Chris Lizotte (President): I’m going to start. I’ll call this meeting to order at 5:02pm. Before we approve the agenda, I’ll note one thing. Item number 6, suggested bylaw changes, I was originally going to have actual bylaw language but I don’t so I’ll keep the item but keep it really brief. It’s just going to be me talking about some more general suggestions. But with that, I’ll entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): So moved.

Alex Bolton (Law): Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections? Okay. I’ll entertain a motion to approve or amend the minutes.

Genesis: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Okay, we’ll move on. First thing is I wanted to show you the project that I’m working on. Show you where we’re at, at the moment. So tomorrow the Graduate School, in their bi-weekly email, will send out a blog post that I guest authored that will announce the launching of this initiative. The student committee came up with a snappy name of Grads Guiding Grads, which is G cubed. This is actually on the GPSS website now, under services. A lot of the content still needs to be filled out, which I’ll be doing tonight. The important things to notice is that we’ll have an intro page where people land and over here we have the page to apply to be a mentor. I’ll show you the application in just a minute. This is still under construction and it doesn’t need to be live yet since we don’t have a mentor core but this is where you apply to get mentoring. This is a list of other on-campus resources and we need to change the order of this but this is the introduction and background on why we decided to do this and what some of our research showed in terms of the availability of these kinds of services and that kind of stuff. Esra Camci did a crack job at packing the website and putting everything in so it fit in with our general aesthetic. I’ll also note that even though right now it’s hosted on the GPSS website, our long-term vision is that we would love to see this to eventually take on a life of its own and not be a GPSS project persay. Assuming this survives that long, this is several years down the line to begin with but we’re off to a strong start with support from both the Graduate School and the Counseling Center. Just to show you the application we came up with, we had a lot of conversation about what kinds of qualities that we wanted people would be able to indicate of what is a good balance between too much or too little information, privacy and that kind of stuff. We got a whole folder for the working group if you’re interested. Here’s the application. Currently, it’s a Google form, which is using UW Google tools so people can access it if people
don’t use UW Gmail, which is nice. So the first step is first name, last name, department or program and gender identity, which is both optional. We have a pretty broad range of choices and one is prefer not to say so you could just not answer it. By the way, if anyone has suggestions, feel free to shout them out.

Austin Pettibone-Wright (GPSS University Affairs Director): Does it have to be a list?

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Sometimes fill in the blank works. Although you might need it for statistics.

Chris L: Statistics and in terms of being able to efficiently process what data we’re getting. We did make degrees sought a mandatory question because even if people don’t want to say what department they’re from, if people do want to be paired this way, we want people to be paired from similar programs. This is the breakdown that I came up with unscientifically. Research based masters, generally the kinds that lead to a PhD, professional masters, like an MBA, the Built Environments degrees, other professional degrees such as JD and MD, research based PhD or practice based PhD, which would be a PhD in Social Work, PhD in Education. That’s kind of my loose unscientific breakdown. Current stage in program. Obviously programs have wildly different lengths so we decided to go with relative to how long it takes to complete your program. So for a business student who is in a two year program, it will be different than a PhD student. Just again, it’s to get an idea of where people are so if someone wants to be paired with someone who’s early in their program, middle of their program or late in their program, they have that option. Then we have our whole list of topics around which people can indicate that this is something that I have particular knowledge, expertise or experience in and I would be willing to talk to people about it. It’s optional. People don’t have to do this. People requesting a mentor don’t have to indicate what they want to be mentored about but it’s another tool to match people. I feel like it’s a fairly exhaustive list and there’s an “Other” option. If anyone has suggestions…

Evan: Have you sent those out looking for suggestions?

Chris L: Other than it being workshopped in the working group, we talked about it with the Graduate School executive staff.

Evan: I meant like to us.

Chris L: Yes, I’ll send it out. “Are you fluent in a language other than English?” There could be possibly important for people that want to be mentored in their native language. Then there are a couple of essay questions. This is not the limit of the space. When you built the form, it will expand to meet the space. The answer doesn’t have to be as short as the answer boxes. One is “Why are you interested and what are your expectations?” We’re not thinking about this as an application process. We have no idea what kind of responses we’ll get in the first place but we’re not thinking in terms of a competitive process. We just want to make sure we get people who have some sense of empathy and genuinely wanting to help other people. We have also
talked about how this is a valuable opportunity for professional development for people and a lot of what the Graduate School is offering is support for developing that aspect of the program. We want to make sure that people aren’t doing this because it will look good on the resume. There is easier things to do that will look good on a resume with less work but just to make sure. Then the kind of mentor relationship. We thought of it initially in terms of long term being somewhere between 3-9 months and up to a year or possibly longer of 1:1 meeting somewhere and talking. We also came up with other formats that will be good. One is drop-in sessions where someone just comes in and they just want to talk to someone once and that’s it. We’re looking at spaces where we can to do that. For example, the space in the Research Commons is one, in Allen Library. The Center for Teaching and Learning can be another alternative. Kelly Edwards from the Graduate School suggested Skyping being an option, which is there. I wouldn’t want to do that but the option is there.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): I would.

Chris L: Well there you go. And there is another category. Finally, “Are you willing to be contacted by more than one student?” You know so are you willing to mentor or give advice and feedback to more than one student. Then anything else you should or like to tell us. That’s pretty much it. The next step is to get some print materials. That’s not as high priority right now because pamphlets are the kinds of things that we’ll leave at the Counseling Center or Hall Health and places where people can read about the program and read about the being mentored side rather than the mentoring side. I’ve asked Tina to design a logo to make the G cubed thing really cool. That’s pretty much what we got. I’ll be filling the website tonight. The content is created but it just needs to be inserted. Are there any questions?

Alice: What is in it for a peer mentor? Especially since people are busy. Is there a plan to advertise this or compel people to participate as a mentor?

