GPSS Executive Committee Meeting- 27 May 2015

Meeting called to order at 5:35 p.m. by meeting chair Alice Popejoy

Members Present:
GPSS President Alice Popejoy
GPSS Vice President Alex Bolton
GPSS Secretary Natalie Gordon
GPSS Treasurer Douglas Taber
Executive Senator Elloise Kim
Executive Senator Eddie Schwieterman
Executive Senator Evan Firth
Executive Senator Yasmeen Hussain
David Goldstone STF Chair Elect
Current STF Chair Jared
GPSS Policy Analyst Brian Taubeneck
Graduate School Liaison Kelly Edwards
GPSS Senator Monica Cortes-Viharo

Approval of Agenda
Natalie moved to approve the agenda, Elloise seconded.
Agenda for the meeting approved without objection.

Approval of Minutes
Eddie moved to approve the minutes, Elloise seconded.
Minutes approved without modification.

STF Updates - Chair Appointee
Jared: My time to leave has come. I will be graduating. Our committee nominated a chair position, and we need confirmation from ASUW and GPSS. I would like to introduce David Goldstone.

David: I am a Sophomore triple majoring in math, history, and econ. I grow up in Washington in Federal Way. I joined the STF committee this year. And I really enjoyed all my time and we have done a lot of great things and met a lot of great people and worked on lots of great projects. I am curious if there any questions that I can answer.

Eddie: I am interested in knowing what your initiatives would be in this leadership position.

David: I have three initiatives: 1) continue policy centralization that Jared has worked on this year. There are a number of ways that we can do this. In terms of computer labs, we would like get all the colleges on campus together so we can identify which computer labs are important to students and make sure we continue to expand and fund those at specific locations. 2) remote computing centralization. The College of Engineering is looking forward to working with STF to provide a complete college of engineering computing system. 3) makerspace centralization. there’s going to be a makerspace that unfortunately STF
was unaware about. We want to start collaborating between those departments and figure out good ways that STF can work on those. Two others are pretty brief. One is to increase research that we did to make sure the committee is really knowledgeable on what sort of things that we fund. Also to increase name recognition of STF. We did great with our second round proposals, so we would like to continue that tradition and really get our name out there.

Alice: I have a couple questions: you touched on communication strategy as far as advertising open proposals. But I am curious the communication both internally and externally because this year we had some communication issues- I didn't know who to contact. So how does that work with the program coordinator and the chair internally and externally to make sure students are aware of STF funding?

David: For the first part, I think Alton is really knowledgeable about the program, and I think he would be the best contact person. He is the sort of the guy that does everything and STF would not be a committee without him. I think in terms of the majority stuff, in terms of contracts, proposals, and that type of thing, it would go to Alton. In terms of general goals and other ideas that you would like to bring to the table, I would be the one to contact. So I can help guide the committee in that direction. In terms of communicating with outside departments, Alton would really be the go-to guy. For everything else, I will do the individual contact things. I really think establishing personal relationships with different departments is really important, and so I will be taking on that role. In terms of advertising, we will have our website up soon. And we are also looking at other ways to increase our advertising footprint on campus by having consultant services on campus.

Jared: We were really successful with the second round proposal process and advertising. We got email lists and we got flyers printed out. Our communication officer did a great job. We're hiring someone to design sandwich boards and pamphlets. So those will be set up. One of the proposals that we received is resources scout, kind of like space scout but with equipment and machinery and computer labs. We approached UW IT to put that on their agenda, and they wrote a proposal for us. And we have a timeline that stretches through the end of Fall.

Elloise: I think on the website, if you can make the contact information clearer that would be great for external communication. Like who is in what role. It would be easier for people to navigate. It’s a simple thing, but it would be a lot easier for people who are not familiar with STF.

David: I am very in favor of getting the website up as soon as possible and getting that information to students. One of the large complaints we have gotten from colleges is about our website and it’s very challenging for them to know who to contact and what we are looking for in proposals. So the website is very much something that we will be working on.

Yasmeen: There were some internal policy discussions this year, and I am wondering how you see going forward in implementing those things and transitioning?

David: One of the key things I brought to the committee when I was running was that continuing Jared’s policy crafting is something that I am interested in. I think we can always be updating and collaborating
with other groups to fund the optimal policy. I would like to convene a policy review committee in spring that can goes through each individual policy to make sure all things are something that we still agree with.

