Agenda | January 31, 2020 | Special Meeting of the Kent State University Graduate Student Senate

I. Call to Order: 8:04 AM
II. Roll Call: Absent: Applied Engineering, Sustainability, & Technology; Digital Sciences; Foundations, Leadership & Administration, Nursing, Public Health
III. Discussion of the Bylaws
    A. Anna: We're just going to be going over the award portion of the bylaws. Liz (Biological Sciences) do you want to lead this because you led the committee? We're going to start with the "General Award Guidelines" and go from there. As we go along, I'd like to discuss them in chunks and then vote on them in chunks.
    B. **General Award Guidelines |** *VIII-A*
        - Liz: For the "General Award Guidelines" these are things that apply to every subsequent subsection. We just pulled them out and made them their own section for ease of use. This way, each individual award will just encompass the items that pertain to that particular award. The proposed suggestions are as follows:
            - Added a General Award Guidelines section as VIII-A
            - This displaces all other subcategories down one letter
                - Motion: Biological Science
                - Second: Economics
                - No discussion
                - All in favor: majority; No opposed or abstentions
    C. **Domestic Travel Award |** *VIII-B- i-vii*
        - Motion: Chemistry & Biochemistry
        - Second: Music
        - Established predictable award deadlines ("11:59PM of the second Monday of each academic semester")
            - Liz: I feel like this is the most amenable change of all time. Is there any discussion?
                - No discussion
        - Clarified eligibility rules and the DTA lottery system
            - LDES senator: We're only considering the people who did not get the awards last semester?
            - Liz: You can apply for it during any semester.
            - Jenn: Originally, you were only allowed for one DTA every year. When they opened it up, if you got it in the fall, you would be a second round applicant for both spring and summer because you'd already received it for fall.
        - Set presentation requirement based on "the standards of the applicant's field"
            - No discussion
        - Specified procedure for handling applications from executive board members
            - No discussion
        - Moved general award considerations to separate section
            - No discussion

- Reorganized section for clarity and consistency with other awards
    - No discussion
- General discussion:
    - Physics: Since we can't extend the areas, what should we do?
    - Anna: Let's keep the wording that's already in VIII-A-v. So, domestic travel is constrained to travel within the continental United States and the following Canadian provinces adjacent to the continental U.S., British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick.
    - Liz: Whatever the proposed wording is in v, the additional language clarifying where travel would be would be added to v if that is satisfactory.
    - Philosophy: Why are we not allowed to extend it?
    - Anna: It's university policy.
    - Liz: It's not like Kent State was putting the hammer down. It's true for faculty too.
- Motion to accept the proposed wording except for VIII-B-v, which we would keep as the original wording from the original document: Economics
- Second: Geology
- All in favor. Passed. No opposed. No absentians.

D. **International Travel Award |** *VIII-C- i-vii*

- Motion: English
- Second: Biomedical Sciences
- Standardized date and time for submission ("11:59PM of the second Monday of the second full month of the Fall and Spring semesters")
    - No discussion
- Altered reimbursement times ("Funding from the International Travel Award may be used to reimburse costs accrued within one year of receipt of award letter")
    - No discussion
- Expanded application of funded events ("Receipt of the award requires the applicant to travel to actively participate in a conference or comparable academic event, according to the standards of their field")
- General discussion:
    - Business Administration: The heading for ITA with the parentheses of travel destinations outside of those listed in the DTA was excluded from the new proposed word changing. I think that we need to clarify this because some of my constituents have had trouble with whether or not Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or Alaska are within DTA or ITA.
    - Anna: That's a very good point. Where are you seeing that in the original?
    - Business Administration: Right above bullet point #1 there is the heading for ITA.
    - Anna: I got ya.
    - Liz: We can add that -- especially given the DTA changes.
    - Anna: Is there anymore discussion on that? Or anything else?

        - No discussion
    - Motion to accept proposed wording with the addition of the parentheses after VII-A-v, DTA travel destinations: Business Admin
        - Second: Theater and Dance
        - Discussion:
            - Physics: Do we want to add that parenthetically? Or do we want it to follow the same flow as the DTA?
            - Liz: I have a question for Physics, “Why are you like this?” Yeah, I think we probably should [follow the DTA formatting] if we’re going to keep this consistent.
            - Physics: OK, so it would read VIII-B-v.
            - Anna: OK. I will need exact wording.
            - Liz: It would say, “International travel is constrained to destinations outside of those outlined in VIII-B-v.”
                - Mini vote: All in favor

    - Motion to accept proposed wording with the addition of the language that was just proposed by Liz: Business Administration
    - Second: Psychological Sciences
        - No discussion
        - All in favor
        - No opposed. No abstentions.