Chris L: So beyond doing something to help other people, we have two main things. One is a monthly meeting of all people who are all mentors in the program to get together to debrief about their experience. Then also more targeted, more formalized professional development activities having to do with mentoring relationships, which is something the Graduate School already does so it will be fairly easy to incorporate that. We might not be able to implement this immediately but the Graduate School has a lot of for credit things for teaching, but having like a one credit mentoring thing offered by the Graduate School. That could eventually be a program requirement. If you do this once a year, you have to take this one credit thing. We’re not quite there yet but it’s a possibility as well.

Alice: Have you talked to anyone with working with Psychology or the School of Social Work to incorporate this as part of their practicum requirements in terms of having that fulfill their hours?

Chris L: No. I’m sure a lot of the students will prefer to do this than what they’re doing right now, but that is a good thought. Since a lot of that stuff is governed by the national accrediting
organizations, like what kinds of things qualify for practicum, it may not rise to their level of criteria.

Alex: What’s the timeline before it goes live?

Chris L: The application for the mentors is going live tomorrow. We’re forging ahead and we’ll be accepting applications until May 20th. So were shooting for a late May-early June with an option for the summer depending on how much interest we get and people who say they can do it over the summer, but definitely for the 2014-2015 school year and it will be on a rolling base.

Alex: Is there a plan for a kick-off or anything?

Chris L: Right now, we’re working with Ellen Taylor to nail down a date for a very basic training. Essentially what she calls gatekeeper training. It’s training to know this is the point where I need to refer this to a professional and this has gone beyond my capacity to deal with. Along with that, we’ll have a social aspect and the Graduate School has agreed to kick in some money for snacks and stuff. It depends on their schedule but looking at the week of May 25th at this point. Okay, moving right along. You have in your packet a very drafty version of a resolution on the topic brought up by the presenters at last week’s senate meeting. I shared the document with Beth, Alice. So this is not meant to be voted on in next week's senate meeting. This is for and information and preliminary feedback. We’re not trying to rush this through yet. On a side note when I do get around, probably around next week’s senate meeting for a series of bylaw changes and anyone else, by the way, who has proposed bylaw changes should think about those now so we can look at them. I would really like get exec out of the business of reviewing resolutions and have the be the work of internal committees. That’s how most legislative bodies work. That’s how ASUW works and I think their model work really well actually. For example, if you look at the ASUW resolution on Israel, it says refer to the committee for presentation, style and format so what they do is they bring it in the full senate for a first reading and you’ll have to correct me on this but it has to go to a committee to come back?

Maxine Sugarman (ASUW Personnel Director): I think you can use fancy language to get out of it but generally it goes to the committee and then it gets passed and we rubber stamp it.

Chris L: I think that’s a better model for GPSS to move toward. It may be longer than a one year change but I think it’s a good place. Nevertheless, we are here as the executive committee and we have this in front of us so this issue came up in the beginning of the school year. My understanding was that the deal, to the extent that there was a formalized deal, was done. The affiliation had been made. There were oral promises and maybe a couple written statements. I’m not entirely sure and I’ll have to go and look but the UW administered health care would not change as a result of this but this group of students, SPHERE, are apparently concerned enough to bring it forward. So Esra and Joseph wrote the resolution.
Alice: Did you see the minutes or did you find out what they talked about in the presentation since you missed it? The update on that was basically the affiliation has been started but not finalized and that there is a contract and that ACLU is going to review it before it get finalized but what they’re pushing for is specific language in the contract that no students or people affiliated with UW will have to follow those directives because some of the Pharmacy students and medical people are worried about is if they get assigned to residency or get trained at an affiliated hospital that they won’t be allowed to offer care so it's a clarification and doing it in writing as opposed to an oral agreement. It is in the formalization process right now from my understanding.

Chris L: That’s good to know. That would be a good “THAT” clause to add because I don’t think it says anything about a pending legal agreement.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): That’s what we really want in this right?

Chris L: What?

Chris E: We want to say you talked about this but we want to see it in writing.

Chris L: Yes, I guess it doesn’t say that either. Right now the closest one is, “THAT the leadership of UWMC should make a formal explicit unequivocal that can and should be clarified to say in writing in any pending legal document forthcoming.” Yes, that should be added to this.

Alice: I had a question. Beth is sending the letter before we vote on this resolution. Do we have the authority to just tell her to go ahead and add it since no one was really opposed to it at the meeting or do we have to vote on it as a senate to have GPSS added as a supporting organization?

Chris L: I think we can vote on it as a committee to endorse the letter. One thing I’m not sure is whether we want to specify that. We are empowered to act on behalf of the senate between senate meetings.

Alice: All of the discussion on that issue during the big meeting were clarifications from senators from Ecology and Medicine talking about the issue as it concerned them and everyone seemed to be pretty supportive. There wasn’t anyone asked questions on why we were doing this. It was always people being like, “Yes, and we’re especially concerned about this and we’re thinking about this and we’ve written our own letter.” I feel like we were implicitly given the authority to endorse it.

Chris L: They just want us to add our name to the letter?

Alice: They want to add us as an organizations but she said if we wanted to do our own resolution and add to the packet they were sending, they would appreciate it. It’s suppose to be
the first week of May. That would mean that we want this voted on next week but I don’t know what that would require. It would have to go out in an email right?

Chris L: Right and this is not going to be ready by next week, but we can vote as a committee to add our name in support and then as soon as this is ready, and beyond the ones that I came up with off the top of my head of people that they want to support it, that would be great.

Alex: Do you have major problems with it as it stands? I don’t understand why it’s not ready to send to the senate.

Chris L: Two things. One, the points that Chris and Alice brought up. I want it to be specific about whatever contract is pending and also make sure that the statement is delivered in writing. That could be added to those clauses and we can add another “THAT” clause. THAT any legal arrangement between two parties makes explicit the UW’s commitment to such and such.

Alex: Is there a reason we can’t do that at the meeting? We’ve done some work to set up a resolution. I think the senate is expecting something back. Timewise, if we hold off on it, it wouldn’t make sense to do this.

Chris L: That’s true. The only other thing is I want some kind of citation on the third whereas clause. I have no doubt these situations exist. We just would want a citation.

