjamin E Torres
Sociology - Corey Resweber
Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences (SLHS) - Brooke Rodgers (Acting)
Statistics - Kyle Conrad
Technology, Leadership, and Innovation (TLI) - Elnara Mammadova

Not Present (16):

Agronomy - Lynda Peter
Anthropology - Rebecca Gale Martinez
Basic Medical Sciences - Naseem Alfadhil
Biological Sciences - Morgan Chaney
Comparative Pathobiology - Omnia Ibrahim
Computational Interdisciplinary Graduate Program (CIGP) - Meenakshi Narayanaswami
Educational Studies - Ali Holmes
Entomology - Leslie Aviles
Environmental and Ecological Engineering (EEE) - Venkat Roy
Gerontology - Destiny Ogle
Global Supply Chain Management (GSM) - Rohan Saini
Management (MGMT) - Jinfeng "Phoenix" Chen
Mechanical Engineering (ME) - Meghavin Bhatasana
Philosophy and Literature - Mickey Bergman
Purdue University Interdisciplinary Life Sciences (PULSe) - Lauren Wilbanks
Veterinary Clinical Sciences (VCS) - Oluwabunmi Titilope Oladele



APPENDIX A
SENATOR ROLL CALL

[SEE ATTACHED TWO (2) PAGES]



*(This page intentionally left blank. The Officer Reports
(<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/2/folders/1Ki1LEgzD5wRw2L5OCtoINWkZR88L8OjR>)
will be inserted into the PDF after rendering.)*