Jared: David was part of the internal subcommittee for writing the new policies. In particular for the compliance policy. He also approached arts and sciences and environmental sciences, and student life on the dean signature policy. We are trying to reevaluate and see where that's going before the year end. And David is steering that.

Eddie: Move to extend by 2 minutes | Doug: Second

Eddie: Specifically about the dean’s signature. The second round RFP had broader requirements. I remember the chair discussion on the oversight board. STF was coming from the perspective ensuring that there's space for the equipment and support. And it seems to me that you indicate that the deans disagree with that decision that there doesn't need to be a dean signature. Is that correct?

David: I wouldn't say so much that the deans disagree. But I think the deans think there’s more optimal ways of ensuring that students have the most access to STF. And there's appropriate responsibility levels taken by it. Unfortunately it's different for different departments. In the College of Engineering, it’s very laissez faire- and they prefer to have their own department chair signing off, but the current policy we are looking at is deans, directors or department chairs signing on the line and are accountable to give instructions to the proposal authors.

Eddie: I think it’s great that you are exploring it very carefully. I would just come at it from the perspective of making sure that any students who wants to put in a proposal are able to are not shut out because they don't have a tight relationship with the dean.

David: That’s the approach that set us off on this process.

Doug: I sent him my usual interview questions. For future reference, if you can include the next year’s treasurer on deciding your meeting time, just so they can know when those meeting will be. (David: 4:00PM Mondays)

Alice: Thanks for changing it from the PACS and SAF time. One thing that I want to get on the record is the timeline and there's sort of a drop-off of time line. It’s three years right? That students are required to have access?

Jared: It’s three years for certain items. The committee has the right to extend it to 5 or 7 years for really expensive and risky equipment. For example Hayek is going to be under our supervision for quite some time because we have invested a lot of money. But in terms of accessibility, after that 7 years it's not really a conversation that we invest too much time on.

Alice: I know the reason behind it is because the committee does not have the scope to continue investigating and supervising the resources that you guys have funded after certain point, I hope there are some policy conversation that could be had next year about the possibility to have some requirement on
good faith that STF funded resources are available to students forever. It just seems to me like buying three years of time. Students pay to have these resources be implemented and provided and for three years, they are required to allow students to use them, and then after that point, it just sort of goes off. And maybe students will never have access to it again and we won't know about it. So I would love to see some sort of expectation that students will always have access to it. And just sort of unspoken understanding that if there's any question or problems, students can report it to STF, and there can be some kind of intervention. That would just be my suggestion.

Eddie: Move to approve David Goldstone as STF chair | Douglass Taber: Second (no objection)

**Ad-hoc committee on Fee-Based programs**

Alice: I learned an incredible amount. An hour is not enough time to meet with these people, because there are such richness of issues, and there are so many different issues that we need to touch on. The one that I am currently interested in is who actually has the fee setting authority for fee based programs? if you ask the program or the department, they say oh its PCE, and if you ask PCE they said its departments that are charging. I think it’s both. I think it might good to know who has the authority to set those things. And what’s happening. This came up because someone in the School of Nursing said that she received an email that says fee is increased for summer quarter by $16 a credit. So next steps is setting up a student advisory board to the vice provost for educational outreach. He seem to be receptive to the idea of having a student advisory board for education outreach or just PCE so they can hear those problems directly. If anyone has any leads on how we can look into those, maybe Kelly and I can try to figure it out.

Kelly: have you asked Becky? She might have the answer to that question and I will follow up with her. She did a fee-based report from the grad school. Is there's someone that's going to move forward with the student advisory board idea after you are gone.

Alice: Alex is there for that conversation so he and Monica knows about. I have that report as well as a master thesis from a previous GPSS senator Danny Fitz who did her entire thesis on fee based program at the university of Washington comparing it to University of California. We have fantastic resources from her. And that's been circulated in faculty senate. That was helping to guide the conversation.

