



Delegates present: e alexander, Luke Andrejek, Selasi Attipoe, Tyler Beauregard, Qiuchang (Katy) Cao, Alec Clott, Katherine Conner, Austin Cool, Robert Dahlberg-Sears, Archit Datar, Ty Drayton, Story Edison, Brandon Free, Jahmour Givans, Jenna Greve, Abigail Grieff, Lindsey Hernandez, Kathryn Holt, Pouya Kousha (ALT), Carly LaRosa, Raven Lynch, Lucas Magee, Matthew Maynard, Aviva Neff, Maritza Pierre, Kelsey Pinckard, Zeltzin Reyes, Isaac Reynolds, Marie Rineveld, Ashweta Sahni, Conner Sarich, Michelle Scott, Ryan Slechta, Lindsey Stirek, Leila Vieira, Sarah Walton, Daniel Williams, Yu Lun Wu (ALT), Megan Zib

Delegates absent: Pranav Ambardekar, Jacky Anderson, Ali Asghari Adib, Aaron Beczkiewicz, Om Prakash Bedant, Jessica Blackburn, Andrew Borst, Mary Byrne, Yu-chun Chang, Steph Charles, Min-Seok Choi, Jorge Clavo Abbass, Paul Consiglio, Benjamin Duran, Kat Ellis, Jorge Torres Espinosa, Micheline Fahrbach, Elizabeth Galko, Lauren Howard, Audrey Hungerpiller, Sarah Hyman, Kevin Ingles, Jeffrey Kast, Arsh Kumar, Jungmin Lee, Yifan Li, Ho-chieh Lin, Ruonan Lin, Stephen Lo, Madeleine Lomax-Vogt, Eric Loria, Emily Lundstedt, Tori Magers, Rohit Mukherjee, Kate Ormiston, Alejandro Otero Bravo, Tricia Oyster, Ryann Patrus, Mark Pauley, Miguel Pedrozo, Avi Pokala, Ken Poland, Priscila Rodriguez Garcia, Erik Scaltriti, Lena Schreiber, Sarah Scott, Utkarsh Shah, Melika Shahhosseini, Shruthi Shetty, Karla Shockleymccarthy, Preeti Singh, Sundeep Siripurapu, Nithya Sivashankar, Kye Stachowski, Nicole Tchorowski, Philip Tice, Taylor Tomnu, James Uanhoro, Jennifer Valdez, Mitch Vicieux, Derek Walton, Piao Yang, Soroush Zamanian

1. CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at 3:32pm

1.1. Statement of Purpose

- 1.1.1. To effectively advocate and program to ensure that the Ohio State University graduate student experience is the best it can be.

2. ROLL CALL

2.1. Carmen log-in

3. Discussion of USG/IPC/CGS joint statement published June 1, 2020

3.1. Statement from CGS President, Stephen Post (post.144):

- 3.1.1. "Discussing this topic will be hard and possibly uncomfortable for some of you, but I know as CGS it is our duty to fight for the safety of the Black graduate student community. I have seen the pain, exhaustion, and despair in the eyes of my Black peers that continue to endure to from just living while Black. I have deliberately listened and heard them voice these unchanged struggles for at least the past 6 years here at The Ohio State University. As a Freshman in 2014, I joined the student group Sustained Dialogue seeking to engage in dialogue on critical social identities with students of different backgrounds; that same year 12-year old Cleveland boy Tamir Rice and 18-year old Ferguson teen Michael Brown were shot and killed by police. In 2015, I began to plan the 1st Annual OSU Community Police Dialogue at the same time Samuel DuBose was shot and killed in my hometown of Cincinnati by UC Police. The next 4 years from 2016-2019, we held this dialogue and helped built 100's of relationships between students, community members, and surrounding police departments. In that same period, 100's of Black men and women were killed by Police (mappingpoliceviolence.org) including right here in Columbus in the tragic cases of Henry Green, Tyre King, and more. Racism has plagued our land since 1619 before the birth of our nation, and a statement from the 3 student government presidents at Ohio State will not change the deeply entrenched problem we are dealing with. What I believe and hope the statement conveys is my solidarity and allyship in supporting my fellow student government leaders and the need for drastic policy changes that go further than just community dialogues. I am tired of people not listening. I am tired of people not being able to understand which is why I do still value these methods of improvement and look forward to talking about all the possible solutions CGS see that could solve this problem and incorporating them into this

draft resolution for next week's meeting."

