GPSS Executive Committee Meeting  
April 17th 2013  
HUB 340

Attendees:
Adam Sherman, GPSS President
Melanie Mayock, GPSS Vice President
Kristen Hosey, GPSS Secretary
Rene Singleton, SAO
Evan Firth, Executive Senator
Larry Huang, Executive Senator
Trond Nielsen, Executive Senator
Michael Kutz, ASUW
Chris Lizotte, Executive Senator
Kimberley Shurtz, Guest – Law Senator
Chris Erickson, Guest
Elisa Law, Guest, Museology Senator

1) Call to Order
Adam: Calls meeting to order at 5:32pm

2) Approval of Agenda
Chris: moves
Evan: seconds

3) Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting
Adam: Minutes were sent out very recently. I motion to table this until next meeting.
Evan: moves
Kristen: seconds

4) Bylaw Amendments
Kristen: As far as the forum, there was only one post on the bylaws. The one post on the forum was by a senator saying, “the proposed bylaw changes appear to consolidate power among senators... “ see forum post.
Chris: I saw that and I thought about responding. I wanted to say that some of the committees don’t function.
Melanie: I am in favor of spreading around tasks. One of the things for me is a problem is having multiple lines of authority. Senate is the ultimate authority. Also, to me we have created work by volunteers but there is a difference in commitment between officer and committee chairs. For an officer it is a paid position, it is a big deal to step down. That’s why I see it as officers having ultimate authority. I think we were trying something new.
Trond: The idea wasn’t to spread power but to get more people involved. I don’t think we are winding things but just that its not what we intended.

Rene: Practical aspects of this. Some committees have more vivacious personalities. So behind the scenes people were doing things that were supposed to be the officer’s authorities. We had a series of advisors confused about their responsibilities and power. The officers should be spending money and doing certain things. That part needs to be very clearly delineated. Your reputation needs to be dealt with in terms of how you are operating. A style issue.

Adam: The way I see this is there is an issue with substance and process. On substantive side, you take on responsibility to take ownership on a committee then why you should you be striped of authority because other committees weren’t working well. For some specific committees, we didn’t do a good job with involving them with our recommendations. But we do have an opportunity, there are dissenting opinions, and the exec needs to find a way to have senators feel like they are part of the process. If exec says this is our proposal it seems too top down. If we are getting pushback we haven’t done our job reaching out.

Melanie: I do agree we should have reached out more. The timeline is the problem now. Maybe set aside time at the meeting.

Adam: The forum may not be an ideal medium for discussion. In the email sent out tonight, maybe include note on that there will be a full debate at senate meeting. We can have some conversation at senate meeting but we should encourage senators to have specific language changes to bylaws. We need to conduct this in orderly manner. This may be contentious. We could have done better but we need to move forward. If people want to come with proposals, they need very specific language proposals.

Trond: I agree. I wonder if there are too many bylaw proposals to address at the meeting.

Melanie: There were a number of different committees affected but not necessarily different issues.

Trond: Does the personnel policy need to be addressed?

Adam: The only concern I have is that it is us telling them what is important. The senate committee restructuring is central to changes. If people want to table this, then that is what they get. We should be prepared for that.

Chris: We don’t even have to table those secondary things until next year?

Adam: The meeting after senate will be for officer reports. This meeting is generally a celebratory mood.

Trond: What if we present them as outgoing topics?

Melanie: If there is enough opposition, I worry about starting next year with uncertainty. If there is a certain amount of support, then I feel like putting it off until next year will create challenges. Kristen if we say that they don’t have to make this decision. Then I think it is likely that no decisions will happen.

Chris: This is an idea. One of the rationales was some chairs did not exercise responsibility to committee. So we moved towards officers as chairs. What if we moved towards middle ground? Don’t get rid of position.

Kimberly: That would be a good compromise. Second, because there is uncertainty if we tabled it, we could hang on to it for a full year. We could allow committees to develop themselves. More time to weigh in.
Trond: I think part of the problem is that the senate doesn’t actually understand the problem. They think we are arbitrarily changing things. If they were more aware of internal problems, there would be less resistance.

Melanie: With Chris points-my question is what is role of officers? To Trond and Kimberley’s point- this is sensitive because we are talking about individuals. We could make up alternatives to be ready for next week. Such as keep it the same but with small changes.

Kristen: We are adding committees. I can’t do that many committees.

Adam: These are things that we need to be on forum explaining the problem. We need to pare this down. Counting on chairs or vice chairs doing responsible work.

Kristen: It comes back to Rene’s point. Another aspect of problem is that there is not necessarily a supervising officer.

Adam: We are reaching time on issue.

