Executive Meeting
October 30, 2013
HUB 314

Chris Lizotte (President): I will now call this meeting to order at 5:47pm. I know that we have a change made to the agenda so I will not entertain a motion to amend that.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): I will make a motion to add the student tech fee as an action item to number 4. Right before first senate meeting agenda.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): And this is to replace the presentation that was going to happen at the senate meeting?

Genesis: They didn’t understand they had to do it in front of exec. Not the whole senate. So we’re going to add them to our agenda today.

Chris L: How much time?

Alton (Student Technology Fee Committee Presenter): 10 minutes.

Chris L: We’ll leave some time for questions so let’s make it 15. So second?

Elisa Law (Secretary): Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Chris E: Point of information. I don’t want to go against this but after we do this do you also want to add an info item and action separately? I would think there’s going to be discussion beyond it.

Chris L: The action is to approve their item correct? I think we can add extra time and then we can have it rolled in. Any other objections? Now I’ll entertain a motion to approve minutes from the previous meeting.

Genesis: Motion

Elisa: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Sorry what was your name again?

Alton: My name’s Alton. I’m basically the coordinator. So this is the student technology fee. This is basically an overview. There’s a technology fee on campus. Everyone pays about 40 dollars to this fee. It funds non-essential technology. So things that aren’t explicitly needed for classrooms such as the computer labs at odegaard or machinery for aerospace and technology of that
matter. The committee doesn’t select what to fund. The campus creates proposals and the committee votes which of these to fund. These are the categories that we try to fund. There’s collaborative computer labs, remote computing, machinery and software. Computer labs for example, we have a set budget to fund and we don’t go over that budget. For frontier computing, we have a set budget and categories we try to move our money into. These are the anticipated administrative expenses that we have. For 2013, we’re basing it off 2013 results. So you can see, most interesting one is the labstat and key server program. Key server is a software consolidation we have on campus. We just started this 2 years ago. We didn’t have this but SDR started funding this this year. Employee wages may be a bit higher this year because we hired a compliance officer. There have been moments in the past where proposal authors haven’t been spending money the way they should have so we’re trying to crack down on that. This is our tentative schedule for STF. The only date you need to watch for is October 25th. That’s suppose to be October 30th, for this meeting. December 15 is our deadline for proposals. We send out something called the request for proposals which is essentially the outline for how people will write their requests. We’ll be voting on it until about April. Then we finalize those things and then in July we actually fund the proposals. So any proposal that gets approved this year will be funded and will begin spending money next year.

Genesis: So they’re applying for the following year and not this year?

Alton: Yes. 2013, the previous year, they’re spending their money this year. Now we’ve had these sorts of categories we fund and this is how the committee pushes its vision for how we want technology to be on campus. We used to spend about 22% of our budget on computer labs but we understand that most people have laptops now so there’s not much need for computer labs so we’re reducing the amount we are spending on computer labs this year. Also, we just refreshed the Odegaard Library this year so there isn’t a much of a need for a centralized computer lab. We are increasing our mobile computing, so remote computing and collaborative. We want people to be able to have power and access to UW resources whenever they need it and wherever they are. We’ve funding something called Vida, which is remote computing. We have U Drive, a sort of cloud computing that students are able to access on whatever computer they’re on. And collaborative is basically things they can take out on the field. For example, we have a loan program and basically just collaboration between departments to cut down on redundancy on campus

Chris L: So that’s the stuff you check out on the bottom floor of Kane?

Alton: Yes. For future tech, we’re increasing. This is technology that is not fully fleshed out called bleeding edge where we want UW to be seen as leading the pack for technology. We want to have access to the newest technology even if it’s not completely reliable yet. We want the university to have first access to these sorts of things. For example, with machinery and research, we’re increasing because we had a lot of proposals in the past where we need to replace machines in the departments but we haven’t been able to fully fund what we wanted and we’re at a point in time where a lot of machinery and hardware that departments have on
Campus are reaching its end life so were seeking to fund those replacements this year. We are decreasing software. It was 10% of the budget before but not many departments have requested money for software, partly because of the addition of the key server which helps to reduce software costs. Committee members have a metric which is basically a guideline for how we vote. We have student access at 40%. So we value student access very highly for computer labs. For example, if we have a department in CS wanted a computer lab but they would only give access to CS majors, we would be tentative about that because not that many students would have access to it. For example with machinery and research and student access, this sort of thing for machines are for department students and people studying in that major so we don't value highly the student access for that. These are just the sorts of way that the committee measures and we'll vote on it. This is the key server software. It's a centralized host. For example, there's Photoshop which requires a registration key to activate it but to buy Photoshop for every computer is extremely costly. What it does is that it holds all the licences in one place and if a computer in Suzzallo wants Photoshop, they would be able to pull off the code from the key server for that computer and once it's done, it goes back and would be available for other students. This allows software to be used anywhere on campus and is a lot more fluid and more cost effective.

Chris L: Has this been implemented? I know last year still in the early stages.

Alton: We're moving into it. Student awareness is the biggest problem but it is downloadable now.

Chris L: Is it downloadable through anyone with a UW netid?

Alton: Yes, we have to figure out how to get the page available to all students. The problem we have right now is with the administrative aspect but our key server team is working it.

Chris L: So I can do it on my computer?

Alton: Yes.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Can you tell us how to do it right now just to test it?

Alton: I don't have access to it since the key server team is going through some rough transitions but I can show you in two weeks if you like.

Alice: I was just curious if any computer can use it? It doesn't have to be on campus?

Alton: Yes, you should just be able to login with your UW netID.

Alice: I know that some departments have a thing where you can log in to Linux through the terminal and have access to the department, or would you have to download it?
Alton: I can't say that right now. I’m not really sure.

Chris L: I know what you’re talking about. I do that through CSE. I use their stuff sometimes. I think that’s different.

Alice: I know for a lot of departments that have software that their students need to use, they provide access already.

Alton: This isn’t for specific departments. I don’t know if you need special software for computer science but if this isn’t something that all students will need, or if this isn’t something that has wide access to or generally in that department they already provide access, it won’t be on the key server. It’s for Photoshop or some mathematica software that is needed on a wide basis.

Alice: Do you guys have a plan on how you would raise awareness?

Alton: That is on the key server team but it’s just getting it on to website that we’re having trouble with right now.

Chris E: I know there’s issues with the portal last year for SPSF through Vida. So you say you can get it off campus but you really had to be on campus. Will this be an upgrade from that?

Alton: Yes. Any more questions about key server? I can give you guys more information in a few weeks if you guys still need it. This is finding of consumables. When we’ve been funding some equipment, there have been a lot of proposals that have been requesting to charge money for certain items that are one time use. Our policy is that we will fund these but they can’t be used for profit for the department. They would have to be sold at cost so they can’t exploit students.

Chris L: Can you give us an example? What would a consumable be?

Alton: No examples come to mind but this has been an apparent problem in previous committees. We just want to clarify our position that we don’t want departments to profit from students.

Chris L: Like re writable CDs?

Alton: Yeah, I guess so.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Something like departmental NMR machines that charges in-department and out-department rates. This is not the same thing correct?

Alton: Correct, and I think that is it.

Chris L: So for clarification, we would need to approve your budget?
Alton: No, you approve the yearly funding plan.

Genesis: Which slide was that?

Alton: The entire thing is in that document I sent you.