E. **Research Award |** *VIII-D- i-vii*
    - Motion: Health Sciences
    - Second: English
    - Standardized date and time for submission (“11:59PM of the second Monday of the second full month of the Fall and Spring semesters”)
    - Specified IRB/IACUC is required for eligibility only where it is actually required by law
    - Formally defined research as “that which graduate students do” in order to be inclusive of the variety of work done by graduate students
    - Rewrote eligibility and award details for clarity
    - General discussion:
        - Biomedical sciences: in VIII-D-vii, there’s a typo: “All Research Award recipients are required to present **as** the annual Graduate Research Symposium.”
        - Liz: We will fix that.
        - Anna: Do I have a motion to accept the proposed wording with the typo fix in VII-D-vii?
        - Anthropology: How do you require people to present at the Graduate Research Symposium if you graduate?
            - Liz: We can’t hold you hostage. You’re required if you can.
        - Motion to accept the proposed outlined wording with the change of addressing the typo: Biomedical Sciences
        - Second: Anthropology
        - All in favor. No opposed. No abstentions.

F. **Special Contingency Award |** *VII-E- i-vi*
    - Motion: Biological Sciences

        - Second: Chemistry/Biochemistry
- Established new guideline stating the “annual budget for the Special Contingency Award shall be set and announced at the first GSS meeting of each academic year”
    - No discussion
- Award funds would be dispersed on a rolling basis until they are depleted
    - No discussion
- Propose a reimbursement timeline (“Funding from the Special Contingency Award shall be used to reimburse costs accrued within one year of receipt of award letter”)
    - No discussion
- Added IRB/IACUC approval requirement
    - No discussion
- Included a provision to deny an applicant funding and establish a requirement that they be notified in a timely manner (“Should the Special Contingency Award Committee elect not to fund an applicant, the committee must inform the applicant of the reason for their decision in writing and in a timely manner”)
    - No discussion
- General discussion:
    - Biomedical Sciences: What is a “timely manner”?
    - Liz: I would say likely a fortnight.
    - Biomedical Sciences: Instead of a timely manner, before the next application period deadline? Which would be the next GSS meeting?
        - Anna: Mini vote on changing the wording to the “next application period deadline”: A number of individuals opposed
        - Senator: How long does the “next application period deadline” actually mean? Is that longer than 2 weeks?
        - Anthropology: It’s a month
        - Senator: If they’re informed the day that it’s due then they can’t reapply for the next application window.
        - Physics: The goal we were striving for was “as soon as reasonably possible.” Given the nature of the special contingency awards, we don’t want them sitting unsure of their status for three weeks to a month. I think that’s why we originally proposed this wording. Perhaps we should put a maximum on this?
        - Psychological Sciences: What if we just said “in a timely manner but no longer than 5 days.”
        - Liz: I don’t want to constrain it in case we got a bunch of applications, and it requires time to go through them.
        - Psychological Sciences: But, this would be after the decision has been made to fund them, so the decision has already been made.
        - Liz: I see what you’re saying.
        - Psychological Science: It just gives a restriction so the

committee would have to let the applicants know within that 5-day period after the decision has been made.
        - Liz: I'm for a maximum.
        - Anna: We can say 5 business days so we don't worry about weekends and all of that stuff.
        - Liz: Do we want to add, "[...] in a timely manner, meaning the decision will be sent out in writing no more than 5 business days after the decision had been made."
            - Mini vote on official writing: "Their decision in writing no more than 5 business days after the decision has been made.": All in favor; No opposed
    - Psychological Sciences: The original wording about the award will fund. Is there a reason why that was removed? Does it not matter if we have it in the bylaws about what it funds?
        - Liz: That's a fair question. Essentially, I think that's a bit too exclusionary. The idea is that you're trying to get people to not use the SCA as a workaround for the awards because they didn't get them. It's supposed to be difficult. The idea is that you can't just apply to the SCA because you missed the deadline for the DTA or ITA.
        - Anna: I think you do make a good point that we don't outline what the SCA is. Maybe we add a line stating the award is to be used for any funding that is needed that does not fit in the other awards?
        - Physics: What should the SCA be able to fund?
        - Liz: Perhaps I think that is a good point.
        - Jenn: It says the applicants' graduate work. Some of the deadlines for the ITA and RA and DTA, there are conferences that do come up after those deadlines where you will not be able to apply for those awards.
            - Liz: The changes we just approved for the ITA take care of that issue. I'm 100 percent sure of it.
        - Political Science: I think part of the issue is the timing of it. If we give them a full year they essentially could apply for it and wait 9 months. Do we shorten the time in which it needs to be used?
            - Liz: I can only speak from a science POV, but there are things where you may order a "something" and to get that "thing" you have to jump through a lot of hoops before you actually have it. Just because the "thing" is important and you need it, it doesn't mean that it is automatically expedited by everyone else.
        - Physics: What if we included "costs accrued from graduate work"? I think that's as specific as we want to be at this point.
            - Liz: I do think that would solve part of the problem. I feel like part of the reason we didn't write this

initially is because the name of the award outlines that it's an "oh shit" award. It's not called the ITA/DTA/SCA. I feel like it's sort of obvious from the name. But I do think that it could be clarified.
        - Biomedical sciences: Doesn't .7 in the proposed wording take care of that?
            - Liz: Oh yes.
        - Charlie: I completely overlooked this. Just ignore what I said. Sorry about that.
    - Political science: I still think we need to add a point about what special contingency is.
        - Anna: I did write up a sentence. Basically, "The SCA is to be used for funding in extenuating circumstances as determined by the review committee."
        - Senator: Is getting notified that you were accepted to a conference outside of the application window for DTA and ITA, does that count as an extenuating circumstance?
            - Liz: I think part of the reason we made changes to the ITA is to handle this. However, the point of the SCA is that it's up to the review committee. You could do that. Hopefully we sort of capped people to use that.
    - Anthropology: For instance, my colleague can't do the research award, can they apply for the SCA?
        - Anna: This is where the review committee comes into play.
        - Liz: This is why we kept it super vague.
    - Mini vote to add the following sentence to VII-A: "The Special Contingency Award is to be used for funding in extenuating circumstances as determined by the review committee."
        - Majority in favor; No oppositions; No abstentions
    - No further discussion
    - Motion to accept the proposed wording with the addition of VII-A and to accept VI-B (reason for decision in writing within no more than 5 business days): Political Sciences
    - Second: Biomedical Sciences
    - Economics: Should we add the "5 business days" to other awards?
        - Liz: I disagree because the SCA occurs on a rolling basis.
        - Anna: Yes, it's more important for this award.
        - Economics: Got it. OK.
    - All those in favor: Majority
    - No oppositions or abstentions

G. **Academic Units & Organizational Funding |** *VII-F- i-vi*
- Motion: English
- Second: Anthropology
- Application window changed to "sufficiently in advance of a GSS meeting such that they may appear on the agenda"
    - No discussion

- Eligibility for reimbursement is extended to one year from the date of the award
    - No discussion
- Reorganized section for clarity and to fit with existing funding norms
    - No discussion
- General discussion:
    - Psychological Sciences: Is two weeks the norm to add things onto the agenda?
        - Liz: That is the standard, right Anna?
        - Anna: It does state that GSS needs two weeks in order to add something to the agenda.
        - Liz: So, I would add that to 1 then as people are requesting that.
        - Physics: If we add that to the bylaws, then we would have to change everything if technology or norms change.
        - Anna: I think this corresponds with Robert's Rules of Order so I don't think it would change.
        - Psychological Sciences: Is this information found somewhere easily accessible like the website?
            - Anna: Yes, it's on the website.
    - Geology: It says there's not a cap, so what is the reasonable amount to ask for?
        - Anna: It used to be capped at $50, but they changed it last year.
        - Physics: It was changed last year because, say, you come to us and say you need $20,000 to do something awesome then fantastic.
        - Liz: Part of the reason why it's not listed is because multiple departments could get together and request money to put on a mini interdisciplinary something.
        - Anna: This is on you guys. Senators get to approve these things based on the budget we have for that particular year.
        - Liz: It's not as if this gets slipped under a door and a bunch of people in cloaks make a decision. We all vote on this. We do have control over whether or not the funds are given.
- All in favor: Majority
- All opposed: no
- Abstentions: no.

V. Announcements

A. General Senate Meeting next Friday, February 7th, 2020 @ 8:00 am

VI. Adjournment @ 8:57 AM

A. Motion: Geography
B. Second: Physics
C. All in favor. No opposed. No abstentions.