Kristen: Move to extend by 5

Melanie: seconds

Kristen: My original idea about the chair vs vice chair. It’s just a title change. Same work but pulling back certain tasks to officers. Chair vs vice chair doesn’t matter.

Melanie: To be specific, I did not feel like the FLSC chairs were not accountable to meet. We need to specify that officers oversee committees. If we keep this for another year, remember that it was tough to get people to run

Elisa: Its just semantics. You will get less interest if the title isn’t “chair”. As long as they know what their responsibilities are.

Rene: I don’t care what you call people but a training on how GPSS works. Everyone needs to be trained. This should be mandated so they know who they are reporting to. Operational things. Something like that could be added.

Chris: I’d be happy to draft bylaw language. It would be along lines of be more explicit of officer oversight. Chairs must undergo some sort of training. That seems like we have a consensus on that structure.

Trond: When you draft this can you include a way to remove chair.

Elisa: I think that is fair. By making clear responsibilities.

Adam: If you look at language now. You could change it. It is not that complicated.

Melanie: Move to extend by 5 minutes.

Kristen: Seconds

Melanie: I agree. But I’m not sure that addresses the concerns.

Trond: Are we saying that chairs would not be elected by committee?

Adam: I like chairs being accountable to members of committee. It’s easier administratively.

Chris: If we focused on the problem aspect.

Adam: I would encourage everyone to get on forum and participate. To answer questions. Translate this conversation onto the forum. No objections I would like to move to next item.

Adam: I would entertain motion to move item 9 to just below item 4.

Melanie: Move
4) PACS Background Info Session

Michael: I’m here to talk about provost advisory committee. My role is Chair for students. Formed in 2011. Local control for tuition. A committee that makes recommendations for budget and tuition. The purpose of it is to weigh in on budget, tuition, aid, admissions, management. We meet weekly with provost and give feedback and act as student think tank. Composed of GPSS, ASUW and ASUW T and B. It’s a university committee. We’re about to make budget recommendation in May.

Melanie: Who determines what your tasks/goals are?

Michael: It would take collective action.

Melanie: Currently it is not involved with fee based programs.

Michael: That goes into the topics we’ve gone it this year. We started with budgeting 101 meeting. Then distance learning, degree completion, differential tuition, student budgeting principles, financial aid, new payroll system, UW proposal to state, faculty salaries, fee based programs with dean of public health, I hope our PACS members understand that issue. We talked about cross subsidization. Some colleges have lower costs than others. The result is higher net revenues in certain colleges. Cheaper degrees are subsidizing the more costly degrees. We are looking into investments provost are looking into. When new incremental revenue is coming in. Main charges in weighing in on those. Outcomes include topical discussions. We published student budgeting principles. We based decision off of lens of tuition rather than faculty salaries. We want to go with “what is the max students could provide with tuition increase”. Now we are creating a budgeting recommendation. Includes tuition percentages. We will make recommendation on undergrad tuition, faculty salaries, financial aid- how we need to update policy, student engagement in budget, fee based programs, and then investments in classroom technology. Some main insights: most incremental revenue from tuition increase or miracle will go towards faculty salary increases. There isn’t going to be as much conversation with provost reinvestment fund. I do have a couple things that I want feedback: 1) If there is something missing let me know 2) how can we be transparent to GPSS. We have lots of influence so it’s good for everyone to know what’s going on. 3) documentation of research.

Melanie: I think it’s is awesome. The process on grad tuition needs to be worked on. The dean said this is what we want to do for tuition, no matter what happened with state funding it wouldn’t have mattered. It is unclear and unlikely. For fee based programs, when we saw proposals for deans we didn’t see that presented. Process for student input for fee based programs. Including tuition rates.

Adam can you remind me whether regents approve fee based programs or is it PE?

Melanie: We should find out.

Adam: Any other thoughts?

Michael: To be clear, Melanie your main input is no student input for fee based programs.

Melanie: Yes.

Kristen: How to more effectively communicate what you are doing. From our website, if we could put that on our front page of website. Is there a way to blog too?

Adam: Anytime there is something admin wants to feel an issue out before making a proposal. When they are considering a proposal they wish to keep it confidential.