**Graduate Program Reviews**

Alice: Every year, GPSS at some point of time argue to be the student perspective when the graduate school is doing their 10-year-review of every program at the university. It’s been perceived as a blessing or a burden. I had Patricia doing this all year. She sends me this report and she did the site visits with the committee that's reviewing the program and she did the site catalyst the we inherited but made better this year for students. and she works with senator in that program to tweaks the question and allow them to add additional questions that would be helpful. She synthesized the results of the surveys and we have all the raw data, and we send it to the graduate school by the deadline that they provided us at the beginning of the year. I found out last week at the graduate school council meeting that the deadline they gave us was actually too late. Half the time these reports we gave them weren't even forwarded to the committee because it was passed the deadline. And no one informed me. I thought it's been going great all year, and last year they said that GPSS didn't do the program review, and I was like we are not going to be that this year, and I talked to last year's president and he was like “oh no, we did graduate review” and I was
like that was not what I heard. I blamed it on him, and now I am learning that they might tell next year administration the same thing even I wasn't aware. This is serious lack of communication that has been an issue for many years. As a result now, there’s document circulating now that the graduate school is going to redo how they do student surveys and they are going to have someone else doing the survey instead of GPSS. Which I see very problematic because it is something that I built into Monica’s new position. We have some serious smoothing out that needs to happen in the next couple of weeks before I drop off and I am hoping Kelly would help us facilitate this.

Kelly: This is academic planning and I do student affair so this is not my portfolio. But I did follow up after we heard about this. It sounds like that they are really harsh on this. But I think there's a new strategy for getting student surveys, I don't know what the new plan is, but the new incoming person should meet with Becky, Augustine and David to make sure what is the new system and I would be curious what their interest is. For GPSS, our interest is to make sure that student voices are included in meaningful way in the process. Whatever system we use, I just want to make sure that student voices are included, and that's all I care about, but I am curious what's the investment to have it run through you guys.

Rene: GPSS asked to include in this historically. I am going to say at least 7 or 8 years before. Because senators felt like the process used at that time wasn't so great. I know you guys have a few year where that has not been done that. But the idea of having someone done all these work and having it not be used or read by committee member, it sound strange. If there’s change in time frame, and you were doing on other time frame, did they have a personnel change?

Alice: So what happened is that they give us an outline for when the site visit were, And the word that we were told last week were “It would be best to have the results of the survey before the site visits.” So the committee members can review them. I heard that at the time as: make sure we get them by the site visits” I didn't hear that as make sure we get them a week or two before site visits so the committee can incorporate it into their process. And if you don't get it to us by two week before the site visit date, we are not going to send it to the committee at all or not even included in the process. So it’s just a misunderstanding of what the deadline meant. I thought the hard deadline was the site visits date. But then I was told that it was some ambiguous time before the site visits. Which is not defined.

Eddie: Yeah I think this is very frustrating. It seems really unacceptable that no one said anything. Someone was receiving these reports and knew that they either didn't send it to the person they are supposed to send them to or had some kind of process where they decide it was t900 late and didn't send it to someone. and just made the decision to not to contact. But the committee should be expecting the response of GPSS, and somebody on that committee should have sought that input actively. For GPSS to be actively spending resources and putting in person hours, and not have it use is just unacceptable.

Kelly: It feels like some kind of misunderstanding. David who was the other person who runs these with Augustine had- he said in a couple of in-person meeting in the fall where he is clear about the deadline one week before site visit. He said in writing and in person. It sounds like they have been doing some communication with Patricia. And I think going forward, I want to know how the students are feeling about the program- all the information was archived so nothing was lost. And I want to go through and do an analysis and kind of post talk and say if there is program specific things that we can learn or even just
sharing the report directly with the program in certain cases. And Is there any summary points that point to different policy or program issues that we can pick up. So I would say: one, completely tragic that this happen, and two, we will find way for us to use that information, and three, I think what you would like to see happen going forward. It’s worth pressing on it. How much do we want to deconstruct on what went wrong this year. But that's up to you.

Monica; I feel like those two are intrinsically tied that unless we know what went wrong, we can make a plan on making sure that that never happens again. And I understand that they might be at a point that they don't want to talk about what went wrong, and just want to move on. But that's problematic given all the work we have done. So I think there's got to be a bit if investigatory time without finger pointing. But I think that’s the only way if we are going to retain our role, we can do so effectively in the future, we have to know what happen.

Alice: I really like to know the rationale. I went back and looked at the time line, and one of the sentiment of the students is that we don't necessary feel comfortable answering these questions, because we don't feel like our criticism is welcomed and we are afraid of backlashes. And we actually got a low response specifically because of that. That's the rationale of having GPSS doing the survey, especially on catalyst. If it comes to GPSS, we are not revealing who did the survey whereas if you have the graduate school do it and they are reporting it back to the department, one, students are not as likely to give honest response, and two, they are going to be concerned with identifiability. For me that was a really important thing. So I went back to my email, and I send the final copy to Patricia on March 3rd. So that was by the site visit date. And it was my understanding that the committee writes her report after the site visits. So if they got it the day before the site visits, and they are writing the report after. The fact that GPSS wasn't even included in the report material that the graduate student counsel received last week. So to me that almost feel spiteful.

