

Presiding: Jess

Attending: Vik, Apurva, Anna, Ayse, Carly, Kurt, Dr. Morgan, Kaustubh, Xiao

4 May 2020

1. Constitution revisions today
2. Impeachment
  - a. Necessary?
  - b. Why?
  - c. Vik: Maintaining consistency with other student orgs
  - d. What are misdemeanors?
    - i. Vik: left purposefully vague because there can be many, many other problems that could require removal
      1. Should be rare
      2. But having process should be important
  - e. Kurt: Should we ban after being impeached for life?
    - i. JT: Agree with Kurt that banning for life is extended
    - ii. Vik: Currently placed at removed for current academic year only
    - iii. Ayse: Agree with not banning for life
  - f. Ayse: Do we need an impeachment process spelled out?
    - i. Dr. Morgan: Should keep it
    - ii. Kurt: Should maintain a clear process
    - iii. Vik: We should keep it just in case
    - iv. Jess: Include the process and keep it detailed to make things clear
    - v. Clayton: Maybe doesn't need to be too serious?
      1. Remove voting power for advisors
      2. Temporary officers are spelled out in Art. 6, Sec. 15.
    - vi. Going to take out mode for temporary officers
  - g. Weilee: Other organizations have impeachment provisions in constitutions
3. Attendance requirement
  - a. Who is allowed to be on the Executive Committee?
  - b. What should happen if meetings are missed
  - c. Kurt: Should repercussions for lack of attendance be immediate?
    - i. Maybe too strict to have immediate vacancy?
    - ii. Maybe can let Executive Committee decide instead
      1. Put it to a vote instead with accused disqualified
  - d. Kaustubh: Warning first and then go to Executive Committee for vote
  - e. Carly: Should timing be an issue?
    - i. Will be fixed if we switch to a vote
4. Voting
  - a. What method of voting should we be using?
  - b. Kurt: What timing should be applied for impeachment?
    - i. Currently says that it gives a two weeks grace to get to trial, etc.
    - ii. Carly: Should we make it two weeks for special election of impeachment too?
  - c. Kurt: Voting in elections

- i. Kurt: Ranked-choice voting for elections is my preferred method
    - d. Vik: Ranked-choice was just a placeholder; we can change as wanted
      - i. Currently using first past the post/plurality
    - e. Kurt: Can also use approval voting (up or down)
      - i. Most approval will get position
    - f. JT: How to run ranked-choice
      - i. Can use a Google Form
    - g. Jess: Will ranked-choice drop turnout?
      - i. Vik: Didn't happen in his undergrad
    - h. Kaustubh: Do we even need ranked-choice because usually we don't have more than two or three candidates per position
      - i. Kurt: 3 or 4 people ran for social chair
        - 1. In case of only one or two candidates, ranked-choice is the same as plurality
    - i. Jess: Will send a poll via email to officers to figure out which one most of us want
5. Term Limits
  - a. Kurt: Should we impose them?
    - i. Currently don't have them
  - b. Apurva: Sometimes there might not be enough interest in the incoming class to join GSO
    - i. We shouldn't have them as such
  - c. Consensus: Don't have term limits
6. Symposium
  - a. Kurt: Rather than having it be separate offices, should we have it be in each officer's job description?
    - i. Jess: Flexibility is nice to have
    - ii. JT: Should maintain flexibility to maintain adjustments
  - b. Consensus: Maintain flexibility
  - c. Should we maintain that it is required to keep the Symposium on Thursday?
    - i. Kurt: Could be easier for logistics to take out Thursday requirement
    - ii. JT: Is a time requirement even required?
    - iii. Weilee: Could help with orientation since poster session is useful for new students to get an idea of research opportunities
  - d. Consensus: remove time requirement
  - e. Should we have it in an Appendix or an Article?
    - i. Vik: Maintaining in main Constitution is a good idea; gives the veneer of permanency
    - ii. Kaustubh: Keep in Constitution for importance
  - f. Consensus: keep in Constitution
  - g. Kurt: Should we enumerate the goals of Symposium?
    - i. Providing recruitment opportunities for upper level grad students
    - ii. First year orientation
  - h. Consensus: Add in goals of Symposium
7. Officer Titles
  - a. Vik: Took out Chairs because we don't actually have committees

- b. Kurt: Titles only matter in elections to delineate responsibilities, etc.
  - c. Changed FY titles to “Representatives” instead of “Liaisons”
  - d. Consensus: Leave other officer titles as is
- 8. Davidson School of Chemical Engineering?
  - a. Should we have the full name of the school or just School?
  - b. Dr. Morgan: Davidson will be the name for around 20 years because it’s an endowment
  - c. Consensus: Have full name
- 9. President: Should we maintain the requirement that Presidents should have been in the Executive Committee at least one year before
  - a. Consensus: Add this in
- 10. The Rules of Order
  - a. Removed “in all manners as it sees fit” with “accordingly”
  - b. Should we maintain Robert’s Rules?
    - i. Kaustubh: It’s to maintain parliamentary formality
    - ii. Very cumbersome
- 11. Academic Standing
  - a. Maintaining both the School’s and University’s status is important
- 12. Three step approval process
  - a. Vik will send out latest revisions tonight or tomorrow
  - b. ExComm has until end of day Wednesday to vote
  - c. Full membership gets until Monday
  - d. We vote next Monday