Genesis: Yes, I sent that to everyone. Is this right here? The budget?

Alton: This presentation is an overview of the important points of the actual document. We just need you to approve the document.

Chris L: Are these changes in the funding levels all changes from last year?

Alton: Yes. With the percentages we try to keep them solid but last year we didn’t spend as much in software so we moved some of that money over but we need to request to asuw and gpss to make any changes in funding levels.

Chris L: In that sense everything that you say makes sense.

Evans: I have a question. Does electronic journal access fall under any of these categories? Like UW students can’t access any Springerlink articles. It might be under the libraries’ duties but I wasn’t sure if there is anyway that STF has any say in the matter.

Alton: I’m not sure what that is but if that’s something that can be accessed from your apartment or something where you don’t have to be in a certain location to do it, that can go under remote computing. They have a lot of leeway in the way they’re described. For example, we had a couple computers that were being requested, like laptops that were intended for a certain use but during the summer, they just loaned them to a summer program instead. So in one way they were collaboration but they also were used for remote computing. They’re fluid guidelines for the committee.

Chris L: One question I have is the reduction in software budget. Is that sufficient to fund the key server program?

Alton: We fund the key server program from our administrative budget but most departments don’t request that much software and whatever is left over from that budget is used for the key server. We had a really small number of requests last year.

Chris L: I just asked because I think the key server is one of the most exciting things and I agree that the first thing to make sure is that people know about it but once it is up and running, I want to make sure that you have what you need to keep it going.

Alice: I just have one more question about the key server. How does that not violate copyright
laws?

Alton: Most companies that we request will allow it but we have to pay a small fee every year to keep those and that includes upgrade fees. For example, Adobe has moved to the creative cloud where it’s hosted online so they’re being extremely difficult in the way they implement it. For example, newer Adobe software can’t work in the key server situation because Adobe has requested that we buy a licensing code for every computer on campus if we want to key server it. We still have the Creative Suite 6 so you can still use it offline or download it directly on to your computer but it depends on the company.

Chris L: We’re at time so I will either entertain a motion to extend time or vote to approve the funding levels of each budget category.

Evan: I move to approve the funding levels and the document as a whole.

Alice: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Seeing none we approve your plan.

Alton: Thank you. I was kind of worried that you wouldn’t. Just in a worst case scenario. I also have another thing. We need our appointees and we need 3 but that number is set because grad students can be busy with their schedules. If it comes down to it that we can’t get enough appointees we were hoping that someone on the executive board could stand in while we find someone.

Genesis: I think as treasurer, that will be me.

Chris L: Can you do me a favor and make sure that no one from last year will want to serve again? Or you can give me their name and I can contact them.

Alton: I only know one but I think he might have graduated.

Chris L: We just want to make sure that we don’t have that issue where we double booked a committee. But if you say there are 3 open positions then we’ll do 3.

Alton: Thank you.

Genesis: Congratulations.

Evan: How often does STF meet?

Genesis: I think they meet more in the spring quarter when they’re actually approving funding requests but now it might be just an orientation of committee members. Kind of the same thing
that SAF is doing.

Evan: It’s just that winter and spring quarter, I’m going to be gone for 3 week chunks.

Chris L: So, I’m adding in the typical stuff.

Genesis: Approval of 10/23/2013 minutes. Previously on GPSS, would we want to do that again?

Chris L: We can get a sense of people are finding that…i think it’s a good thing. Until people start saying please stop.

Elisa: Especially since were still getting new senators.

Evan: Just helps us to get back into the mindset.

Chris L: Has anyone said they’ll do a spotlight? So I have gotten some interest however with 2 people regarding caucusing. There’s someone in pharmacy actually, that is interested collaboration across the health sciences and they want to do this outside the senate as well. I told them that could be done inside the senate. Another one is a law student that was not sure if she was going to be elected as 2nd senator from the law school and was interested in doing a women’s leadership caucus. Her name is Chrissy Elles. So although we had talk about setting aside time not during meeting for that correct?

Genesis: For caucusing?

Evan: Yeah, for afterwards.

Chris E: If we want to do a spotlight, and there isn’t anybody, we can put transportation there instead. Maybe that doesn’t work? But they’ll be there and it'll separate nicely from the actual resolution.

Chris L: Who?

Chris E: Two people from King County will be there.

Genesis: You want them to just talk about the issue?

Alice: I think that we should keep them separate. Keep the spotlight separate from a relevant action items. The idea of the spotlight is to bring some information that we wouldn’t otherwise hear about in the graduate school or the community but this is pertinent to something we’re moving on.

Chris L: If no one comes up, we can strike it from the agenda.
Alice: I mean, I can do it. I think it be cool since you want to start with the college councils to see if someone from the public health council would come in but I would’ve needed to ask her already. There were so many people that were potentially interested.

Chris L: Chris, you know how much time King County would like?

Chris E: I’d like to give them at least 10 to 15 minutes for the presentation plus discussion.

Genesis: How much time would you like for your presentation?

Chris E: I would love 10.

Genesis: Should we just make it 20?

Chris E: Yes. I’d be happy if it was shorter.

Evan: I haven’t seen this resolution yet but I think it has to have been sent out already.

Elisa: It’s suppose to be sent today. It’s going to be with the email that goes out with the agenda.

Alice: It wasn’t last week? I thought it has to be sent 2 weeks before.

Elisa: It has to be to me 2 weeks before but 1 week for everybody else.

Alice: I didn’t add anything but we didn’t set a time tonight to talk about it?

Chris L: Talk about what?

Alice: The resolution.

Chris E: We can.

Chris L: We can suspend the bylaws and add it.

Alice: Can we do that? Can we move to suspend bylaws and add a 10 minute discussion of transit resolution?

Chris L: Motion to suspend bylaws.

Evan: Second

Chris L: Any objections to that?
Alice: I move to add a 10 minute discussion of the transit resolution.

Chris L: After the senate meeting planning?

Chris E: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? So it is so.

Evan: So we have that. What usually comes next? I feel like there’s a couple things between it.

Genesis: It’s kind of actually what we did last week except there’s no tech fee presentation. We need to do something about the executive senator vacancy.

Chris L: Eddie Schwieterman was interested but said he didn’t have time.

Alice: No one has time.

Chris E: I have someone from the 1st year from Evans. I can’t be sure if he was confused.

Genesis: Doug Taber?

Chris E: Yes.

Genesis: I think he actually is interested in being an exec senator but then he wants to be slsc flsc and a bunch of other stuff.

Chris E: I also think that amongst other things, both the 2 people I know from the law school running for the open position are interested in some capacity for being on exec plus others.

Evan: We can ask Colin to do it. He might not say no. He would be good on exec.

Genesis: He would. He’s an amazing leader on FMB.

Alice: Who’s that?

Evan: Colin Bateson. He’s a 3rd year mechanical engineering i think

Chris E: Is there any inclination from last year folks like Michael?

Evan: Colin is the FMB guy.

Genesis: Allen-Michael Weatherford?
Chris E: Yes, he had run in spring as well.

Genesis: You’re talking about people who ran last year?

Evan: That would be worth doing.

Chris L: Chris do you want to do a brief thing on the higher ed summit?

Chris E: Can we do that during announcements? Or I can do that as part of my update or yours.

Genesis: We don’t do updates so you would have to have your own agenda item.