Kelly: That part of the deconstruction needs to be investigated. The council needs to have an education process around student feedback is part of the reports, part of the review, if you are not seeing them, ask for them. And it’s best to have a sit-down meeting between whoever is involved and work out on how did this happen. to me that’s inappropriate. And then I would Want to now, I actually don't know how it will happen, I think it will happen through office of education, (it is), so let's just make sure that whatever the alternative system that we are meeting student need.

Elloise: We need to remind the committee the purpose of program review to make sure that the program is serving everyone’s needs. And if students voice cannot be heard or is intentionally neglected, it's really problematic. I am concern with the confidentiality issues, and not everyone would be willing to speak against program, and it’s quite easy to identify who is more outspoken about those issues. So I think the council should have some accountability on not sorting out student voice when it is something that they has to do, and confidentiality should be improved to make sure that they are heard without backlash.

Kelly: One thing, it would be great to get the council agenda the first of the year. I think that would be fantastic.
Eloise: deadline is important since everyone is important. However I think it's absurd that they didn't not include student voice simply because of the deadline. What is the purpose of the review, if student voice is not included. I think it’s pointless

Alice: Everything we provide to the graduate school is completely anonymous. We have done at least 8 or 9 reports. From last year, I don't know. I Suspect where the misunderstanding occur fundamentally is their rationale for having the report from GPSS before the site visit is so that the committee can follow up concerns that were brought up by students during the site visit. And That I do not have an understanding of. What I thought was make sure you give it to us before the site visit because that's when we collect all our data, and when we write the report to the council, we will have everyone's information included. I think when you provide someone with a sheet of all program reviews, to say verbally that we would really like to have these ahead of time isn't enough. Like give us a sheet that says these are the dates that you actually need to hand in the report.

Kelly: It always help me to know the rationale of something. And if any of you have been through a program review, they do external site review has a private meeting with students in the program, and they have a confidential discussion with them.

Alice: We didn't make it anywhere into the graduate school council. Like that’s a concern that was brought up, and their response was that it didn't make it to the committee’s report because it's nowhere to be found in the official material. I think that’s just a way to systematically exclude that from being put on the record because it was on the record. That makes me really uncomfortable. I know we are supposed to encourage student to the site visits to show up and with someone from GOSS presents. And Those specifically has lower responses than the surveys because they are advertised by the department. I think we have seen a lot more honesty out of survey than in person situation.

Monica; it's really busy right now, I would like to meet with people in person. I don't want to wait until the beginning of the year. I would like to start as much as possible

Alice: Maybe Patricia is not the best person to schedule this meeting. Is there someone at the graduate school? To have you and Becky loop in on this too. let’s do it before the e13th.

Kelly: Who in GPSS will be there?

Alice: Patricia, Alex, Monica, and me.

Brian: Alex might not be able to make it. Alex is going away to the south.

**Strategic Plan of Graduate Education- Kelly**

Kelly: We would like to have any input on what's important for David to emphasize during the senate meeting. basically to get to this process, there is an extensive process with survey with good response rate with students. Talked to department chair and dean around where we should go with graduate education. And where is the future of grad education and how can we be ready. The result ended up here. The paper document is in your information material. We consolidate our goal to the 5 pillars: grad experience,
diversity and inclusion, innovation and excellence, advocacy and advancement and administrative structure. I gave you just graduate student experience page. I would appreciate some input. Each of the pillar would be led by different dean team. That just mean that there will be an oversight group will work with these goals and objectives and develop how to set priority and how to pull in some project team. On purpose we call this a strategic plan for graduate education. We realized we have a lot of partners in this. and we want to figure out how we can best collaborate to best move some of these initiative. the biggest theme for graduate experience is to make sure that you can have the best experience while you are here include efficient process as well as prepare you for the career that you want to have. And you feel prepared for the next step. One of our planning pieced, and Natalie and Alice were part of this, we are thinking about critical juncture of graduate student experience. All the way from getting offer, accepting admission, arriving and getting started and finishing, We’re really trying to recognize diversity in short term and longer. It’s hard to say that this a single plan that's going to address this thing. But we have been thinking whether there's any population that we have been ignoring. Fee-based program as an example. that's the brief overview of that. We welcome ongoing student contribution to the working group as well as suggestion on how to move forward with regards to collaborating with GPSS. And How should Dave talks about this next week?