Chris E: This might go down a longer path but I would be comfortable if we went to the senate next week with the idea of endorsing the letter. It’s a lot easier. I know we can act on it in the senate if we endorse the letter, but also if the opportunity is available, I’d hate to assume what the senate wants since it shifts. One thing I also want to know is they talked about maybe not issues but other contracts have been signed in other places. I’d be interested in finding out how that worked out. Did these things become an issue? Were employees made to do certain things or was it a non-issue? Or did they say they were going to do it and it wasn’t enforced, which would call for a little stronger language. I think the letter is good and this intent that we can be stronger with a resolution where we could add things. We wouldn’t be hurt by being a week or two late.

Evan: Just to address that, I think I remember that there were previous precedents but not at a larger public institution so as far as their research, there wasn’t anything that was directly comparable where they can go back and reference these historical things. It’s mainly at smaller ones.

Chris L: If I remember correctly, there was Swedish.

Chris E: It was talked about.

Chris L: I agree. I would just want this whereas clause to have a citation.
Evan: Are we going through to bring up specific things to bring up right now?

Chris L: Well, Alex brings up a good point that it would be more timely. We do have our new system in place, where even though it would have to go out, Yasmeen has provided us with the means to make amendments up to 48 hours before the actual meeting. We do have some more flexibility than we previously had to make the changes that we’re talking about right now. One possibility is to send this out and then tell people that this is live, allow people to make changes and some combination of us to go and make the changes we’ve been talking about and do what Chris suggested where at the same time we vote on the resolution, let the senate vote on being a signatory to the letter.

Alice: I think that’s a good solution. I agree with Alex. These senator have worked hard to get this together so even though it’s not perfect, acting on it immediately would not only be timely for us but for the packet that’s going out. That being said, it might be going out really soon because she said before May, which is tomorrow. I do think from the discussion in the full senate, it was very clear that people were supportive of this widely. That’s why we have executive senators, to represent the opinions of the senate and it’s my strong opinion that they would support this. If I could tell Beth tonight that you can add our name to the letter whenever you need to send it. I would like to make a motion to allow Beth and SPHERE to add GPSS as a supporting organization to the letter, send this version out tonight and then put it live online as Yasmeen said with the email explaining to senators that this is live and can be editable 48 hours in advance and bring it up for a vote at the meeting next week.

Chris L: Why don’t we separate that motion out?

Alice: I want it all in so we can move on.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Alex: Yes. While I think the tone of the conversation of the senate did seem like that, there was no direction that we were voting on it. I think if we were voting on it, they would bring up concerns and I feel leery to set that precedent of us voting to signing on to the letter. It was more like a presentation for me at the meeting. There was discussion on it but it didn’t feel like it was an action. All we agreed to was to set up a working group. I’m concerned about it. To me it looks like exec is trying to go on its own.

Alice: I think it’s totally within the purview of exec to take discussions and the sense we get from the senate and take action on things. That’s why we have an executive committee. I mean, point well taken. I agree that if people didn’t get the sense that action was being taken in general, that would be an appropriate response, like let’s go back and ask. But it was discussed. I asked her directly, “What can we do as a senate?” There seems like there is a consensus that we’re
in support of this. What can we do to support you? Then she said add to the letter and there was head nodding and Chris asked if there was anyone in the senate who wants to draft a resolution and several hands went up. That to me personally, feels comfortable but if you don’t, then we can bring it to a vote.

Elisa Law (Secretary): Would it be possible to just approve it as the GPSS Exec committee? Since there never was a vote, I agree with Alex. I would be wary of putting a senate stamp on it without having an actual vote happen. Can we say GPSS exec approves this?

Chris E: If the Executive committee endorses this, our name will be going on the letter. That’s what we’re voting on. If we vote, then were voting to put GPSS’s name on that letter. Then also I believe to bring the resolution up in the next meeting. I would say that I agree with a lot of sentiments especially with the timeline. From my understanding it’s later in May but with that I’m definitely encouraged to call for a vote.

Chris L: Is there any more discussion on this?

Alex: Is there precedent in the last few years of exec during the regular school year and senate not doing it and exec do it instead?

Evan: I can't remember.

Chris L: I can’t remember either. Definitely in the summer.

Evan: On the other hand, if it would be useful to sign on as GPSS Executive committee, that would be great. I don’t know if that would have the same weight.

Chris L: Alice, when did she say she wanted stuff to go out by?

Alice: That’s the only reason why I’m suggesting we do this. It’s not to set a precedent or have it be a formality. I don’t know the exact date and I would like to be able to tell her that she can add us right now. I understand the concern about it as a precedent setting thing. In this circumstance, I felt like there was overwhelming support so that is why I don’t have any personal leerance about it but I understand that people do.

Evan: Would people feel more comfortable, if we did do this, to inform senate later on? Does that make anyone more or less comfortable?

Chris L: I totally appreciate that. We want things to be as timely as possible. On the other hand, Elisa are you looking the minutes right now?
Elisa: I’m looking them up right now. Unless there is a notion that there is sense of urgency, I’m hesitant to push this through just because we think it might be urgent. If you can find in the minutes that gives a pretty strong notion of a due date, let us know.

Chris L: Toward the end of the presentation, I asked the timeline and they said end of May, to which I remember the response was, “Okay, cool. We should have plenty of time to address that at the next senate meeting.

Evan: I remember that.

Alice: Really? Okay, that’s not what she told me. She said the beginning of May. If that’s the case then I don’t need to pursue this.

Chris L: Would you like to withdraw or amend the motion?

Alice: Can we table this and see if she responds to me in the next 45 minutes and vote on it? Can I make a motion?

Chris L: Sure, you don’t have to table the motion. You can just withdraw it and bring it up again. I would still be in favor to get this out into the world. I’ll entertain a motion to add this to the agenda and send it to the senate tonight.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Point of information, do we want to make our exec corrections to it first or are we just going to assume its going to happen?

Chris L: No, let’s do it in the system that we have set up. Unless you want to move that. I wouldn’t just say no.

Evan: I think it would be nice to see if there’s anything we can do to make it better before we send it out.

Chris L: The motion is to put it through the process.

Chris E: So it's eligible to be addressed in the next meeting.

Chris L: Right.