- 3.2. Some members of Exec participated in the joint zoom call to talk through the statement. There was discussion of the language and the demands raised in the statement, but the decision was made that we should support this statement.
- 3.3. Whitaker.105 (ALT for Kousha.3): Point of order: the body should only debate an action.
 - 3.3.1. Khamees.5 disagreed and clarified that there is no specific language that prohibits an open discussion.
- 3.4. Edison.22: It was important that we published something in a timely manner because of the urgency of the situation.
- 3.5. Magee.113: With such an important topic, it would have been important to have a forum for discussion to get real input from the delegate body. No problem with Stephen making statements as CGS president or on the behalf of CGS. The social media handling of the statement however made it seem that this statement represented the opinions of CGS as a whole and implied that we had discussed it as an organization. Additionally, the delegate body should have been notified of the statement before it was published. Also, signatures were accepted from not only students, but others outside the university.
- 3.6. Slechta.3: Thanks Stephen for calling the special meeting. The exec committee had good intentions but may have sacrificed inclusivity for the sake of timeliness in this instance. There was not a way for the voices of CGS and our constituents to be heard and included in crafting the message of this statement. We could have had a special meeting or gathered votes to approve or not approve CGS signing on to the statement. He believes that Stephen should apologize to the delegate body for this breach.
- 3.7. Stirek.1: Stephen is a representative of the graduate student body as he was elected by the delegates, who were elected by students. She agrees that it would have been idea to call an emergency meeting but recognizes that we were working with other organizations with their own timelines. She believes that in the moment, he was doing what was right for himself and CGS. If we want to use Carmen voting to pass approval on statements in the future, we should investigate how to do that.
- 3.8. Dahlberg-sears.1: In general, students have voiced support for this measure. Stephen is our representative and it is within his purview to make statements on behalf of CGS. Students have also been asking after they have signed on to the letter as an individual, could we maybe gather votes about policy and plans from departments to give us more leverage? We need to find and defend a thoughtful stance moving forward.
- 3.9. Magee.113: While Stephen is our leader, he doesn't have the power to make formal demands to the university without the approval and input of the delegate body.
- 3.10. Holt.351: This is not the first time that the exec committee has put forth a statement and then followed it up with a resolution. There was a representation problem in this case because of the social media angle. We should move on from this issue and instead spend time talking about how we are going to make further progress.
- 3.11. Stirek.1: Agrees with Holt.351. If an apology is needed, fine, but Stephen has not explicitly violated anything in the by-laws. If we want to limit the president, we need to be clear about exactly what we want those limits to be. Maybe we don't use CGS letterheads for statements not approved by the delegate body?
- 3.12. Post.144: Everything that has been said is valid and he apologizes for not being able to work on the statement in a timeline that allowed for feedback from the delegate body. He agrees that he should have sent out an email alerting delegates about the statement. The intent was not to represent this as the opinion of CGS. Does not apologize for the contents of the letter because it has opened up a dialogue and there have already been candid conversations with university administrators, which is historically unusual. We always intended to follow up this statement with a resolution that would be discussed and passed in a meeting where the delegate body would get to share their thoughts and opinions.
- 3.13. Khamees.5 (Parliamentarian): Stephen is, by definition, a representative of CGS. According to our bylaws, it's not clear whether he needs to get authorization from other representatives for any action. President should fulfill duties at the direction of the council and the exec committee and in this situation, the exec committee did direct him to sign on to this statement. There is no requirement for an official vote in such a case.
- 3.14. Scott.1445: If the delegate body really feels that we have an issue with the precedent that was followed in this situation, we should address that and lay out more specific rules for the future.
- 3.15. Sarich.6: Encourages us to move to a discussion of the issues and content of the resolution.
- 3.16. Beauregard.13: In other similar situations that have previously occurred, there maybe was some issues or

concerns and we should address this in the by-laws.

- 3.17. Williams.6571: We need the president to be able to make quick statements on our behalf. We need a forum for delegates voices to be heard but this may not be able to be accommodated before a statement is required. The roles and abilities of the president are not explicitly state in our governance documents. He trusts Stephen still and hopes he will learn from this experience.
- 3.18. Free.41: The president should maybe avoid making specific demands to the university without delegate input.
- 3.19. Slechta.3: This is the first time he is aware of the president issuing a unilateral statement. He can issue a statement on behalf of the executive committee if it is voted on. He pushes back on previous comments and states his belief that this is an important issue that we need to discuss fully. The statement co-opted all the voices and power of all graduate students by not discussed with a wider audience first.
- 3.20. Whitaker.105 (ALT for Kousha.3): The authority granted to the council means that it can appoint representatives and participate in university councils. The president is responsible for implementing all the decisions of the council and the executive committee is tasked with carrying out the business of the council between meetings. The exec committee should bring any matter needing the consideration of the council to the council for discussion before acting on it. The body should definite the limits of what the exec committee can take without approval from the council.
- 3.21. Hodak.2 (CGS Advisor): The historical precedent is that the president has made statements at the direction of the exec committee without the input of the full council. He cannot make a statement that counters a previous position or policy of CGS. There have been cases where the delegate body has set the official position in a resolution that may or may not align with exactly what was previously publicized in the president's statement. This does not undermine the authority or position of CGS.
- 3.22. Gregg.186 (ALT for Wu.3363): He doesn't see any problem with Stephen's actions as nowhere in the statement does he claim to be speaking for the entirety of CGS.
- 3.23. Edison.22: Motions to move into discussion of the resolution.
- 3.24. Motion seconded by Williams.6571.

4. Open discussion of Resolution 1920 SU-012: A Resolution Addressing the Injustices Against the Black Community and Columbus Protestors by the Columbus Police Department

- 4.1. Resolution authors, Post.144 and Brandl.8: We have a lot of ideas for policy changes and specific demands that can be made of the university but want opinions about what should be included. This is still a very rough draft and needs feedback about what the appropriate scope and position of the resolution should be to make it the most effective.
- 4.2. Free.41: If we leave in the clause saying that we support the original statement, it may constrain us and might be better to instead lay out our policy asks.
- 4.3. Givans.2: In the 4th WHEREAS clause about demonstrations, it should be expanded beyond George Floyd
 - 4.3.1. Post.144 asks how we can effectively include all relevant names of individuals. Some are called out later in the document.
- 4.4. Edison.22: It may be helpful to layout the specifics of the statement if we are going to reference it or at least describe it more fully.
- 4.5. Dahlberg-sears.1: In the 3rd Be It Resolved clause, we should change "desires the Ohio State University to identify alternatives to protecting the safety of students" to say "to identify and implement alternatives".
- 4.6. Slechta.3: The clauses that propose making changes to Article 13 of the CGS Constitution will require us to vote on this twice. The sponsor is typically a committee rather than a single person. We may want to lay out more specific police reforms.
 - 4.6.1. Sponsorship will likely be changed to the executive committee.
 - 4.6.2. We have talked about putting in specific reforms, perhaps an independent civilian review board, address implicit bias. This is definitely an area that needs more input.
- 4.7. Whitaker.105 (ALT for Kousha.3): No sponsor is needed as long as the resolution is seconded. He recommends removing the clauses addressing constitutional changes and creating a second resolution to address them. In the 3rd Be It Resolved clause, we should change "desires the Ohio State University to identify and implement alternatives to protecting the safety of students" to say "to identify and implement alternative means of

protecting". He also recommends removing the reference to the joint statement until we can sort out what we want our precedent to be.

- 4.8. Pierre.77: In the beginning of the resolution, we should include a more general statement about the outrage that has sparked protests and then pull in specific examples like George Floyd. Also, we need to research the effectiveness of the reforms we are proposing and address accountability.
- 4.9. Beauergard.13: We don't need to be the experts on all the reforms that we are asking for. Our job is just to express our values and wants to the university and the administrators need to carry out that obligation. We can be more general and say that we want things that have been shown to be effective.
- 4.10. Dahlberg-sears.1: We need to do our due diligence and make sure the things we are asking for will be meaningful and effective. In the 4th WHEREAS clause, change "murder" to say "police murder". In the other people named, we should also emphasize that these are police murders.
- 4.11. Brandl.8: Encourages people to think about changes and initiatives they would like to see and add ideas to our policy document. This will be a focus for CGS this year and we will be putting forth a lot of resolutions on this and related topics. The only issue with not stating specific reforms is that it can make it hard to hold the university accountable.
- 4.12. Pierre.77: May be more effective to frame the reform demands in terms of impunity and accountability.
- 4.13. Whitaker.105 (ALT for Kousha.3): CGS can direct internal committees to work on creating actions and doing the research. It's important that this resolution articulates our commitment to these issues and we can follow it up with more specific plans if necessary. There's room here to use more emphatic and bold language to set higher expectations. We could also create a specialized ad-hoc committee to work on this issue specifically.
 - 4.13.1. Haynes.242: This is actually something that is already in the works: There will be a Public Safety task force with students (from the student governments and unaffiliated), faculty, staff, and the Department of Public Safety. Student Life also has been soliciting feedback.
- 4.14. Slechta.3: There is not a lot of available data to pull from so maybe we can ask for funding to study these issues in the Columbus Police Department specifically.
- 4.15. Magee.113: In the 5th WHEREAS clause, he suggests an edit to include a reference to the fact that students were exercising their first amendment rights while peacefully protesting.

5. Meeting adjourned at 5:26pm.