Yasmeen: They seem really vague to me. Is this just a vision?

Kelly: by the time you get to strategy, it's supposed to be more concrete. And there's a metrics team that's developing metrics on how we know it's effective and what we need to work on. but each of those should have metrics that determine the results and have concrete deliverables. Some of the pillars are more specific than mine. mine remain vague because it depends on what kind of students you are talking about so I wanted to convene a working group, and drill down what are the project level that we want to finalized and invest in this year.

Yasmeen: I like that this is an inclusive document and it’s trying to include the range of graduate student experiences, but I see a couple times that graduate students are found the solution to the world's greatest problems. And I think that’s actually not the goal of graduate students. Or if it is, perhaps we need to have a discussion of what's the goal of graduate school. Just that first line and the third line.

Kelly: Do you have a suggestion on how to make that inclusive or extensive.

Yasmeen: I think just taking that out, maybe just skipping that part. because I don't think everyone is doing scholarly pursuit to solve the world's greatest problems.

Kelly: I think one of the blur is that when you have multiple audience, we tend toward language like that. This is toward the part of advocacy in legislature,

Eddie: even further, having people educated, adds value to the world. I think that’s a more correct statement than solving the world's problem.

Monica: I think the other issue for me is that it's about asking the important question but not always having answer to that. We want to link it to some kind of values. Like asking important questions. We
may not get to solutions. So I think one is the intrinsic values of having people educated in the society, and if we want to drill down to what are research university- why not something else. And We want to link it to some kind of values. Somebody got to starts by asking important questions.

Alice: I think this is a really rich and valuable conversation to have. I think there are students input in the beginning, and now that you have more of a solid plan, maybe we can take it to the whole senate.

Kelly: Elizabeth is working on the final wording of this. And so this is why they tried to keep it the streamline version, and the operation guide, we will have more time with that. But I will take this note to Elizabeth now.

Alice: Be careful what you wish for!

Elloise: question about the student feedback part. Are you planning to develop a universal model that the programs and department can learn from? Or are you thinking of something else when you talk about monitoring.

Kelly: It probably wasn't even as fully developed as you described. There’s a lot of student data, even with these program review, it's just not being synthesize. And that’s the intention. How to take the data we already have and figure out what other data we need so we can be making more evidence-based decision. Rather than waiting 10 years for a program review.

Elloise: if there's a role model that program could just take rather than trying to developed their own, it might be more confident, and it would be more effective for students to push their program who might be reluctant. And learn from other program.

Kelly: this group, we would really like to gather best practice from departments that are doing really well. That’s not the grad school saying what to do, but saying that your peers have been doing this really well, and see what works well. And Students can even be mobilized to institutionalize those.

Eddie: speaking of metrics, there's a lot of worthy goals in the summary. What metrics would be used to evaluate the progress towards meeting those goals. for example diversity inclusion. What kind of metrics would be employed. Is it worth saying we will evaluate our process toward these goals specifically.

Kelly: the diversity has its own page. It doesn't yet include metrics, because that would be the next 6 months. GPSS would be great to hold us accountable for that…. we want t9o be able to get at meaningful experience too. So we probably have a mix approach.

Doug: You mentioned state as a stakeholder for this document. Over the last few years, we have lost some funding (40%) and there are tons of articles about higher education being economic stimulator. And investing in career advising. State funds paying for that would encourage students to stay here. I think it's a really smart investment for the state to make.
Alice: looking at all these pillars, how does the GPSS stay engaged. I feel like we have a committee or a staff member who correspond to each of these pillars. So for the graduate experience. We actually create a computer this year on graduate student experience. And that's my intention of consolidating all the committee that were under the preview of the president to address some of these issues. that committee you can meet with your group. Diversity inclusion you can meet with diversity committee. And diversity council that is advisory to Sheila. And we have a GPSS senator on the diversity council. So that would be a good person to try to increase communication. Innovation and excellence, we have spots on faculty council on research, we have different people that report back to GPSS on different issues. Students who are highly involved with the issues could be very good people to bring in for these issues.

Kelly: Absolutely. Coming to meeting, I have learn a great amount. I think it would just really help facilitate the process.

Alice: A lot of time what happen is that they avoid, and different people see it from different perspective, and they started working on it from the side and the only official connection GPSS has to the graduate school aside from doing the program review is GSCA.