Chris E: Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections?
Alice: I think we should go in and do those corrections. For example, a lot of these “THAT” clause, we don’t have the authority to say like, “THAT these ethical and religious directives ought not limit…” Isn’t it THAT GPSS believes or supports or encourages. There are just very basic things that we don’t want to be under discussion because that’s just boring. There’s specific things in here that are not only stylistic but policy-wise, it will be more efficient for us to deal with.

Chris L: Is that an objection or is that an exhortation to do this between now and then?

Evan: Is part of the process have us going through it before the senate does?

Chris L: No, this is sending it as it is and then we would, based on the discussion we had here, in the time that is now available.

Evan: But those then come up at the meeting.

Chris L: No, everyone can see it up until 48 hours before. So as long as those changes are made.

Evan: Then does it have to be discussed at the meeting?

Chris L: No, not if the sponsor takes them as friendly amendments.

Alice: Oh, right. That was the idea to put it online. We can accept anything and people can make amendments. Then that was not an objection.

Evan: Thank you for the clarification. I second that then if it already hasn’t been.

Chris L: You are too late. Any further objections? That’s what we’ll do. I totally agree for the first “THAT” clause.

Alice: I’m happy to go in and do that as soon as it’s live because I love editing resolutions.

Chris L: We will ask for the citation for the third whereas clause.

Evan: Can I throw in a few? We don’t need to continue to re-reference the abbreviation for the ERDs. Things like that. You would only need to reference it once. Has for the last whereas clause, has the communication been vague or not recent? I thought that something had come up at one point that they asserted this but we haven’t heard it in awhile. The final one is the second to last “THAT” clause, it has LGBT and maybe we should change it to LGBTQIA.

Elisa: We haven’t done the public platform for editing resolutions yet. This would be the first one. I think in that resolution, it was left up to the people putting the resolution forward’s responsibility
to make it live. Then we would share the link with the senate listserv. I just want to make sure of that.

Chris L: You are correct. I'm a co-sponsor so I will take responsibility.

Chris E: Due to time consideration for the agenda item and the withdraw of the motion to discuss this later, I move that we move on to agenda item 6.

Alan-Michael Weatherford (Comparative Literature): I second Chris.

Chris L: We'll just move on if there are no further discussion. We're up to six. Like I said, I don't have any language so I'm going to keep this extremely brief. Basically I think we all have ideas. One of my major ideas is the process that I just described of how I think resolutions should move through the senate. That is one I'll be introducing. Austin and I have been talking about clarifying the roles of the UAD in the bylaws as well as in the job description, which makes sense because the position of the UAD is only in its second year of existence. What I would suggest is for our next exec meeting, for everyone to bring and possibly do some vetting so that we don't have a huge marathon and session from hell but proposed bylaw changes that makes sense based on your experiences this year. Another thing I'm going to propose the elimination of the committee coordinating board entirely. I think the senate should fulfill that function. Things like that.

Chris E: So one of my biggest things with the bylaws is that even though we all mean well, the people before us meant well. I'm really tied to this idea that we need to give the freedom to next year’s officers and do the job as they see it and what works best for them. Within that, we can make a large amount of suggestions but I think this is best addressed is at the beginning of next year, the officers go to the senate and say this is a list of bylaws we wish to suspend for this next year. That way we're not changing the constitution at all. For this year, it works best for us to not work in this frame. The senate can say yes or no and you can keep what works for you and it’s renewable every year so some people might not like them or might not. It's the decision of the officers and senators for next year to decide what is important to us. That would be great if we can help with that. Maybe that works in the transition stuff, but I really have a non-want to dictate to future people what works best for them because very numerous times, that good intent has made it harder for us.

Chris L: Agreed.

Alice: Since Alex and I are going to be the President and Vice President, we've actually been talking with Natalie for about a month and a half and Doug also briefly about our ideas next year. This is also an issue that has come up in the senate improvement working group that Alex and I are both on. There is a Catalyst webpage that we would like to talk about and show people the webpage with all the discussion areas. One of the discussion areas on that Catalyst page is what do we do about the bylaws. We wanted to open it up to all senators and I would encourage us as a committee to post all of your ideas in that discussion group so we have that all recorded.
The senate improvement working group had the idea of doing a bylaw overhaul, not a complete overhaul, but looking at things that make sense and pulling suggestions from all senators on the way it functions and what makes sense for everyone moving forward so that these bylaw changes would come from a group that spans the entire senate rather than the Executive committee, which I think would sit well with people. It would be helpful for us because the senate could vote on bylaw changes this year before the summer. Then we could make our plans for next year during the summer based on those decisions and recommendations made by this year’s senate. And I agree with you that it’s not great to be prescriptive about what people should do in future generations but because that was what’s done last year and the previous year, I think we can do a good job of ironing out the pieces that don’t make sense so it will be easier for future generations in regards to how they operate.

Chris L: Agreed and agreed. I think there’s a way to combine both of those approaches. Three of next year’s officers are sitting right here and you do have input already into this discussion. And I do agree that the senate should be involved. I had totally forgotten that there’s a whole category for bylaws in there. At the same time, I do agree with Chris that there are probably some bylaw changes that we can all agree on, that we can just do before the end of this year and there are some that can wait until next year. So there’s not a sense of urgency that we have to get every single change that we could ever think of by the end of the year so agreed, agreed. Also, one more thing. While the senate is an excellent point who should have input, there’s going to be a lot of things that the average senator is not going to occur on the effect of how we operated with the x part of the bylaws.

Evan: I definitely agree with Chris’s idea. I want to caution that the only hurdles to that is you get new senators coming in there so you lose the institutional memory so that might’ve been the idea to do it at the end before the institutional memory runs away. You want to gather their knowledge. It might just be my experience but the bylaws that end up getting changed are the ones that we run into conflicts. So at the beginning of the year with fresh senators who wouldn’t have run into those conflicts just yet so you may not know which bylaws to change. On that note, and Alice’s comment about the Exec committee inspired this, the groups that I have seen running into bylaws more often than the senate as a whole are committees. I wonder if we want to put the question to committees who frequently might run into these bylaw committee restrictions or hurdles than the senate as a whole. So maybe targeting them directly before the senate’s out, we can have input and something on the board.