Chris E: I’m comfortable doing it during announcements but do we need a little more? At that point we’re two weeks up. We need volunteers.

Alice: What is this for?

Chris L: The Higher Ed summit.

Alice: I think we should do it separately.

Chris E: Is anybody else gonna do some stuff?

Genesis: I have nothing. Travel grants have met and all my other committees are good.

Evan: I think it’s good to have Chris’s own update section too because I remember Melanie giving a lot of updates last year especially because this is what is actually going on.

Chris L: Do you need time for a legislative update?

Chris E: Not so much going on right now but I think at the next meeting we can start that because then both committees will be up and running.

Alice: Rather than having presentation of transit resolution, why don’t we have that as the legislative update? That way you have your own space.

Chris E: Sure.

Evan: I disagree because it’s its own action item and we have to keep that separate anyway.

Chris E: Are you talking about the King County one?
Evan: No, the resolution.
Chris E: Yeah, that has to be its own. I want to do the King County before the resolution because I think it would be important to have people understanding why.

Evan: Then President Chris can do an update if you have anything too.

Chris L: Do I have anything?

Evan: I feel like Adam having these big goals and coming back to the senate and saying this is the progress I made.

Chris L: By then I'll have some things to report on the sexual assault task force and my peer mentoring thing and an idea that davy is going to request.

Evan: Also do we have anything to report on Starbucks? Or anything on sponsorships?

Chris E: Adidas?

Evan: Is there anything more to report to the senate as a whole?

Chris L: No, not on starbucks. There’s not really much news right now. Maybe what I'll try to do is for the GPSS spotlight i'll try to get either Davy or Adam Sherman who works for davy who works for Davy and have him talk about their project that they are requesting provost reinvestment funds for. It would be a mentorship program for both graduate students to mentor undergraduates and they would start with at risk and underserved minorities who are academically struggling and are wanting to apply to grad school. And it could also be a senior graduate student to a more junior graduate student program. Dove tells a lot with what I’m thinking about. Another thing that’s just starting up is that’s actually really exciting is that HR is starting a campuswide wellness campaign. It’s really comprehensive and it’ll probably be more down the road but I just heard it for the first time in the senate meeting on budget and planning committee one day. It sounds cool and will affect grad students. But for the GPSS Spotlight, i'll try to get Dave or Adam to talk about that.

Alice: It’s funny because our entire agenda is all Chris.

Chris E: Do you want to do an update or talk about the events that we’ve done? Like a recap of who showed up and stuff.

Chris L: Show some photos?

Genesis: Sure, I’ll put that at the end.

Chris E: Maybe put a spotlight on the biggest turnout for non-Evans.
Alice: Is that on previously on gpss?

Chris L: I think on Previously on gpss is specific for what we talked about in our meetings but we can do photos from the tailgates and the 522 panel.

Evan: Maybe even for tomorrow’s social.

Chris L: There’s actually a lot to show.

Genesis: We could call it events update or whatever.

Elisa: I can do that with Genesis.

Chris E: Keeping up with the GPSSians?

Genesis: Let's say 10?

Evan: 5.

Chris L: You can take 10.

Genesis: We have so many events that I just want to give them some light.

Chris L: I’ll make sure I’ll time everything really well but for the executive senator vacancy information, we should try to think about what we want to say instead of just saying we need another executive senator.

Evan: Also that might be for us individually talking to people. If no one’s come forward in the last 3 meetings we’ve advertised it, we might have to do that.

Alice: Also, in the meetings, we haven’t been saying ‘Is anyone interested in being an executive senator?’ We’ve just been saying ‘Hey, there’s this position that’s open.’ We haven’t posed it in a way to actually invite people to say that they’re interested. I think we should put in an action item, elect executive senator, and say at the meetings that we need an exec senator. Who is interested? I guarantee someone will raise their hand and come up. We need to elect someone today. Is there a bylaw to not allow that?

Chris L: So the bylaws are actually vague on this. Four executive senators shall be nominated by a committee consisting of the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer and approved by the gpss after all senators have been advised on duties and responsibilities of executive senators. Further nominations may be made from the floor.

Evan: So we can do that.
Genesis: So we can say I nominate _____ for executive senator.

Evan: I think that’s where the difficulty is. They can nominate themselves but they have to be approved by one of the standing exec because that would be in my mind, a further nomination by the officers.

Chris L: Actually that’s not the way.

Alice: Where is it?

Chris L: It’s in article 6, section A, clause 1.

Evan: Also the officers needs to interview the nominees.

Chris E: It doesn’t feel like what happened last year.

Chris L: Yeah, so the way I read this is that we can nominate by saying that we would like to put them forward as a candidate and tell them before the meeting. We can reach out to people that we think would be great. People, additionally, can then from the floor nominate themselves. That doesn’t require our approval. It says all interested senators all have the opportunity and the opportunity has been given. No one has come forward. We can exercise our executive duty in identifying people and letting them know and of course they can refuse. We can say that we’re going to do this next week. If you want to run, contact us or run from the floor. In fact Dawn from EO is interested in doing this but EO has a scheduling conflict since they have late classes but I think it would be great to have someone from EO. That is educational outreach so like a fee based program, not a converted continual education type.

Alice: I know that when there were 3 of us interested last year we all came I said that this is a conflict and I just stepped down and there were only 2. But when I was elected last year, there were a few people interested ahead of time but somebody just nominated me from the floor. I know we can do that but I feel like at this point, couldn’t we just we can interview them on the floor. Just ask them questions. I think we should do this. We don’t need to waste two weeks interviewing people. We can just say executive senator appointment. We just ask them who in this room is interested? We know there’s someone. Someone will raise their hand, we can record name and departments, ask them to stand up and talk for a minute about why they want to do it and give the officers the opportunity to ask questions in the senate and have a vote so we can just be done.

Elisa: Should we put that in email? Also say that they would need to be prepared to give a minute speech?

Chris L: Yes, definitely. We don’t have to do this right now but do we have a list of who we can nominate?
Genesis: No.

Alice: I think individually, if you think someone can be good, you should encourage them. People can nominate themselves?

Chris L: They can nominate themselves. This is what I propose. If everyone can reach out to those people and say I’m going to nominate you for the executive senator position, unless they say no.

Chris E: If you’re gonna do it that way, I would prefer that none of us do it. You can nominate yourself or have someone else nominate you. If we do this open call, i don’t like the connotation of us nominating them. We’re opening it up for a fair trial. If we say this is our nominee that either puts them in a huge advantage or disadvantage.

Chris L: But that is our prerogative. It says in the bylaws.

Genesis: But it also shows that they expressed interested to us and done research on the committee.

Alice: Let’s clarify. If someone is nominated is by the officers, if we followed the whole process you have all decided before the meeting who you want to bring forth and nominate. This is just an open call. We’ll be asking for any nominations from the floor so you wouldn’t be doing any nominating.

Chris E: I feel better on that.

Alice: That’s the process.

Chris E: I felt that the last year’s election for officers was very much skewed and too much involved by the officers of that time.

Evan: Alice, what you’re saying now is that the nominations is open from the floor and we’ve already made our nominees and they’ll follow into the next step that’s the elections?

Alice: Yes, so this is a call for executive senator nominations right? And that includes the interview process or should we make them separate?

Chris L: No, that’s the speech part. That’s why I gave them 15 minutes.