Kelly: We are going to start hold ourselves accountable internally. One quick inclusive question: I know Dave talks about graduate education, we often use language such a leadership such a s” the leaders at graduate school..” how does that framing sit with you

Yasmeen: I think all these things are different things that people might do. But I don't think that leadership would be something that everyone would do.

Kelly: Ok. Just testing out different framing.

Monica: I really like the idea of the citizenship. The idea is that an actively engage community member. Again, not everyone can be the captain, but we can all be strong citizen. I am trying to think of the idea of being a strong participant of the university.

Elloise: Or maybe community servant.

Alice: We still have to talk about helping Dave’s talk. . Because it's going to be quite short. Can folks throw out ideas quickly?

Yasmeen: Insight on why this is happening. Here is the document, we are looking for student feedback, and we are looking for feedback.

Eddie: And maybe an explanation on what kind of feedback is helpful and what timeline on the feedback and what types of feedback is helpful

Natalie: If you can send me the draft so I can send it to the senator, so they can have a heads up. If you can send it to me as soon as possible.
Kelly: Yeah. I gave you two pages, the whole thing is 6 pages.

Monica: I was thinking about the background of why this is happening and how is this going to be used. Where is it going to be used. Are there going to be mechanisms to keep us accountable. The how is going to be the key on whether people want to invest time on this.

Kelly: based on Ana Mari’s, I said it might be best to have longer Q&A

Eddie: Something else that might be helpful too is when there are question that he watches the time that he spends on answering the question

Monica: Sometimes when they say that They will be available to answer the question, and people just go right outside and it can be kind of loud. so I don’t know if we can reserve the space out there. ( Kelly: I can help facilitate that)

Alice: Our meeting is going to be short, and it’s going to be at Lyceum. I suspect that he will be able to stay, but he can, we can just finish right around the end of the meeting. So maybe just. We wouldn't want to keep him for the whole meeting. We can put him later on for our agenda, but we can also bump him up if he can't do that

Yasmeen: I wonder how many students would recognize him from the UAW email, the union letters. Particularly if this is a draft of something about welcoming students and making their experience better. I think it would be an interesting position to be in. Heads-up.

Kelly: He didn't like the letter either (Laughs) he is totally up for relationship repairs for that.

Alice: Was that helpful?

Kelly: Yes

Natalie: Can you send me the draft. (Elizabeth is formatting it)

Alice: I really feel like the senator would be much more receptive the plan if they know it's not final and they can have involvement. like if they know they still have opportunity to provide input. Having the senators seeing it for the first time and telling them that its final is not appropriate.

Kelly: This round of the communications about invitation into the next phase, and making these phases measurable. We actually want and need input moving toward the operation phase. I think everyone has cubism about the strategic plan that it takes forever then it gets put on the shelf. So when Dave picked up this, he was really committed to making this a living document.

Monica: if its going to turn into initiative committees that you want students representation. Because students will feel like they are invested in to help craft the formal document.
Alice: ideally it wouldn't need to start from scratch. Ideally it would just be like here are the goals and plug and play if you engage all the right stakeholders. That you can just find and copy and paste into your strategic plan, so it’s not graduate school coming up with the whole plan. So let’s make that a big part of Dave’s languages” that this is an invitation to the next phase” So is there anything else that you. (Kelly: No thank you) Thank you for being here.

**Senator Awards**

* Awards are as following: *
  * Senate Choice: to be voted by senators *
  * Rookie of The Year; Jane Kirk *
  * Perfect Attendance: TBD *
  * Outstanding Committee Chair: Brian Tracey & Kelly Fleming *
  * Older than the Archives- Most Senior: Colin Bates & [Ted Chen] *
  * Exec Liaison extraordinaire: Joseph Telegen (ASUW) Tiffany Woelfel (Disability) *
  * Voice of Accountability: Justin Bare *
  * Most Resolved: Julia *
  * Community Connection Award: Brian Tracey *
  * Volunteer of the Year: TBD *
  * Power Proxy: TBD *
  * Awesome Advocate: Brandon Ray *
  * Senate Leadership: Vanessa *

Alice: three years ago exec, the last time we did this, the exec made all the awards. And there's one award- senate choice award- where senator has to decide on this. So if we can send out a poll tonight for senator to participate, that would be fun. Maybe we can take nominees and then vote?

Eddie: I don't think we should vote on that. It would also be discouraging for people who don't get voted.