Michael: Greater web presence.
Kimberley: Could you share PowerPoint presentation?
Michael yes
Elisa I am in fee based program. There is concern about transparency with tuition and funds. Nobody knows that information. I would like to know whether the regents or PACS know. Is there some kind of rule?
Adam the UW decision making structure is overwhelming. Its huge. PACS is trying to rap its arms around it. This will be multiyear process. I would encourage people to keep pushing. As much patience as possible. We will continue to have pacts updates

5) Endowment Resolution
Adam: Endowment resolution was sent out in advance. Ids like to get general feedback. Major issues or minor issues?
Chris: Minor issues.
Adam: The main clause of concern was third and fourth that clause. “GPSS authorizes exec to make investments in reserve fund.... 25% of following years budgeting cost”.
Chris: The senate has to authorize GPSS to do that. This would mean that exec would put recommendation to invest money in budget proposal.
Adam: And the senate so approves?
Chris: Yeah
Kristen: Do we need to involve finance and budget in this decision?
Adam: “F&B has had a chance to review” the senate should make the ultimate decision.
Melanie: Different point. I’m concerned that 25% figure may be too low. We are in a pattern of running large operating deficits. In future we will have to make more money or get larger staff allocation or spend down reserve fund. We’re gonna run out of money faster than we will make money.
Adam: The reason I went to Paul Jenney for recommendation because in his professional opinion that is proficient.
Trond: The senate can always change that limit. If they are approving the budget then they can change this number. This is just a guideline.
Kimberley how the student bar association deals with budget issues. The finance budget committee can make recommendation to senate.
Kristen: One question. At what point will we be able to ask for more money for SAF.
Adam: They want us to spend down reserve fund first. If we can show a trend, they we have built up a case.
Rene: What is your timing. If you do this in advance of SAF, you are including them. If you do post SAF, do you want to separate them or do it together. You need to build in something. Otherwise you will have to explain investments to SAF. It’s an interesting flow. Process wise, I would narrow it down.
Adam: This clause is for any time. If we did it before SAF proposal, it would have to be part of explanation. The next clause has temporal issue.
Rene: If you are having f & b give you recommendation. I could see you having pressure or not have priorities. It’s not going to work if you have others who follow who are not as interested.
Melanie: Move to extend by 5
Kristen: Seconds

Larry: I agree. As long as your request are steady from year to year. One good point we talked about. We don’t want to get into details, we just want to see reasonableness.

Melanie: I’m worried we are assuming. If we are under spending, that is a core problem. 50,000$ deficit is a big deal.

Adam: 10 thou is over budgeting for officer comp. Another big chunk is staff.

Evan: 50 thou wasn’t going to be regular deficit. It was closer to 30 thou.

Adam: I do see Trond’s point as this as a guideline. I would entertain a motion to adjust this number. This number is consistent with what Paul Jenny suggested. I suggest we go with this as a recommendation.

Chris: I have language “GPSS, on an ad hoc basis may authorize exec committee... that the investment has been reviewed by f &b. “ that implies that senate has final say.

Trond: Unless GPSS is authorizing someone else.

Kristen: We could flip these. So it’s in order by progress.

Adam: The idea behind this is we don’t know how much money in reserve until the end of year.

Trond: At least once a year, you should tell us whether you want endowment. “GPSS directs exec committee to make recommendations annually to transfer funds from reserve to endowment”. The idea is every year they are making recommendations. More than once a year.

Adam: What we’ve got now “that the GPSS directs the executive committee to make recommendations at least annually regarding any transfer from reserve fund into GPSS endowment so long as such investments do not cause reserve fund to be reduced below 25% of following years budget annual operating cost”.

Adam: I entertain motion to extend.

Chris: move.

Melanie: seconds.

Adam: The next clause. Larry brought up concern that there may be unforeseen projects. I came back with proposal that at end of clause we could add ‘as approved by exec committee’. Does that address concerns? Any other concerns?

Trond: GPSS directs exec committee to make reasonable efforts.

Rene: I think that after you do last paragraph, there should be added to your bylaws, effective. If you guys wait. Lets just making it codified.

Trond: The resolutions are difficult for future years to follow.

Adam: GPSS directs bylaws to be amended to include contents of this resolution. Is this going to be part of bylaws amendments?

Rene: Whatever last clause of bylaws add this as last phrase. You can drop that in there. Whatever last section, add it in there. Titled endowments.

Adam: I can work on that. I will put together list of proposed amendments.

Kristen: Its two weeks in advance.

Adam: I will do friendly amendment and draft recommendations.

Trond: We can have this conversation.
Kristen: We only need this today if it will be voted upon.

Chris Erickson: When you talk about Paul Jenny, it’s a stagnant thing that won’t change. That stanza may have ongoing applications. It says Adam Sherman.

Chris: My name only has one z.


Melanie: I’m still uncomfortable with a low reserve.

Adam: Do you want to remove your name?

Melanie: yes

Larry: What is 25% in dollar terms now?

Adam: I’m not sure. We should move on.

6) Senate Agenda

Adam: We only have a few more meetings coming up. Its time we think about what we want to accomplish between now and the end of the year.

Rene: There are those resolutions coming up. Build in time to invite them or whatever you want to do.

Adam: For 4/24 we have... PACS update, bylaw amendments is action item, exec senator elections, endowment resolution, international student fee resolution, leg update.

Melanie: For exec senator elections are we comfortable with having elections for Tronds seat? My point is we don’t have policy for elected term. We would have to decide term.

Trond: It might be reasonable to elect exec senators at beginning of year.

Kristen: Do we have anyone thinking of running? What happens if we don’t?

Trond: I will resign as soon as we are ready to replace me.

Melanie: I’m worried we wont have interest in this position.

Adam: We are supposed to make recommendation.

Melanie: It might be rushing it. It might be better to do it later.

Adam: I’m not sure how much they will gain in two meetings. We have this meeting, officer elections, then final meeting.

Kristen: It’s only a 5 minutes item.

Melanie: We should put it off and pump it up more.

Adam: I like the idea of doing it following elections. Consider it as an alternative. Exec elections on May 8th. Exec senator reminder. PACS update. We could have Michael do it or you do it. I’ll ask Michael to do it.

Melanie: Could we have it grad student focused. Make it clear to let senators know that. Make it as relevant as possible.

Adam: Bylaw amendments

Kristen: More than 10 minutes.

Melanie: I would give it 20.

Kristen: Did you get someone for that committee? I’m getting emails from the bookstore.

Evan: People might be gone by announcement times.

Adam: Bookstore position reminder 1 minute.

Melanie: International student fee is this an action item?

Adam: yes.
Melanie: I’m worried its early to vote on it.
Adam: I’m fine making it a discussion item. When do we do it then?
Melanie: If we make it action then it should get a longer time. I don’t think its cut and dry. There might be varying opinions.
Kristen: We might as well put it on agenda.
Adam: If we give it 20 minutes. We would be under 90 minutes.
Kristen: Did Michael Hutchinson get in touch with you?
Adam: Chief of police 10 minutes information
Kristen: Michael Hutchinson resolution? Has he talked to you?
Adam: Has he submitted it as official? It’s a UW alert process. It’s opt in and he wants it mandatory motion to approve.
Melanie: moves
Evan: seconds

7) International Student Fee Resolution
Chris: Crafted by me, Adam, and student life committee. Fairly straight forward.
Melanie: I will probably oppose this resolution. There seems to be strong case that additional services are needed. Anecdotally I have friends who have had trouble with ISS office. If you say state leg should fund this then it won’t happen. To me the need for the services seems high. It’s not an insane amount.
Chris: I agree with you in a lot of ways. But the committee in general was in favor of this.
Adam: Asking to go to legislature and saying its DOA is 100% correct. As long as we are willing to be steamrolled, are pushovers, that is what will happen. We have to think about what community we are a part of. We all need to pitch in and make sure they have resources to be successful. I’d rather see it through tuition increase than fees.
Chris: This is not asking legislature to do anything. It’s saying they are fucked up. Its bringing legislature to account. They don’t care about services including uw. Its forcing us to raise money in extreme means.
Trond: It doesn’t really do a good job of keeping them in account.
Chris: The original language was stronger.
Trond: I generally agree with item but I am biased as an international student. My original point is that the list of what this fee funds. If the UW wants to facilitate TAs it’s a funding issue. It should be coming from teaching budgets. It’s misplaced. I’m behind anything that gets ISS funded.
Kimberly: The committee supported this?
Chris: Student life committee
Kimberly: Have you worked with international committee?
Chris: FIUTS supports fee. There doesn’t seem to be grad international students who are unified to provide opinion.
Adam: FIUTS approved this because they get funding. Do you charge international students with fee or through tuition increases?
Trond: You shouldn’t take FIUTS opinion seriously because they are generally just a social club. Don’t take them too seriously.
Melanie: We all care about international students. This seems like practical way of achieving goal. Taking this to legislature is not a good idea. This is asking for trouble. Bringing up something a lot of people won’t like. I would recommend against.

Chris: Why?

Melanie: It will remind students that international students take away spots of in state. I don’t see it.

Trond: Strategically, its not a good idea.

Adam: The administration needs to understand needs to understand that we won’t roll over. They need to hear from us.

Melanie: I don’t think we are rolling over.

Trond: It’s a fine line we walk. Its not clear

Chris Erickson: They cut funding year after year, but the leg will say that we have 9% revenue. We are the ones taking the hits. I get the idea that you what tell legislators. Based on a fee per student. I don’t get the idea of saying we won’t roll over. It may be the best way to figure out how to charge fees.

Elise: Realistically it won’t be put in tuition. If this goes to community, students would have decision-making power.

Adam: With regards to how people use services. If there was a proposed fee on disabled fee for services. Just because people use services differently they should use fees?

Chris Erickson: It should be lobbied on...

Trond: Move to extend by 5

Evan: Second

Chris: It mentions tuition as an alternative method. I could take that out.

Melanie: Its good that it could go through SAF. I generally agree with socializing costs but I want this to happen.

Trond: We should pass this resolution

Adam: other comments?

Chris: Minus sending to chairs of higher education

8) GPA of the Year

Kristen: Last year grad program advisor is given out by GPSS. Secretary hands award to GPA but it is decided upon by exec. We’ve done a callout for nominations and last year there were people from different departments. Maybe you guys to say how it was decided upon before.

Melanie: People emailed me their statements and voting on in exec. A few problems. It doesn’t seem fair that some serve 10 people and some 100. Secondly, more organized. Third ask how many students in the department.

Kristen: I created a catalyst tool where we send out to senators. Name, department, name GPA. Moroni and I came up with questions. At the end a fill in an abstract about how awesome they are.

Adam: If people are nominating these persons how is it objective?

Kristen: Suggestions?

Trond: Anecdotes. Tell a story about why this person is cool. Multiple anecdotes. Some occurrence that illustrates what’s great about them.

Elisa: What are the GPAs being judged by?
Kristen: Just votes. Limit it to senators because if you are a good GPA you have found a good senator.
Elisa: Judging what people write about is unfair. It might not give a balanced look at candidates.
Adam: It’s the nature of these awards. It’s difficult.
Elisa: I would suggest telling the person to write about as many areas.
Kimberley: The possibility of sending out a survey to that department and maybe having a scale of 1-5 department.
Adam: Normally we send it through GPA. Some do some don’t. Anyone want to extend time?

10) SAGE Report
Melanie: A few of us went to DC. Coalition of grad student governments. We lobbied congress on top issues. Immigration reform. Fed research funding, and student debt. We had meetings with delegations. We probably met over 100 congressional offices. Ongoing process of influencing congress. Immigration bill introduced on comp immigration reform doesn’t include f visa. Position item is to get bill amended. Student loans-bills out there. Lots of follow-up needed. Fed research funding but no one will come to agreement on sequester. Bottom line, its important for us to get out there.
Adam: The other side of it. It’s a growing organization. SAGE that is. Moving forward it’d be great to for people to get involved in leadership of sage. We have more knowledge than anyone there. I would like to see SAGE delegates get more involved in leadership. It has much potential ten years from know.
Melanie: For anyone considering running for VP. Jump in with sage early. State leg update. At 459 our bill in fee based programs was next on senate bill then they made motion. Our bill didn’t get floor vote so I died in legislature. Our sponsors did much to get votes. We owe him and koule wells and frocked. We brought lots of attention to that issue. On bright side house bill 1331 student advisory got passed today. It protects us for keeping PACs. Budget still needs to be negotiated. Transit funding is not dead. Effort to amend it to get local transit options on bill. One thing, if anyone depends on transit not living in Seattle.
Adam: This is not an easy job to get bills pushed through. I want to recognize you for your hard work.

11) Executive Officer Reports
Evan: f & b will be done with special allocations by next meeting. The rest will be focused on revamping our own application. Then addressing travel grants. GRC meeting
Trond: Student regent interviews next week. We only got 4 apps. We might extend deadline.
Adam: Ff you know anybody who wants to apply.
Melanie: You also cannot be running for GPSS officer?
Adam: I don’t know of anything in bylaw. I’d have to review that
Chris Erickson: In email that went out you can run for it but you can’t become it without resigning.
Trond: One other thing. I wrote letter to editor to Seattle times. Debunking some arguments.

12) Officer Reports
VP
Treasurer
Secretary Kristen: Yesterday we had science communication workshop next Friday diversity event. Tuesday diversity committee meeting. 1000$ of funds. Criminal background check question. DAWG talks presentations on Tuesday. Ten minute talk on anything. We need presenters.
Adam: Talk to Colin Goldfinch.
Kristen: If you know anybody who wants to give a talk. Let me know. Any topic if anyone has posters they want to put up.
Kimberley: What time is diversity committee meeting
Kristen: 1 o’clock

ASUW
President: I was at SAGE. Mostly I’ve been putting together innovation fund request to SAF for travel grants and advancement director position. Two things I’ve been working on. I’ve also been working with treasury about endowment. And I’ve been catching up on emails.

13) Announcements
Adam: announcements:

14) Adjourn
Kristen: moves
Rene: seconds

Adjourn at 7:54pm.