Genesis: Then 10 minutes will be for passing out ballots?
Chris L: Yes, so we’ll need to prepare that.
Evan: We should just say that the people we nominate have the chance to speak too.

Chris L: It is okay for us to say that the 4 officers have nominated XYZ. That is clearly spelled out in our role.

Evan: Or say that they're previously nominated and can open the ballot to anyone else.

Elisa: I don’t want to give an unfair advantage to anyone on the floor though.

Chris L: But isn’t that the idea? If you expressed interested in advance and you've talked with the current officers you should have an advantage over someone that decides then and there.

Evan: Maybe step 1 is we have a ballot with the names that you guys nominated.

Alice: Do you guys have a ballot?

Evan: Hopefully by that time.

Genesis: But if we’re opening it to the floor, how would we have it ahead of time?

Evan: Then step 2 is other/write in.

Alice: So you do have people you want to nominate?

Evan: I was under the impression that they were going to come forward.

Chris E: We can have four names by next Monday.

Elisa: 4 people that are interested?

Chris L: It doesn't have to be four.

Alice: The reason it says 4 in here is because there’s 4 positions. So in this case we would have 1.

Chris L: We can nominate 99 but only 1 will be elected.

Evan: They can already be on the ballot and then have space on the ballot for anyone else that want to come forward who are then interviewed and then give a chance for people on the ballot to talk on ballot and then vote.

Alice: I just think if the four of you haven’t met and decided and somebody has shown interest and have gone through the process in what someone would normally do to be nominated
including attending an executive meeting, then that’s the process for nominating people. I think you can have people write in. Since its last minutes and you don’t have anybody ready to go, I don’t think you should nominate anyone. It’s either or. Extend this for 2 weeks and do it right and officially nominate them or not at all. It’s a more legitimate process that way.

Chris E: So we’re now back to the original way we were thinking?

Elisa: Yes. Just the call.

Chris L: Our choices are purely open from floor or extend this another 2 weeks and say at the next meeting, ‘If you want to do this, you must come to an executive meeting or at least you need to touch base with us.’ Then we have a slate of officer nominated people and that would happen on November 20th.

Chris E: You don’t have to be there. Melanie read Kimberly’s statement for her.

Evan: We can do both. We can fully open it in the meeting and if no one comes forward, in the next senate meeting, we come with officer nominated names.

Alice: I think if you have people you want, it’s okay to encourage them to run from the floor. They’ll be the groomed candidates but I don’t think that without the vetting process coming to the meeting and knowing who the people are it’s be better to leave it open to the floor.

Chris E: One, I need to know what the final decision is since the original plan was to do an information section. I know 3 or 4 people that want to do that but we have larger fish to fry in my book like filling committee chairs and SAGE delegates and the people I know who would be doing that would be candidates for this. Unless we’re in a super rush, then I think it’s worth it to wait than have some random person throw their hat in. At that point, we’ll know who’s going to be there because with the 2 people at law, we don’t even know who the actual senator is going to be. So there’s a disadvantage of time but are we back at ‘Let’s make another announcement and the decision is going to be made by our group in the next executive senator meeting or go straight to the floor next Wednesday?’

Elisa: I think we should go straight to the floor. They had plenty of time to figure out if they’re interested.

Alice: We have a room full of veteran senators who know the process and we had two meetings already. It says in our bylaws that we’re suppose to have 4 executive senators so we’re not in a rush but it’s our obligation to have 4 executive senators.

Chris L: So the question is are we comfortable accepting nominations and potentially and having someone who may not have a significant amount of experience?
Alice: I trust the senators to vote on that. There’s a room full of vocal veteran senators that will ask the right questions to vote on it. I’m just worried about nepotism. The four of you decide who your nominations are then have gpss vote. It feels like that process would advantage someone more on our end whereas the executive senator is to be a representative of gpss. Even though it does say that you can have nominations from officers but because we don’t already have a slate of people who the officers want to nominate, its up to gpss to decide who they want to be representing them.

Chris E: You misunderstand what I’m saying. Because in the fact if I find someone I want to nominate, I would find someone else to do it. I personally don’t feel comfortable nominating anybody because of the advantage or disadvantage that would give to them from how people feel about me. I feel that it’s not our place. I’ve been vocal in this meeting how our executive officers implanted themselves in the election last spring. I’m one to stay away from that entirely

Alice: Which election?

Chris E: The officer election. There was a room full of senior senators but in a situation where there was only 2 questions to each candidate, an executive officers took one of these from two of the candidates. That’s the kind of thing I want to stay away from. I much rather not be involved in any of that. I rather have people nominate themselves and do that. I’m apprehensive to where we do it right now. If its only one person that stands up, are they it? Decision or not, we have to wait for some of the things to happen. At least I’m not going to involved myself in it but the people I’ve talked to I think will be good and I’ll voice that to you guys but that conversation hasn’t been appropriated yet.

Evan: Can we take nominations twice? This meeting we can say we’re holding a vote next senate meeting and take more nominations then, so we have two pools of candidates. We’re pushing them to stand up instead of just an information thing but we’re also open about it.

Chris E: My thought would be this week, we talk to whoever we want to nominate and say you better be at the next meeting and if we have their names before time, say that these are the people who talked to us and are nominated. If there was anybody else who wasn’t aware or didn’t know we’ll add their name to the list.

Chris L: These are my thoughts. First of all, this is written extremely confusingly for electing executive senators. For a position that’s relatively important we should strongly consider rewriting the bylaws but that’s for later. Second thing is that last year the elections, that whole process, was not done well. When we formed the elections committee we should encourage to be mindful of that. This is my preference for what we do and I take responsibility for not having thought this through this process carefully. At the next meeting, we put out the last and final call for executive senators. We get one of the current senators to describe what it involves. In this time the interested people have to in order to be officially nominated, they must contact one of us, talk to the officer about their interest, come to the following executive committee meeting or
do something equivalent if they can't come, and on the 20th, we'll say that these are the official nominees. If anyone would like to run from the floor we will allow that. I'm open to suggestions.

Genesis: I like that

Alice: That seems like the most in line with how it is intended.

Chris L: I agree that there's a time element but I would rather have a quality candidate especially someone who is serving for more than one year than have it another way.

Elisa: So instead of an open call, were saying that if you're interested in the position, contact one of the officers and convince us that you'd be a good candidate so we can nominate you in the following meeting so you can be voted on.

Chris L: The process is contact one or more of the officers.

Alice: Could we ask the floor, not more nominations but if we could see a show of hands of any interested senators? Then take down their names and departments and we can also contact them. Some people are sitting there are interested but they just forget about it. I that was done last year.

Chris L: We’ll say more than just contact the officers. We’ll say that this is the final call and if you want to be nominated by the officers you must take these steps.

Alice: I’m willing to do a little explanation since last meeting I did something like that. I’m happy to stand up and do that part of it. Executive senator vacancy final call and talk about what it means and ask people to raise their hands.

Chris L: And outline the process clearly. Is everyone comfortable with this process? Alright, make it final call like this is happening.

Chris E: Is this someone we need to move or something that’s just a general consensus?

Chris L: We have to approve whole agenda but if we feel comfortable collectively on that then we can approve it through the agenda.

Chris E: I ask that because I feel like we just laid out a whole policy on how to do this.

Chris L: Yes we did and part of it is the confusing bylaw. I think what I just laid out is in the spirit.