Alice: Senate Choice award, and I want us to really quickly identify awards that we can give. Eddie do you remember any?

Yasmeen: Voice of accountability

Alice: I am pretty sure that that created award for specific person. They created voice of accountability for Yasmeen, and then leadership for me.

Evan: Newbie award. Like for someone who just jump in and do a lot. (Rookie of the year) I think Colin should.

Eddie: Longest serving senator.

Yasmeen: Brain Tracey has the perfect attendance.
Natalie: I want to give him diversity awards though. Because he has been such an awesome chair. What about outstanding Committee Chair.

Evan: I do like the idea of most connect with the community. So something about who usually provides community bulletin. Walking bulletin awards.

Eddie: How about best resolution?

Yasmeen: Is that Justin Bare?

Alice: Exec liaison annual award

Monica: Most resolved?

Yasmeen: So committee chair?

Natalie: there are a few people that go from proxy to senator.

Alice: Who is rookie of the year?

Yasmeen: Jennifer Kirk.

Brain: shout out too Vanessa Kritzer from Evans.

Alice: rookie of the year- can we give it to Jane Kirk? So perfect attendance award is to whoever with perfect attendance. Outstanding chair is Brian Tracey, most senior is Colin Bare.

Eddie: Ted Chen is in there too.

Evan: People who have outlived our archive

Alice: Some award for being here for a long time - older than the archive. Exec Liaison is Jordan.

Natalie: What about Tiffany? Tiffany Woelfel is the exec liaison to the disability.

Alice: Most resolved is Justin Bare.

Yasmeen: I will call him voice of accountability for Justin.

Alice: Who offer the most resolution? Let’s give Julia the most resolution.

Evan: Who do we have community bulletin awards? Brian?
Alice: I don’t know if giving an award for giving announcement is…So community connection awards? And that’s to Brian? And volunteer of the year? How about fun seeker event? And power-proxy awards goes to this list.

Doug: Brandon Ray (Alice: yes you are right, I want to give him something)

Alice: I want to recognize Brandon for advocate. Awesome Advocate awards.

Brian: I feel like you are about to say something about Chrissy.

Monica: I feel Vanessa always make really good contribution.

Alice: so senate leadership award? So that’s the spirit of leadership from the floor. Thank you so much, this is hyper productive.

Natalie: For most resolved- that's not a senator, but we are okay with that?

Alice: It should just be GPSS awards.

Brian: are we putting on Staff awards?

Alice: Yes

Evan: do we want to give award for spotlight

Monica: Maybe instead of awards, we can do shout-outs

Evan: yeah, just some flexibility

**Senate Agenda**

Yasmeen: Are we having one more exec meeting?

Eddie: we need to select new exec senator. Three exec senator.

Yasmeen: yeah, because Eddie is leaving.

Alice: No you are not leaving. Do we want to have a spotlight? Let’s just cut the spotlight. The spotlight is Dean of the Graduate school. And we give him 20 minutes?

Kelly: It can be 15 minutes and rolls into the reception. 5 minutes talk and then 15 minutes Q&A.

Alice: We told them the party starts at 6:30, but hopefully it’s a shorter meeting than that. Should we not have the last officer report> I want to do a state of GPSS- end of the year thing. Let’s just put Dave at 5:30 and if he wants to stay for recognition. It would be closer to 5:40. Do we have any resolution? (Natalie:
nope) maybe we should do our executive election. How about president's address? I want to have slides and talk about all the things. so 10 minutes? So president Address, then executive senator election?

Evan: Are we just throwing them from the floor?

Alice: When you send out the minutes, can you actually all-cap 2 senators needed? How much time do we want for the agenda? 10 minutes? Is that enough? I have heard some interest in the fall. Let’s just put 15 minutes. Another thing is that we change our bylaws.

Evan: Can we send it out as a separate email.

Alice: I can send an email out.

Eddie: If I recall correctly, the judicial committee conduct the election?

Yasmeen: if more than one candidate, you want to make sure that you ring the candidate.

Alice: So there’s a written ballot.

Yasmeen: We should come prepared we written material.

Alice: Let’s just do 5 blank slots. We will see how many candidate we get. And if we get more than two, we will use the written ballots. Can you send me an email to remind me to send out the exec election email? And then officer report? Brian, do you know Alex has anything to say.

Brain: I might try to take some of his time to try to sale state legislature

Evan: Can we just put in 15-10 for end of the year report.