Chris L: I think that’s great to make sure we gather the knowledge before the end of the year, but they don’t necessarily have to be enacted until the beginning of the year. You lose institutional memory but at the same time, you lost those people and you have the new group. So you see what I’m saying? It is important that we get the input before they leave. However, the changes don’t have to be codified until the beginning of next year. Some of them could be before the end of the year but not all of them, but you’re right. It is crucial that we do crowdsourcing.

Alex: I like Chris’s idea of trying to make sure that we’re not holding people back. I think it’s good way to frame it too when we are working on these that that we are not directing people on what
to do and how to do it, like micromanaging to death. So people come elected with these ideas but they can’t do anything since they’re trying to address bylaws that they are suppose to do. If that is something we want to look into, if the idea of suspending it each year, the current bylaws aren’t built for that. We should build them so they are brought it up to be not too specific and built it to so if we did need to suspend it, we could.

Chris L: Bylaws can always be suspended.

Alex: I know, but I mean setting it up like a dynamic bylaw with a base and more fluid parts if that’s something you want to do each year. In general though, our approach on bylaws needs to be very broad. We have to trust the people we elect.

Alice: Could I suggest, in the interest of time and memory of this conversation, that we move it to the Catalyst discussion? That is a thing we set up and the the senate improvement working group wants to work on, that is less work for us and it’s also a way to have this input directly translate without me and Alex paraphrase what your input is on the bylaw changes. So if you can go to the Catalyst page, make your comments and get that conversation started so the senate improvement working group can take this on as the bylaw editorial process. I move to move this discussion to Catalyst and continue with everything.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections?

Chris E: I would like to make a motion. To jump directly to agenda item 11a and then directly after revert back to item 7.

Chris L: Is there a second?

Alex: Can you speak to it?

Chris E: Yes, I just want to get my report in before I have to go.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Genesis: I’d love to go. I’m dying over here. Can you explain why you leave all the time?

Chris E: I have a class.

Genesis: I just wanted clarification.
Chris E: So Vice President has been pretty easy going now. We have Alex in and we've been meeting and we'll do some transition work. I met with Ana Marie very recently to go over how we can move forward with the inner joint higher education committee, which will hopefully happen next fall. I’m meeting with Margaret Shepard next week to figure out how best do that, especially with some new implications between Washington State and UW around the Medical School. There’s some awesome stuff there so whether we do it on our own or continue with the vision of having it all be graduate student specific will be a part of that. I also met with the joint federal and state committees and there was some intent that we will probably end up bringing Senator Barbara Bailey with the Legislator of the Year award for her work on Veterans and Dream Act this year.

Chris L: Alright, then we'll go move on to item 7. If anyone doesn’t have the link to the Catalyst site, just ask Alice, Alex or me. I will need to go put all your ideas and if possible, reference the actual part of the bylaw that you want changed, but that’s where you should go.

Alex: We’re hoping to engage more of the senate.

Alice: Elisa, we also talked about it at the meeting, the improvement working group meeting, of trying to make it more prominent in the email that you send out either tonight or next week to the meeting to just like, “Hey everyone, do you want to improve senate? Do you want to make GPSS better? Please go to the Catalyst website.” Make it pretty apparent rather than just a line because frankly people don’t see it. So just to highlight that’s where that conversation can happen.

Elisa: Yeah, just send me the blurb that you want to be said. I'll put it in color and all that.

Alice: I would just say that. Want to make GPSS the best it could be? Go to this website.

Elisa: Anything you want added to the senate email, you should send to me. It’s hard to keep track when people just say them so email it to me and it'll go out.

Chris L: Okay, item 7. ASUW Divest Israel resolution. This was dropped on April 15th as they say about legislation. So basically this is for information. I’ll tell you what I intend to do so far is to invite the pro and con sides if they want to make a presentation to senate. At the very least, I believe the senate needs to inform our representatives in ASUW on how to vote on this because it will come to a vote on the ASUW senate. We have two representatives on the ASUW senate and I would be uncomfortable either allowing them to vote on their own or the executive committee to dictate how they vote. I would be uncomfortable telling them how to vote on my own. So I think the senate should instruct them at the very least. If any of the students who are active around this, either for or against, want to introduce a resolution to GPSS, I will make it clear that they may not do that without a senator to sponsor the bill. They can’t just drop their own resolution with us. They would have to solicit support or a sponsor to introduce to the senate. So those are the steps I’m going to take in the near future. I just want everyone to have
a copy of this. I think it’s well written and well thought. Regardless of whether you agree with the statements that it’s making. As Michael Kutz said to me about it, it show a pretty sophisticated understanding of how the consolidated endowment fund actually works and what the UW would actually have to do to divest so it’s fairly sophisticated in that regard.

Alice: Point of information, what does Caterpillar Ink do for us? What’s our endowment with them?

Chris L: They are a company that makes earth moving equipment.

Evan: It’s probably because of all the construction going on.

Rene Singleton (SAO Advisor): Just as an advisory, if you have a discussion for the meeting, you might want to anticipate lots of people and a longer time of discussion that you may or may not be prepared for.

Austin: 16 hours was UCLA.

Chris L: I have not invited them yet so I don’t think this will come up next week. I have not extended the invitation to them so unless they can do it right now..

Austin: We anticipate the piece coming up in ASUW either this week or next week.

Alice: So if it’s this week, that’s before we’re able to discuss anything.

Austin: It hasn’t yet gone through first readings and it likely will not. It’s a crapshoot as to where it will go. I’m not sure if it will necessarily go to second readings.

Chris E: So I can’t speak specifically at this moment whether he would support or be against working on this resolution but there is a second year senator from the Evans School named Adam Yahyaoui that is involved with the palestinian groups on campus. If people have questions or I would want to cite him as a very good resource if there was resolution or however that might work out. I’ll have no problem sending him an email and following up on that.

Chris L: We can have an internal discussion without the sponsor or opponents. It is the kind of thing where we’re not going to become foreign policy experts overnight. My feeling is that since this will very possibly come up for a vote in ASUW, GPSS needs to instruct its representatives, if not have an opinion, at least instruct its representatives on how to vote or to abstain on this. We can talk about how to facilitate that discussion when we do the agenda, but thank you for pointing that out. I know Adam. He’s a great guy. I’m sure he’ll be helpful in that regard. Is there any further discussion on this?

Austin: If it becomes known that we’re talking about this, then the information from both sides will start flying very fast at us so just a word of caution.
Chris L: In senate or as an Executive committee?

Austin: I think Executive committee.

Chris L: Okay. Are you saying that you think we’ll be lobbied to render an opinion?

Austin: Yes.

Chris L: Seeing as we have none as a committee, unless someone makes a motion to create one, if that happens I would encourage everyone to simply tell them that we as individual members of the Executive committee are not in a position to express the opinion of GPSS, the opinion of the Executive committee. You’re free to express your own opinion obviously but it would be appreciated if it is clear that this is your opinion and not reflective of any larger body in which you are a part, until such an opinion is formed. Any further discussions?

Evan: I was going to ask, you said there was a for and an against side so I was going to ask what the against side was but we’ll be hearing of it.

Chris L: Kevin Shotwell, who is our very methodical representative along with Austin to the ASUW senate, has given me contact information. I just haven’t followed up with them yet. Okay, so the next item is the transition planning brainstorm, which at the time when I put that in the agenda, I didn’t know what I meant by it, but what I mean by it is that I would like to take a few minutes to talk about the things we would like to make sure that we do before the end of the year so the new officers feel sufficiently prepared. On his way out, Chris left me a note. At the end of last year, a faculty at the Evans School had a connection with someone named Bianca who does executive leadership training and she did a session with some of the incoming and outgoing officers.

Alice: Was it Dorothy Bullitt?

Chris L: Dorothy Bullitt is the faculty member.

Alice: That’s who Kiana recommended.

Chris L: Last year, when Adam contacted her, Professor Bullitt referred him to Bianca. This year, maybe she would be willing to do it on her own or pass it to Bianca. Anyway, that was not free. It wasn’t hugely expensive but I think we have money in the budget so that’s not a problem. Is there anything else that people would like to see especially since we have three of the incoming officers sitting here, is there anything that people would definitely like to see happen in addition to meeting with your current counterparts and doing all that kind of stuff, but things that we can do collectively as the group of incoming and outgoing officers.
Alex: Could you explain more of what you did last year?

Chris L: So last year, besides this session with Bianca…

Alex: It was outgoing and incoming?

Chris L: Yes. To be honest, it was very ad hoc. I’m sure Genesis and Elisa can attest to that. We had one officer who was graduating from Law School and planning a wedding and we had another officer who was getting ready to go to Africa for a year and also graduating from Nursing School.

Genesis: I think if you guys prepare what you want to know for the transition and have that ready and talk to your outgoing person will be helpful instead of waiting for information to fly at you. That would be helpful. Otherwise, what do I know of what to talk with you? When I started talking with Doug, I knew I needed to know because I didn’t have a good transition period last year so if you already know what you want to know for the positions.

Elisa: I think, like Genesis is saying, it should be between the two officers and less as a body but I don’t know, maybe one meeting with everyone there would be great but most of what needs to happen should happen between the two officers. Every outgoing officer will have some kind of report hopefully or specific things that they want to impart that they didn’t know going into it that they wished they did.

Chris L: At our next meeting, we’ll elect two new executive senators.

Alex: When?

Chris L: Before the end of the year, I guess.

Evan: Sooner will be better.

Alex: We’re not done until June 16th.

Chris L: Right, so we’ll have executive senators elect I guess. But I would personally highlight the importance of the executive committee as a body over the summer and to the extent that, Alan-Michael and Evan, the two of you can be present and support the officers is really important and whoever comes in.

Alex: My understanding is I thought we do the executive senator elections in the fall. Would an incoming senator be eligible to run in the spring if their term starts in the fall? Like, someone who will be elected to be senator next school year.

Alice: I was elected in the spring.
Alex: Even though you weren’t a senator at the time or you were?

Alice: I was a senator.

Alex: I’m just wondering because if someone was going to be a senator.

Chris L: I mean they could’ve been elected the day before.

Genesis: He’s saying that for the Law student, he won’t be a senator until the fall.

Alex: But our election is next week.

Alice: I appreciate your point that they wouldn’t have an opportunity to run for exec but I also don’t think it’s appropriate to have brand new green senators on exec because the point of it is to be a vetted person to help advise the officers and I don’t know if I want someone who didn’t know what was going on.

Evan: Also, we need them over the summer. Last year, we went through three exec senators before we landed on this current group so we have to not do that. There was a lot of effort and ramp up time of getting people involved so it might behoove us to spend this week getting a good solid couple people rather than running from the floor to get good solid executive senator. I talked to Dawn who might be available. Maybe we can consider others who ran for executive senator if everyone is comfortable for that.

Alice: Committee chairs.

Chris L: I would highlight the importance of summer as a time for Executive committee to meet and work on stuff. So for example, if it’s the bylaws that get talked about but not voted on, you would think through that stuff. It’s really the time you have to think about how the year would go. Once the year starts, you’re in it. When I became an executive senator, I found summer to be valuable in that regard.

Rene: FYI, before I forget, you really do need this current exec to set up all the meetings for summer and for fall and vote on it now so it can be set in OPMA so if you guys connect with each other on when you want to have it, otherwise it’s going to be a whole year of special meetings so if you guys do that between now and your next meeting, that would be terrific. Genesis: I was going to bring that up to because the rooms. What happened to us last fall was that last exec decided not to schedule all the meetings ahead of time so that’s why we lost HUB 145 in the fall quarter. That’s why we were all over the place.

Rene: That’s why I urge you to do exec and senate early.
Alex: So we need to do that in the next meeting.

Genesis: Yes.

Alex: How often do we usually meet in the summer?

Chris L: The minimum, as required by the bylaws, is once a month. I would recommend twice a month if possible or twice in June maybe once in July. That’s what makes scheduling tricky. Or you schedule your meetings and if people are out of town, they’re out of town.