Evan: It’s better than what is written because it opens it up and with what Chris was talking about, which favors introduction or disfavors it by the committee, it opens it up to the senate as a whole but we still get quality candidate.
Chris L: It will advantage the people that take the time to go through the process as it should and we can say that the officers will not ask any of the questions.

Chris E: I think I really like that because we’re not exactly saying that we approve of this person. Anybody who does these things can get our nomination.

Chris L: It’s not an endorsement. It’s like running for officer nominations. If you turned in your stuff you got on the ballot.

Chris E: An other indication of that is that by us putting your name on the ballot, you showed some initiative.

Chris L: Right. We’re not endorsing people. We’re nominating them.

Elisa: So what I have is final call for nominations for the open executive senator seat. This means that we’ll be taking names of interested senators and will be scheduling interview for the following week and will be taking a vote on the following meeting.

Genesis: We’re not scheduling interviews. We’re requiring them to contact us and they need to come to an executive committee meeting.

Alice: I don’t know if we should require it.

Evan: We can say we require it and if they can they can’t, we can ask them to do XYZ.

Chris L: Maybe we can say that we strongly recommend the meeting or require some kind of interaction with one of the officers.

Genesis: If they can’t come to this executive senator meeting how would they be able to come to other exec meetings?

Alice: Maybe they just had something for this next week.

Evan: Then they can contact the officers individually.

Chris L: Anything else? I will now entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Evan: So moved.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? It was a circular discussion but I think it’s good that we went through that. A lot of these procedures are things we’re all learning and for this particular thing, there’s
not a lot of good guidelines.

Alice: That might’ve been done intentionally.

Chris L: Sure, because the executive senator is more likely to leave than an officer. So the next thing is discussion of the resolution.

Elisa: I haven’t edited the language quite yet but it looks pretty good but if you have any edits you’d like to make let me know.

Chris L: My only thing is that typically a resolution be therefore, or after the therefore.

Chris E: Does that say be it resolved that?

Chris L: Yes, I don’t know. It should say be it resolved. Resolutions typically involve an action instead of just a recommendation.

Chris E: We can make that language stronger.

Chris L: There’s nothing substantively that I have an issues with but that ‘therefore be resolved that’ or it could be ‘therefore be it resolved that gpss strongly…’

Chris E: So should we say that gpss requests that a transit package be passed during the special session in November?

Chris L: No, that GPSS requests.

Chris E: So you want it to say GPSS requests.

Chris L: Or recommends.

Genesis: Not recommends. That’s not an action.

Evan: Or a formal recommendation is an action.

Chris L: So each ‘that’ clause should have an action.

Chris E: Sure, and this might be an older version. We changed the word recommendation to a charge or a call to action.

Alice: We didn’t have the chance to read it before this meeting and I was wondering if we could agree on a version because that’s what they did last year. The executive committee would go through and make our revisions and have that sent out. I know Trong would go through and have
a list of edits but this isn’t the most recent version so I would like to see it because this has a lot of punctuation situations.

Chris E: Matt Portwood brought up the online forum idea from last year and I know they weren’t heavily used but maybe we can bring that up again and get the help of other senators to get the conversation started for us. That would give an opportunity to see resolutions out in public and see what is going on.

Evan: The primary goal is to conserve senate meeting time. I know from previous years, that was the case if the executive senators were split on it then that would escalate to incredibly long meetings and not passing resolutions.

Chris L: If we send out the most recent copy and ask them to go through this and make your edits and come prepared to propose the amendments.

Alice: Chris, you said you’d be open to a online editing process. What would be the procedure of elisa sending out the most recent version of this and put it in a Google doc or the online forum where its up there and make changes during the week. We can send out an email with the link and say you can see this document as its being edited. We don’t want people proposing the same change.

Chris E: Where did this version come from?

Elisa: That was from my email.

Chris E: If we can find the one that was sent to you and the slides for last week, this is the one we need to go off because this was done before we edited it.

Chris L: So the one from last week?

Chris E: Yes.

Tina White (Communication Specialist): Jake sent me a email with the document but he also made some changes while I was putting it on the Powerpoint. So we can look at the slides. They’re in the public drive under Communication Specialist.

Chris L: This is the thing. Whatever goes out tonight is the final version that can be amended but it has to be amended at the meeting. We can’t collaboratively edit it and it can’t be different from this.

Evan: My interpretation of that would be proposed amendments that would be coming to this meeting.
Alice: Anyone can sponsor the collective amendments that senators have access to. Then we can bring up the amendments from the Google Doc as they are and any substantial changes we can go through and everything else can be friendly amendments.

Chris L: We can do some of those corrections right now. Until we send it out it's not the final version.

Evan: I think it's fine as far as I can tell. I think this is not the document but this is a collection of amendments that would be sponsored and proposed and we can say in advance who will be sponsoring them and proposing this.

Chris L: Let's figure that out not right now. I don't know what committee would do that but let's concentrate on this for the moment.

Evan: One thing that's not strictly language is I don't recall having an actual copy of the resolution word for word going out of house. That was always in house and the actions coming from that resolution going out of house. The very last clause, that's what we would send to Washington state senators.

Alice: I don't think it's smart to send this. If someone came to me with this, I want to see a few talking points. Maybe if they're interested in seeing the resolution we can send it to them.

Evan: We can instruct the Vice President to speak broadly on our behalf. At which point you don't need to have specific language vetted by the GPSS because GPSS vets you as a whole. If you want names and people attached to it then we can have a petition.

Chris E: I was hoping this would have more people aligned. I agree but I didn't a resolution to get your guy's approval to write a resolution to work on transit. I don't think this is something people would read. I think as a body we want to be on record that we made a statement about this. I'll send it to everybody but for the purposes of us, being on record or sitting on press release or whatever we do, as we work in this vein that we do have a general record statement. If you want to know where we stand, here it is. We voted on it. I personally want to share that with the governor at least. Especially if we can get asuw to do something similar or sign on to this and us be leading the way on that. Or we can have other student organizations point to our resolutions saying we agree with that. I don't want to do a lot of this stuff and letter writing can fall on deaf ears but I think this is a unique situation. We can keep it in house if that's the decision we make but I would also make the argument that if we don't send these to anybody, if these are just guiding documents for us, I will personally say that I don't really understand why we go through the time to go through that.

Chris L: Typically that last clause will instruct, usually the President to deliver the resolution to administrators because they typically have to do with university policy.
Evan: That would explain why this feels a lot different. I do have question though. I wouldn’t know but would it be more effective to send the resolution from gpss the entity or a petition with possibly more signatures than GPSS.

Chris E: This is dual. We have our own legislative document. Now we can use this to craft a letter/petition for people to sign on to. I think its interesting or good to have a separate document. For example, the King County Now group has a petition of all these groups but we speak specifically for students which the plan all along was to say there are all these possible funders that are business people and who people in Olympia might listen to more that wouldn't sign on from a business or political aspect but in the light of saying they want to promote students, they might be more open to that. That's the angle on that and I do agree that if we're out talking to people or promoting that that list of names is what we're talking about. In the end, we don't need to send this list to anybody. The governor’s is good enough.

Evan: Also additionally, is it more effective to send this to you in this resolution format or would it be more effective to pass a resolution to instruct you to send your own letter?

Chris E: I think it’s one and the same. I don’t think it’s bad to have both.

Chris L: What about a compromise of a copy of this resolution and an accompanying cover letter that will be written by the GPSS Vice President.