Alice: Natalie? Sure. (Brian: I am sure Alex would want it) Do we still have regular announcement. And then recognition ceremony. Or do we adjourn and then? So recognition awards for 14 awards- how long should it be?

Yasmeen: Just an suggestion- it might not be easy to sit through the meeting if you didn't get the award.

Alice: I will still put it on our agenda- end of year reception at HUB lyceum.

Monica: We are at the Lyceum for the whole thing? Alice: Yep.

Alice: So I have president's address for 10 minutes, executive senator election for 15 minutes, 20 minutes for spotlight, and 20 minutes for end of year officer report, and 10 minutes for announcement, and we can trim that and then end of the year recognition, and then end of year reception. That’s already an hour 35.

Yasmeen: wonder if recognition can be part of the reception ceremony.
Alice: Entertain motion to approve agenda | Elloise: So move| Natalie: Second

Monica: do we still have announcements on agenda? I was just saying that they should send it all to Natalie.

Evan: I just send you a quick email to you- we should send a quick thank you card or gift to Rene.

Alice: Exec meeting on the 10th, I will take exec senator who wants to go to the Jurassic World Premiere.

**Executive Senator Report**

Evan: SAF went through. A lot of people who I talked. GPSS got plenty of funding. We got a bunch of money to fund the 5th officer bow. SAF found really little room to cut from anything. They understand that we went through can cut a bunch of our stuffs already.

Alice: I have a question- they said they cut the president's parking pass budget.

Eddie: I was under the impression that Doug found money for that.

Evan: Travel; grant will have the end of the year meeting to review the application process, we welcome criticism and comments to revise that.

Yasmeen: Meeting with the food system working group, they have a intro to their group, I met with Andy Who gave the presentation. and there’s some talk about another bylaw revision in the summer.

Eddie: Had conversation with the EDN and Release from SAF, there's a press release about student wage increasing to $15.hour. It has money to go to 13 in January. The major obstacle that the administration said we have has now been removed.

Evan: Why is it $12.50 when SAF has prepare for $13.

Eddie; the union was asking for $15 by 2017. So the union bargaining position is the University follow the most restrictive schedule that Seattle have. I can't remember …. whatever it was, the university didn’t budge on it. So they eventually accept it for the contract to not to expire. But they will continue to push by 2017. Even if overtaken by aggression by Seattle campus, this would benefit Tacoma and Bothell campus.

Evan: I hope if the SAF has found 13, that the student get 13.

Evan: PACS chair salary.

Alice: The PACS chair Salary …. this needed to get work out. SAF decided to take PACS chair out of their budget entirely. Ad it has been made to the innovation fund this year, and hopefully we will have an MOU,
Evan: Maybe it's good for SAF to have some autonomy there.

Alice: This year’s PACS chair pushed back against that.

Elloise; the reason I brought up that there’s some conversation on how much benefits and compensation that PACS chair would have. And we are as diluent on the board to highlight the minimum wage issue. I think the conversation is still happening. I think our GPSS

**Officer Reports**

Brian: MOU has a couple more edits on it. The WSA MOU.

Yasmeen: Does that mean we are committed to the 15,000 thing? (Brain: yes)

Alice: I just sent you guys this electronically

Douglas: Looking at funds that were closing. So we eventually got on the phone and found that we have $5000 discretionary fund. That’s something that we will need to start remember. It’s discretionary. It’s not been touched by us at all. So there’s something to be figured out. So this is going toward our Husky Sunset event.

Alice: I need to send out an all student email.

Douglas: Hopefully we can have about 500 people showing up on June 2nd at the event at 5:00.

Kerstin: there will be a volunteer sign-up sheet. Email Angela.

Doug: grants and everything is going good. I am writing a budget report. There’s also a Staff and officer guideline for funding.

Natalie: I completed the 2014-15 book, and I am about halfway through this year. I have meeting with Elloise about transitioning. I got an email from the School of Social Work on whether we have send their response out?

Alice: I didn't know they have requested that.

Yasmeen: It would be good to send it to the sponsor of the bill.

Evan: I don't think we have the obligation to send it.

Alice; would you forward me the email? I don’t know. What do you guys think? I think what we should do is - can we put it on our website, and then can you put a one liner on the email you sent out?
Eddie: it would be better if we just send it out with a PDF attachment. Putting on the website is more like an endorsement. (committee agreed).

Alice: ASUW is not here, and I will forgo my announcement.

**Meeting Adjourned:**
Douglass: Moved to adjourn | Elloise: Second.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm