Graduate Student Organization

Second Fall Meeting 17 October 2018

Agenda with Meeting Notes

1. Call Meeting to Order
   1. President calls meeting to order.
2. Attendance
   1. Quorum made
      1. Present departments:
      2. Coun. Ed., Ed., Crim. Just., Informatics, Bio, Arch., System Tech, Music, History, English, CMCN, KNES, CODI, MechE, PETE, Psych, ENVS, CompSciEng
3. President’s Welcome
   1. Introduce Philip de Mahy
4. President’s Report
   1. Guest Speaker: Philip de Mahy
      1. Lunch and Learn – guest speaker, communicative research.
         1. Two Mondays from now
      2. 3MT – Nov. 8
         1. Same as before
         2. Competing for prize money (amounts not confirmed yet), winners can compete against 9 other states in the southeastern section
      3. Thesis/Dissertation deadline – due in TWO WEEKS
      4. Shut up and Write – twice a week
      5. All events listed online
   2. Office of Student Engagement and Leadership Hazing Presentation
   3. Meeting with SGA
      1. Discussed the parking issues – will discuss later in the meeting
5. VP’s Report
   1. None
6. Treasurer/Secretary’s Report
   1. Secretary – none
   2. Treasurer
      1. 70% - TWAD mostly spent
      2. 30% - research supplies and equipment
      3. Jump to 9ai
7. Report from Communication Committee
8. Old Business
   1. Appropriation 24 – 18 Siroos Madani Reimbursement
      1. ABSENT
      2. Tabled to this meeting to figured out details.
      3. Originally did not get check request form, requested a new one from Tanya, sent beginning of summer. Submitted in early September. Appealed the decision to not fund.
      4. Due to being absent was not discussed further.
      5. Arrived at 5:56 pm
      6. Siroos – got forms in summer, but Tanya didn’t tell her it’s late
      7. Linda and Jonah – not her job. Your responsibility
      8. Jonah – will allow the council to vote on this appeal
      9. Siroos – there isn’t a deadline
      10. Justin – question – summer student?
      11. Siroos – yes
      12. Vote – motion, Layla -
          1. In favor of appeal – 2
          2. Opposed – all other reps
          3. Abstaining – 4 total - Com. Dis., Informatics, Layla, \_\_\_
   2. Parking Issues Across Campus (Results from Survey Monkey)
      1. Comprehensive report will be sent out and given to the graduate school to work toward our needs
         1. Linda: Will reps get a copy?
         2. Jonah: Yes
      2. Which lots need more lighting: not broken down in time of meeting, so for or against more lighting – more lighting wanted
      3. Lottery or first come? – Overwhelming want first come first serve
         1. Maggi – did you consider allowing a third option if a student doesn’t like either option?
         2. Jonah – open comment box
         3. Maggi – not next to each question so we should explore this further
      4. Grad students with campus jobs priority over grad students not working for school
         1. Yes regardless of system
9. New Business
   1. Budget for Applications for Thesis and Dissertation Printing
      1. By-law Clarification – Section V, 4B
         1. Ana Costa – very stressful email chain with GSO. Was a rep, wouldn’t apply if she wasn’t eligible. Sees this bylaw and says that her app should be read within the second meeting not the third like she is told. Email discussion goes back and forth about what meeting her app should be seen. Section VI: Budget: first paragraph does not match up with funding information on the GSO website. If no money left for travel, why should we wait until 3rd meeting? Treasurer and Ana did not agree with each other. Ana says this should not have even been a discussion over email and wants to clarify and have her application funded.
            1. Linda (Civil Engineering proxy) – Maggi and her followed the same bylaw as Ana. Emailed Jonah for clarification. If we haven’t already funded our travel in bylaws, why fund thesis paper and research supplies?
            2. Justin (BIO) – there are no spirit of the bylaws. They are the bylaws to follow
            3. Linda – Section 5, 4a – where is the thesis paper listed in the bylaws delineating where paper money comes from?
            4. Informatics and BIO – there has never been money allotted for paper, but it has all come out of research supplies. We should clarify if we want to
            5. Informatics – 3a 🡪 but this is for research
            6. Ana – bylaws says 70/30 for travel/research – there is no way to fund travel applications at this point and should not even be discussed at this point. Displeased with how this all happened
            7. Maggi, Linda, Justin, Ana – argue about where paper falls. 3a? Each have different bylaw interpretations.
            8. Linda – what happens to the money in the 30% pot when all apps are funded?
            9. Justin - no matter what, should be split 70/30, even if money is continuously flowing into the GSO budget.
            10. Justin, Linda– motion to make thesis paper part of research supplies
            11. Justin – will this make this the law now or what?
            12. Jonah – motion to change the bylaws so this won’t be an issue again.
            13. Ana - $160 equipment, $100 for paper – clarification for Jonah. $160+$100=$260, $140 remaining

Informatics seconds this

For: English, MAT, Informatics, BIO, Architecture, Systems Tech, History, 🡪 15 total (too blind to see everyone’s signs)

Against: 0

Abstaining: Civil, Education, Counsel Ed 🡪 3

PASSES

* + - * 1. Motion 4 to second 3 for clarification 🡪 Informatics 🡪 Justin seconds

Favor: 15 total

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 0

PASSES

Will work on the bylaw change over time so that there is an edit to vote on for meeting 3

* + 1. Approval of Appropriations
       1. Gina Warren is absent, will not argue the ruling.
       2. Officially voting for applications for research supplies and thesis equipments
       3. Linda motioned to block vote, multiple second
          1. In favor: All other reps
          2. Opposed: 0
          3. Abstaining: Linda, Layla (counselor ed)
       4. Voting
          1. In favor: all other reps
          2. Opposed: 0
          3. Abstaining: Maggi, Layla, Linda
  1. By-law Change – Section V, 9B
  2. By-law Change – Section V, 9C
     1. Criminal Justice – a way that justifies that if there is a problem, what happens?
     2. Jonah – then you must be present
     3. Crim – so only if there is a previous denial?
     4. Jonah – not denied from previous meetings, just from processing the apps for that specific meeting
     5. Informatics – finance committee –
     6. BIO – work it “preliminarily”
     7. English – Students not student
     8. Maggi – if university is delayed with the forms we should word this better
     9. Jonah – can address later in part 10 of agenda, BIO agrees
  3. By-law Change – Section V, 11C
     1. Challenge of delay respective of student (via university)
     2. BIO, Linda, Maggi discuss the wording and differences in interpretation
     3. What if forms get delayed in an office and they don’t know about the delay and it hurts them in the end because they don’t know what’s going on?
     4. Crim – what is the unviersity’s capacity to manage the forms being sent?
     5. Jonah – we don’t have jurisdiction
     6. Maggi – maybe word it with a specific time frame where if there is no request form in the student’s hand by a certain date what’s the next step? – within one month period
     7. Crim – some of this can be handled within the graduate school itself to give protection to a graduate student
     8. Linda – not Tanya’s job
     9. Maggi, Justin, Linda – go to eboard for this issue instead of a rep and CC Tanya on the email
     10. English – Grammar edits
  4. By-law Change – Section X Appendix
     1. English – good grammar!
     2. Crim – is this rubric based off the funding committee?
     3. Layla – based off checklist online
     4. Crim -
     5. MAT – Section 4, rubric should be edited for grammar
     6. Informatics – what is wrong or right
  5. Justin – who should actually write bylaw changes? Funding committee? Eboard?
     1. Jonah – unless a rep wants to, the eboard does it. If it is funding related, the funding committee to work on. Treasurer will decide if changes will go through the committee or not before heading to the council
  6. Motion to accept all changes after council edit
     1. Motion – Justin, Informatics second
     2. In favor 17
     3. Opposed 0
     4. Abstaining 3
     5. PASSES
  7. Co-presenter Website Issue
     1. Layla discusses
        1. Was treasurer, denied apps for co-presenters. Always told that the bylaws state co-presenters don’t get funded, only first author. Advised students to pick the main person to apply for with and without academic duties with hopes both students will be funded. Research shows nothing in bylaws stating that they can’t both be funded, but website does. Should we update the website or bylaws?
     2. Linda – whole website needs a revamp
     3. Jonah – website for sure needs an update. Since there is nothing in bylaws, cut this website bullet point? Or should we add a bullet within the bylaws to clarify this issue?
     4. Mechanical – co-authors, or co-presenters? Two separate things.
     5. Jonah – co-presenters. Should we scrap this bullet?
     6. Maggi – what about group applications?
     7. Layla – the word author isn’t in the bylaws at all
     8. Jonah – motion to strike this bullet?
     9. Comm. Dis. – is there a limit for co-presenters? Co-presenting vs group app?
     10. Multiple reps – conferences should delineate
     11. Comm. Dis. – ours don’t
     12. Motion to update the website to reflect the bylaws and have the bylaws present – BIO motioned, Informatics seconds
         1. Favor 17
         2. Opposed 0
         3. Abstaining 3
     13. Layla – if we have money can my student appeal and reapply with academic duties?
     14. Jonah – my view is that if we have more funding then you and Victoria can appeal
     15. Motion to add bylaw about co presenters
     16. MAT – coauthors need to be represented in the bylaws as well.
     17. BIO, English – presenters and authors are different.
     18. Maggi, architecture – nothing delineates what “with academic duties” actually means
     19. Jonah – motion to edit the bylaws for co
     20. BIO motions to define between presenter and author
     21. Comm. Dis. Adds defining TWAD and TWOAD, and define the number of students that makes it a group app. Maggi supports
     22. Justin – a group app only saves paper it doesn’t change the amount of money funded to an individual student
         1. Favor
         2. Opposed
         3. Abstaining

1. Other Advocacy/Concerns/Questions
   1. Linda motions to nominate treasurer, Jamie seconds
      1. In favor: all
      2. PASSES
   2. Linda nominates Justin – Justin accepts nomination, Justin wins
2. Announcements
   1. Layla – we need to update the minutes on the website and willing to help out with access
3. Adjournment
   1. Linda motioned, Jamie seconds,
      1. All in favor