Chris E: I don’t want to seem not open to these ideas and I need to take a second to say yes. I don’t think it’s a bad thing to do both or have this as guiding document. This is the idea of go to put on a special session and do it. The likelihood is thin but at the time, at our follow up, this time now and after the committee days in November when that special session could happen, that is our time to also get that stuff from King County that define what exactly those cuts are and at that time, we can take this document and create our letter of what we really want. Maybe that’s the second step.

Chris L: That second step should be defined in the resolution.

Evan: I’m not inherently against sending it to Washington state senators but it feels more far reaching than we've ever done before which means I think that we need to go through this with a fine tooth comb and make sure its of the highest quality and that the senate has ample time for them to go through it. Giving them a week seems quick and giving them a shorter amount of time in senate seems quick as well. If we do succeed in stressing that this is going to state legislatures to make sure its perfect and no one has an opinion, that’s that but I think we should plan for the possibility of it taking one more session to get it passed just in case people are active about it. I think every single thing is fact checked and perfect as an exec committee.

Chris E: This then becomes our ideas of meetings and timing of things. If there is a special session it’ll be November 22nd-23rd. It doesn’t allow another full senate meeting for it to be done.
Genesis: Yes it does. We meet on the 20th

Chris L: Let’s go through this. Are you able to put footnotes or citations?

Chris E: We can. All of this was taken off of the UW transportation website or Move King County Now. The other thing is, now that I have an updated copy, Michelle Zeeman from UW transportation, I can run it by her as well.

Chris L: I think just putting some footnotes to cite sources will be good but otherwise, can we first look at the whereas clauses?

Alice: The document we have here it doesn’t start with this title part. So this version were looking at doesn’t have any title. It just starts with Article 1.1. Is that what is suppose to have?

Elisa: It was just the way it was copied. I can add it in.

Alice: Also I have a suggestion. I’m drafting this right now because I’ve sent so many of cover letters and bullet points and I’m happy to draft this and send this to you a very brief cover letter that says the University of Washington Graduate and Professional Student Senators representing almost 14,000 strongly encourage the Washington state legislature to call a special session to pass a transit package for November 2013. See attached for the resolution and undersigned have all the senators automatically undersign. So we include in this resolution to direct Chris Erickson to lobby the Washington state legislature to call a special session and forward this cover letter with all senators undersigned and with this copy of the resolution to all these people. Have them see this cover letter at the meeting and tell them that all their names are listed because that accomplishes everything. You don’t have to do more work on a petition and if they vote and approve it they are approving to automatically have all their names added. So we’ll have a long list of students and their departmental affiliations and the resolution so we satisfy what you want and its legislatively effective because its a very small thing. This is what they’re asking me to do. These are all these constituents.

Evan: All their names means all the senators?

Alice: Yes.

Evan: And we can offer them the opportunity to abstain from being on the list and that would be fine?

Alice: No, it would be all the senators names.

Chris E: Everybody who voted for it.
Evan: If we don't have an unanimous vote, we have to give them the opportunity to not be on it.

Chris E: We’re only talking about the people who approved the resolution.

Evan: It’s just a minor detail.

Alice: Would you be open to that idea?

Chris E: Of course.

Chris L: All the same names can go next to co-sponsor.

Chris E: I like the idea of to use everyone’s name in the cosponsor. Well maybe not there. Maybe the executive senators would be the cosponsor to sign on to the letter. I say we use everybody’s address and or district. If they’re from out of state, we can use their Seattle address but if they’re from other districts, we should do that.

Genesis: Do we have access to that?

Chris E: I’m willing to take that on once we cross that bridge.

Chris L: But let’s remember that we’re doing this resolution right now. I’m going down to that clause and Chris you can decide who you want but they have a between now and next wed.

Alice: No, sorry. That GPSS directs because it’s an action item.

Chris L: The GPSS directs the Vice President to forward a copy of this resolution with the accompanying cover letter to the officers of….and then you can amend it and I’m going to take out whoever. Also I’d like to put therefore be it resolved the Graduate and Professional Students Senate: and for each of these items we can put ‘formally recommends.’

Chris E: What’s the word I used in the beginning there? I thought we changed it to something different like a call to action or a charge to the Washington state.

Evan: At the very least a formal recommendation sounds nice.

Chris E: So this is wrong too. I don’t know why that is but we had one that the right stuff. So this needs to say that it’s a recommendation to Washington state governor James Enslee that a special session be called and the Washington state senate passes a transportation package.

Alice: Do we have the right version?
Evan: While he’s looking for the right version, do we need to do the traditional gpss in parenthesis after the full name somewhere? The title is also a place to do that but the title is
also a weird place to do that so if we drop that in the introduction that would be ideal. So ‘a recommendation by the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS)’.

Chris E: We’ll track this down but the one we had had lines and numbers in it as well.

Chris L: I don’t think we need article 1.1 or 1.2. I don’t think its ever been done.

Evan: It doesn't seem completely unfamiliar.

Alice: Who has the authority to call a special session? Is it just the governor?

Chris E: Yes, it’s only the governor.

Alice: Then why are we sending this resolution to the state legislature?

Chris E: Because there’s a special charge to come up with transportation budget during the session.

Alice: But if there isn’t a special session?

Chris E: Then we won’t.

Evan: We’re also just trying to get the word out.

Chris E: Here’s the old U-pass one that has some of the language in it.

Alice: It also needs to have the numbered lines. How many people do we have paid by the gpss to do public policy?


Alice: I just don’t think it’s a good use of our time or your position as a GPSS President to add numbers and lines to this resolution. I feel like it should be in its near and final form and the fact that we can’t even find a recent draft of this to approve tonight to send out to senators is concerning to me on the record.

Chris E: On the record, there is a version with numbers and lines and this was an added agenda item at the last minute.

Alice: But this is suppose to be sent out to all the senators tonight and we haven’t been able to locate this recent version with the numbers. Does anybody else share my concern? Evan: I get where you’re coming from and that it should be a more finished version sent out but I also understand that it’s a rush job for the explicit reason because it loses its potency after a little
while. Although it’s not the best use of everyone’s time, it’s something we have to work with. I remember we had a 3 hour exec meeting last year. Although it would be nice to have it more done and completed, we can’t stop working. Do we want to go further line by line and start editing?

Chris L: I changed the language ‘Therefore be it resolved that the Graduate and Professional Student Senate formally recommends to the governor that a special legislative session be called that a special option for local funding for transit be included in the approved transportation package that gpss urges state legislators take into consideration that the gpss directs the Vice President to forward a copy of this resolution with an accompanying cover letter to the office of so and so and so on. That’s a major change I made down there. Just so that every that clause has an action item in it.

Evan: Can we go top down on this and start addressing anything that comes up?

Chris L: Whereas representatives, whereas transportation, whereas transit provides… A lot of this we saw at the meeting too.

Evan: So the GPSS views transit as a vital service that serves the student as well as the economy prosperity of the surrounding region and the common good. That last half seems broad and reaching. Do we want that as our lead-off statement, something that is not backed by facts necessarily?

Chris L: That says GPSS views. It’s an opinion.

Evan: Do we want an opinion as the first statement?

Chris L: It’s my opinion. I share the opinion.

Evan: Do we want to back it with data first or just say an opinion as our first lead off?

Genesis: I think we should lead off with data because I think it strengthens our resolution. Because here are the facts and this is what we think of it.

Chris E: I’ll say that the idea behind that is to go broad first and to more specifics.

Evan: Can we still achieve that if we start with broad facts to back an opinions?

Chris E: I’ll also say that the reason we modeled it like that was to make an overarching King County specific to UW specific, student specific.

Evan: Anyone else’s thoughts on this?
Chris L: I don’t have a strong opinion on what comes first.

Alice: Can I ask about local funding of transit? What does that mean?

Chris L: That is the motor vehicle excise tax.

Evan: Could we put a footnote there?

Alice: Can i say and option for local funding?

Evan: Do we want to put a footnote even as a suggestion?

Chris L: I don’t think that’s necessary for us because that’s on King County council to decide what the local option to be.

Evan: So, the first whereas statement is still broad. Do want to leave it broad and start with an opinion or broad data that leads to an opinion. We currently have one vote from Chris which is no opinion.

Genesis: I have no opinion.

Evan: That’s something we have to tackle right now if we want to send it to the senate as a whole.

Alice: Do we have a list of all senators and their department affiliations?

Chris L: Yes, but we don’t need to do that right now.

Evan: That would be in our roster. Leaving that for now. King County Metro faces a 17% budget cut beginning of September 2014. Do we need to cite that?

Chris L: Chris and his people can do that later.

Evan: Can we put a note to cite? With a $75 million shortfall, 600,000 hours of service cuts?

Genesis: You want a citation on that?

Evan: Is it plural cuts? I’m not actually sure. And up to 65 routes deleted?

Elisa: Hours should just be cut.

Genesis: No, singular because you’re making one cut, not making several.
Evan: I don’t like deleted. Do we have a better word for deleted?

Alice: Eliminated.

Evan: Whereas the current level of transportation services is currently underserving the region’s demand by approximately 10%. Assume there’s a citation for that? The word is not a contended citation? Is that a well accepted fact?

Chris L: These data have been gathered but there could be a citation.

Evan: I guess I’m not familiar with Move King County but they are a group that would be under contention with people who want to cut transit funding.

Chris L: I think King County Metro have also done that. I can put a note for citation.

Evan: King County Metro services almost up to 65 million rides per academic year?

Genesis: That’s probably a fact that’s verified by UW transportation.

Evan: I’m sure that’s verifiable. I’m not sure I like rides.

Chris L: We usually use trips.

Evan: Many routes serve in the U-district area including the 48, 65, 67, 68….

Alice: Can I say which provide transportation rather than which our trips? Or just 55 of which are

Evan: Are to and from our school? So you’re getting rid of trips.

Elisa: Alice are you using your gmail?

Alice: Yes, I don’t have editing capabilities.

Genesis: I don’t have editing capabilities either. I don’t care.

Alice: I just don’t like that. Can we do which are professional?

Evan: That is an awkward line. I agree.

Chris L: Which one?

Evan: This is ‘whereas King County Metro services with an economic priority to the state’ that’s fine. ‘With over a 150 million trips per year and 55% which are to and from school and work.’
Alice: Do we even need that in there? I would look at it as a skeptic and say what are the other half doing? Can we take that out?

Evan: It may make a stronger statement to say that its an economic priority to the state.

Alice: Yes, with over 150 million trips per year.

Evan: I'm okay with taking that out. So, Chris right now we are considering taking out that 55% of the rides are to and from school from work.

Chris E: That's total number. That's the entire King County and that school counts for over half of the rides. That's not appealing?

Evan: Her argument is that it's only half. Does it make a stronger point to say that King County Metro services economic priority to the state?

Chris E: Sure.

Alice: With over a 150 million trips to school per year. That sounds like a lot to me. That's convincing.

Chris E: You could also say that 65 million trips from school to work per year?

Evan: That sounds better to me.

Chris E: We’re talking about something that people won’t really dig into that much. Like very specific things that nobody looks into.

Evan: I’m just saying, if this is going to be our public face, we have to do it the best way we can. and its our first public face as well. Ordinarily we would spend more time on this but we do have a deadline set by the legislative session. Cuts facing King County Metro will put 25,000 cars in traffic congestion slowing transportation services.

Elisa: You’re reading the wrong thing.

Evan: Transit rides provides benefits for the common good saving King County Metro riders 305 million annually in fuel savings while taking approximately 75,000 cars out of traffic congestion. Can we get rid of ‘provides benefits for the common good’ and give data?

Chris L: Whereas public transit saves King County Metro riders.
Evan: Yes.
Elisa: Do we need to cite that?

Alice: It doesn't save in fuel saving. It saves in fuel costs.

Evan: Yes, that makes it sound a lot better. Whereas King County Metro cuts will add approximately 25,000 cars to traffic congestion everyday inhibiting the fluidity of the state's economy.

Alice: Can we substitute productivity for time? Because that's not the statistics.

Chris L: Is it time in terms of opportunity costs?

Evan: I've heard of statistics cited in terms with taking in the fact of opportunity costs so time does get cited in statistics so I'm not innately questioning that if it's cited as a sentence.

Chris L: That would be productivity wouldn't it?

Alice: I think time is different from productivity, right?

Chris E: Can we look at the top of this? Do you know which change you made? Can we take the change you made and mesh them with the official version which I sent to Elisa's inbox?

Evan: Nope, can't actually see all of them. Maybe I can. Yes, I can. It's just one click at a time.

Chris E: Which computer is that?

Evan: It's just this one attached to gpsspres I believe.

Alice: Is there anything in the budget for exec committee snacks?

Chris L: Nope.

Evan: Did you send this to gpss? Chris, can I access your email? I think its still sending.

Chris L: Sometimes it takes awhile. What are you trying to do?

Evan: Pull up Chris's latest version.

Chris E: It should've sent to everyone.

Elisa: You and Chris Lizotte has seen it?
Evan: If it's on the drive we can all access it. Just pull up the new one, one of you.
Chris L: I have it on my phone now so it should be there on the email.

Evan: Now we can all edit it at the same time. So we can try to not go through it with a fine tooth comb but we kind of have to. I know in science papers I write we put parenthesis in the body and not in the title. We have to do it the first time we say GPSS so can we say it in intro? So the title of the resolution, I don't think it can go there but if you guys don't see gpss fitting in well in the introduction we can put in the whereas clause.

Chris E: Go back to the original where instead of a recommendation, its changed to an appeal to the governor.

Alice: So is that a new version were looking at?

Chris E: This the version that’s submitted and gone over.

Chris L: This is the one we looked at during the senate meeting.

Alice: So the one we’ve been editing is old?

Evan: Correct.

Elisa: I can mesh the new one we’re looking at and the one we’ve been editing. Just go from where we stopped last.

Evan: So we stopped at the cuts facing King County Metro at approximately 25,000 cars in traffic congestion everyday inhibiting the fluidity of the state’s economy.

Alice: Do we all have access to this document?

Evan: It’s just gone up there so keep refreshing your Google Docs.

Alice: Is this title already there?

Evan: Go down to the fluidity thing because Elisa is meshing it right now up until that point and were just gonna pick up editing from the fluidity on the new one.

Alice: Where?

Evan: So ‘cuts facing King County Metro facing approximately 25,000 cars in traffic congestion.’

Alice: Above that, did we change the first one up here?

Evan: We’re going to get rid of transit saves King County Metro riders approximately $305 million
dollars. Were still on the time vs. productivity discussion?

Chris L: Yes.

Evan: I suppose if you’re saving money, you’re not saving money on time but make the jump to productivity.

Alice: Can I go back to this one? Current level of transit service is currently under serving.

Evan: Has that one been edited yet?

Alice: I’m looking at the old version. Whereas the current level of transit service is currently underserving the region’s demand by approximately 10%, suffering educational opportunities.

Chris E: There shouldn’t be two ‘alreadies’ in that.

Alice: I’m looking at the one that’s been revised already. I just feel like saying that the current level of transit service is already even though its under serving, it’s like it’s already doing something. Whereas I think it would be stronger if the current level of transit is stifling educational opportunities of the University of Washington by under serving the region’s demand by 10%.

Chris E: Sure.

Alice: Okay, I’ll change that in the old version and Elisa, you can mesh that together in the new one so you don’t get lost.

Chris E: I just want to make a comment about this. I don’t mind you changing the language of them, but where there was some concern about keeping true to what is factual. This is all taken from the UW transportation website or King County. So on this current level of transit is already under serving the region’s demand, that’s actually the stat we pulled and stifling educational opportunities is an opinion to that. When you move those does it change the intent or validity of what were citing?

Chris L: I’m just going to point out that normally we would not be doing this level of editing on any resolution. I think there are probably some things that could still be changed and I think those could be changed in the senate meeting as long they are given the resolution and are explicitly told to bring whatever amendments they have to senate meeting. My recommendation is that instead of continuing to do each line item, we decide either to submit it or actually the executive committee does not take action on this. If it were submitted to Elisa 2 weeks before the meeting and Elisa submits it 1 week before the senate meeting, it’s gone through the process.

Alice: Actually, doesn’t she have to send senators the version they’ve seen before?
Evan: No.

Chris L: Her job is to format and edit it.

Alice: So I move to stop doing this right now and move on to next agenda item and have Elisa send whatever version gets done before midnight to all the senators.

Elisa: We’re still okay sending in the Google Doc?

Alice: No.

Evan: Which one are we sending?

Alice: Whatever Elisa sends tonight after she edits it with Chris. With the version we all get sent with the senators, we all can make a slew of amendments and we can get them to you, Chris, ahead of time so they’re friendly and propose these amendments at the meeting.

Evan: That’s fine but I would contend that normally we do have a line by line item section. I recall Trong doing a line by line item section. The difference being that everyone had done their own line by line edits previously.

Alice: Because we had a version to look at before the meeting.

Evan: Yes, so while it’s not an official thing that the GPSS voted on but usually the attempt was that the exec committee would be in full agreement of a finalized version that got sent to the senate. This is happening because anecdotal stories that I’ve heard from previous years is that if you let this go to senate it will go on even longer since instead of 6 people wanting to go as fast as possible, you have a senate as a whole. But in this case, I agree. Everyone has things to do so we can do things a little differently and communicate out of the normal sign of time.

Chris L: Any objections to that? I’ll now entertain a motion to suspend the bylaws and delete the remaining agenda items from it. That would be executive senator reports and officer reports.

Alice: To immediately adjourn?

Chris L: Yes.

Alice: I move to suspend the bylaws.

Elisa: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?
Genesis: I know it’s going late and no one intended this to go this long but we have an agenda. Do you guys have a lot to say? Do you have anything to say?

Alice: Fair enough. I withdraw my motion.

Genesis: Because let’s just get it over with. Let’s put it on the record that we’re going to have our updates and everything. Just because this went long, we can’t get rid of the rest of our agenda.

Alice: That’s a good point.

Evan: This has only been a 2 hour meeting and I say only because legends have it that past executive meetings have gone even longer.

Chris L: Withdrawn. Then we’ll move on to executive senator reports.

Evan: I don’t have anything to bring.

Chris L: Alice?

Alice: The only question I have is that came up from the last meeting is the Night at the Museum. Are we going to have alcohol there?

Genesis: Yes, but it’s only 21 and over.

Alice: But there are posters right?

Genesis: Yes, and it says that on our posters.

Alice: I thought it had to be invite only if there was alcohol being served.

Genesis: Our student email is our invite and your Husky card is your invite.

Alice: The posters haven’t been printed yet or posted anywhere?

Genesis: No, they have.

Alice: But Rene said if posters have been put up on campus, it’s not an invite only event. It’s open to the public.

Genesis: But we said in the poster that it’s 21 and over and you need a Husky card so it’s not open to the public.

Alice: I thought they had to an invitation.
Genesis: The email serves as the invitation.

Evan: Did your way get vetted by Rene?

Genesis: This is Rene’s method of getting around the invitation method. This is not my method.

Chris L: Anything else? Okay, officer reports. Chris?

Chris E: Got the group coming next week and we're finishing up on committee assignments. That will be done next week so we'll have some people starting leg committees next week. Did meet in the last week with Matt, Kiana, and Chris about SAGE so we’re ready to go tomorrow to the fall summit in North Carolina. Also working on the Higher Education Summit. That will be on the 18th. There will be one panel before the asuw legislative reception and there will be 2 other sessions on Tuesday. Those 3 will be on Monday, Pay it Forward which is a funding model for education. The Tuesday ones will be E-learning and healthcare as it relates to students so ECA and some of those things. Chris and I are working that with our people so its taking shape. That’s good for me.

Evan: Earlier you said you were having trouble appointing SAGE delegates. So you haven’t done it yet but you have candidates lined up?

Chris E: On that fact that there’s been people who have specifically came to me to want to be involved or want to get involved with SAGE and/or led to me by people like Kiana. Kimberly also had a person she had talked to me about. There was another person that came through Patricia Atwater.

Evan: That’s good to know. I just wanted to make sure there wasn’t a dearth of applicants

Chris E: There’s this expectation too that since two of the people are 1st year law students, we have to wait and see who. It's more important for me that everyone is involved in some way so that might be different depending on who gets the elected seat because I think they’re both people that we don’t want to lose out on. The benefit of having them involved because I'm antsy to fill a position.

Chris L: Genesis?

Genesis: We funded our first RSO this quarter. It's a grad student RSO. They're putting on a career networking day or career fair for physics and astronomy. Travel grants will close on Friday at midnight. The committee has already met and we have our rubric and metric down. We will meet probably on the 15th to review those applications and we have gotten a flood of travel grant applications. The I-522 panel was a hit. Budget for fall social, we are at budget. I think we just have a few hundred dollars extra.
Chris L: Elisa?

Elisa: I don’t have anything except diversity is opening up our funding on Friday for our potential partnering with a group at Evans to do something with a race exhibit but it’s kind of up in the air right now.

Chris E: Is that PDC or the actual diversity committee?

Elisa: What’s PDC?

Chris E: It’s a student interest group.

Elisa: I’m not sure.

Chris E: Who got in touch with you?

Elisa: Olivia Doureeves?

Chris E: So it’s not the diversity committee. Good to know. I would like to talk to you about that.

Chris L: I don’t have much to report. Going to SAGE tomorrow in North Carolina. Trying to get community affairs and academic and administrative affairs together. We have a lot to dig into actually so we will come together as soon as possible. Any other announcements?

Genesis: If you already haven’t signed up for a volunteer spot for the fall social, please do so.

Chris L: Anyone else? I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Genesis: Motion.

Chris L: Second. Any opposed?