Alex: We’d be okay with that than usual.

Chris L: Yes. My recommendation is twice but the minimum is once a month.

Evan: I would say that ideally those can be informational meeting too. If you don’t reach quorum, it’s okay. You can just discuss your plans.

Alice: I was wondering about the office staff. When does their term end and begin?

Genesis: That’s the last day of school. It’s up to the next round of officers. So for this budget, we have for the summer Office Manager, Archivist and Executive Assistant for the President.

Alice: So three positions.

Genesis: Yes, so it’s up to you guys to decide when they come on board.

Alice: Should we start thinking about that now?

Genesis: Yes, if you want.

Alice: I hear what you’re saying of having a meeting where everyone’s sitting there and the Treasurer is talking to the Treasurer elect about specifics and everyone’s just sitting and waiting there and that’s probably not useful so I think 1:1 are cool. Actually, Chris and I have Monday lunches set up now for the rest of the quarter. I also think there’s value in having the entire team, not just the officers currently but everyone who works in the GPSS office in the same room with the incoming officers and if we have new exec people at that point. If we had everyone together to talk about not only what worked well but what didn’t work well and having really candid conversations about what you guys think what would’ve worked better for you and what you would like to see moving forward just so we can get a group perspective and get a feel for things.

Elisa: Even if that wasn’t to happen, each of the staff should be submitting a report with those things on it, like what worked and what didn’t and what I wish I knew by the end of their term. Whether or not that gets done, that’s not under anyone’s purview to enforce that.
Chris L: Unless they re-apply, then you can dock them. I think a staff and officer meeting would be valuable time well spent.

Alice: I would also love to get to know what everyone in the office does. Each officer isn’t reporting specific responsibilities of the job. If everyone could voice in a group setting what was frustrating about the job, what turned out to be really important versus what’s in the bylaws, that kind of discussion would be helpful so that everybody who’s coming in understands all the other moving parts and what the nuances of those situations are because with those 1:1, you’re going to have a lot of this and that and that awareness stays siloed and I think something that we talked about is the emphasis on community and making it like an office feeling. There’s the front desk and you walk in and people are there and you talk to them and know what’s going on. I know everyone’s schedules are crazy and I know that’s why this year you have different hours but I feel like as much as possible I’d like to see that more office feeling stronger than it might’ve been in the past years.

Evan: I think that’s a good idea. I could be totally wrong here but if we’re not discussing GPSS specific, like stuff relevant to senate as a whole, you might want to make it into a special meeting or not even a GPSS meeting but a gathering at a bar and get a whole group around food. If it’s not staff relevant, it might be easier to do it that way. I could be wrong.

Rene: I’m smirking and laughing because I know you guys are at different plans. All the outgoing people are going to be sputtering around trying to get things done and the incoming people are more enthusiastic. Outgoing people have had the relationship with the staff and the incoming people have no staff. You can do your best to try and get together but don’t get disappointed if something does not happen. It’s called transition for a reason. I can already hear the incoming/outgoing and where everyone needs to be so I’m just bringing this up so everyone knows that’s what the deal with this is. If you don’t get a part of it, don’t feel bad. You have lots of records and documents. Do the best you can and be patient with each other while you go through the process and you’ll be fine.

Genesis: As for my staff, there will be reports. There’s been reports for every single quarter on what hasn’t worked and what did and no matter what happens during the transition, there is written documentation. And it’s helpful to other officers.

Alice: Chris, and as far as bringing someone in from the Evans School, Kiana gave me Professor’s Bullitt’s information specifically so I would want to meet with her personally to ask, “Tell me how to be a leader.” Maybe I can ask her if she’d be willing to work with the incoming officers and exec. I don’t think we need a professional to come in with the transition meeting. We can run that on our own. In the interest of your guy’s time, I don’t think we need to bore you with someone telling you how to run an executive committee if you’re not going to be on it next year. Is that fair?
Chris L: Yes. Last year was less about that and more about management styles. It was kind of nuts and bolts of what's your leadership style.

Alice: Do you want to do that with outgoing people as well? Do you agree that it makes sense to do it with incoming?

Chris L: It might make sense to do it with the incoming. The thought behind outgoing as well was to get the perspective of what worked and what didn’t.

Alex: Maybe it didn’t work because of your work style.

Evan: Genesis said it did not help.

Genesis: Seriously, it was useless.

Chris L: Okay, any further discussion on that?

Alice: Who is in charge of planning that? Is that me or you? Want to talk about it on Monday?

Chris L: Yes. We’ll talk on Monday. Any other discussion? We’ll move on to planning the senate meeting.

Elisa: Jess Snow, the senator from the UW Department of Rehab Medicine and Occupational Therapy, will be doing the spotlight.

Chris L: Wait, it says Department of Rehab Medicine.

Elisa: Yes, that’s correct.

Chris L: I thought you said Occupational Therapy.

Elisa: It’s Rehab Medicine and the Occupational Therapy program. She wants to focus on the occupational therapy portion.

Chris L: Okay. We need to discuss the PeaceHealth.
Alex: The senate improvement working group will have Alice give a presentation on the Catalyst survey.

Chris L: Okay, before or after the spotlight?

Alice: After. I was going to say after the PeaceHealth resolution because if we’re talking about doing stuff online, it’s a nice dovetail to the Catalyst working group.
Chris L: This is true. Although by that time it would already have been dealt with online.

Alice: Oh right. Okay, cool.

Chris L: How much time?

Alice: 5 minutes.

Evan: How are we going to have our senators vote on the divestment thing?

Chris L: Do we want to have a discussion amongst ourselves? I can invite them but I don't know if they can come or not.

Genesis: I think we should gauge the senate's interest on this issue and see if they want to hear more you can bring both sides. What's the timeline on that? If we invite them to the next meeting, that would be the 21st.

Austin: The first reading is on Tuesday.

Evan: I guess the question is should we talk about what we have here or invite both points of discussion?

Chris L: I can invite them. There's no guarantee that they will come.

Evan: Do we want to do that given Rene's warning?

Rene: I'm just saying that respective to what side you're on, people are going to know about this. There's a lot of student supporters on both sides. If you want to support your friends that are coming to talk, you're going to come. You'll have one or two extra bodies.

Evan: Do you think that will happen irrespective of inviting people to speak?

Rene: It could. It may or may not.

Alex: Is there a precedent to bring at a senate meeting to vote on a directive for our ASUW rep to vote a certain way?

Chris L: No, not that I can think of. Actually, this is the most engaged we've been in ASUW.

Genesis: Is there a way that we can tell both sides that it's an informational thing. It's not debating each other. It's just to give us information.

Chris L: Yes, and I'll limit them to one person per side.
Genesis: And maybe a specific amount of time they can speak.

Evan: Very strict adherence to parli pro.

Alex: Wouldn't we be voting to give them direction?

Evan: Yes, it's an action.

Genesis: We can ask them to leave right?

Rene: Are you having an informational session where you're just inviting the public to a forum to hear both sides?

Evan: Yup. We need that but we also need to decide as a senate on how to inform our ASUW representatives.

Rene: I would have you as exec give that. I guess you would have to do that before the meeting. If you don't know yet, just tell them to not take action until that.

Alice: Just a suggested format, give the author or the person presenting the resolution two minutes to explain what the resolution is and give someone from the opposition two minutes to respond and introduce it that it came up in ASUW and we're going to have to inform our representatives. We're going to have a presentation and a quick rebuttal from the senator to those individuals, limit their responses again and vote on it and make sure they know after their question and answer period is over, like when we're deliberating, please don't speak after their turn.

Chris L: The thing thing about Strugess' rule on parliamentary procedure is that, I believe unlike Robert's rules where every person is restricted to two minutes speaking and you can only speak a maximum of two times on a topic. I don't know if Sturgess has similar rules so we cannot prescribe such a format unless the senate moves to do so.

Evan: If we make one item for presentation of the resolution at 5 minutes, one item of the presentation of the opposition at 5 minutes and then one item for questions at x minutes. All those be discussion or information. Then a final item that is action by the GPSS so it's self limited so that there is the possibility of extending them but the presentors themselves cannot extend time.

Chris L: That is legitimate.

Alice: Didn't we limit the time responses of ASUW in the ASUW forum at our last meeting?
Evan: o one questioned it. I think if they wanted to question it, they could've. No one was going to question it at that point because it was a friendly debate.

Alice: Let’s just keep that noted that we’re not allowed to do that because I had no idea.

Alex: Has there been discussion within the senators in ASUW with our representatives?

Chris L: Yes, I’ve been in touch with Kevin.

Alex: Has there been other pieces of legislations that we've done this?

Chris L: Nope, this is the only one.

Alex: Do we give them much directions at the beginning of the year?

Chris L: The reason we are now much more in touch is because an incident came up that our representative introduced a piece of legislation that caused a lot of controversy and we did not feel that it was reflective of the values of GPSS. That is in my memory the first time that any of the leadership was in touch with them. First of all, we haven’t filled that spot consistently over the past several years. Second, that to my knowledge is the first the that the leadership has interacted with that person to any degree. We always had the Secretary as a representative to the Board of Directors but that’s separate. This all came up because of that incident.

Evan: How much time should we have there?

Chris L: 10 minutes.

Alex: Do we have an action item?

Chris L: Yes.

Evan: It could be directive to GPSS’s ASUW representative.

Alice: Does our representative not attend senate meetings?

Evan: Technically it won’t matter since we’ll direct them but yes, they should.

Alice: No, I asked if he does.

Chris L: He does not regularly.

Alex: Is he a senator?
Chris L: No.

Genesis: I think it would be beneficial for him to hear the conversation.

Alice: Is that not required of our representative at ASUW?

Alex: I think the Secretary is more the official representative to ASUW. Then we have two ASUW senate positions.

Chris L: Any graduate and professional student can be an ASUW senator but we, as GPSS, may appoint two representatives in ASUW senate.

Alice: So shouldn't that be a senator?

Chris L: No, it's like any other external university committee appointment. They don't have to be a senator.

Maxine: They would be representing the opinion of GPSS whereas any GPSS member or graduate student who wanted to be a senator could vote.

Alice: I see the value of having GPSS appointed person on faculty and university but specifically for the ASUW since all other graduate students have the right to be senators, shouldn't that make sense that our representative from GPSS at least attend meetings or be a GPSS senator? Otherwise it can be any random graduate student.

Chris L: At the moment, it's not a requirement.

Rene: Historically what you're talking about was the case but if you look at how hard it is to get these time commitments to be appointments as grad students, that's why that was annulled so that it could be someone that had the interest to do those. Senators are tasked to go back to their constituents and that's all they can do so that was why it was opened up a while ago. If you go back into your bylaws and see when the switch was made, some of those appointments, you can have grad students representing because of the time commitment. People can't just do that. ASUW senate meetings are 2-3 hours and they're weekly and then GPSS meetings are 2 hours. That's a lot of time and that's why it's opened up.

Alan-Michael: I used to sit at ASUW meetings and I couldn't.

Alex: Full disclosure, I was the GPSS senator for ASUW.

Evan: Chris, do you want to take GPSS at the front and just say for GPSS senators?
Chris L: That we also cannot do since anyone who comes as a guest can speak. Is there a version of executive session of the whole senate? So we cannot.

Evan: Can we put it in the title without enforcing it?

Chris L: I smell what you're stepping in.

Rene: There's a discretion both of Sturgess and in Roberts to use a discretion of those things. If you're in a meeting where you know you will have more people, the chair has a plan and you have preferences. First senators, then community members and you guys can help each other make a list and raise your hand and you keep a tally list. Another approach is to have lines, where people can line up and they can speak for awhile. It's a great way of soothing the crowd. So undergrads, their senate uses some of these methods for some of the stuff if it's a hot topic or not. The last time you guys had a hot topic was the graduate union activities and you had 200 people in the room so you can give Chris suggestions and he's going to use discretions and you guys will have to support him with that.

Evan: Chris, can we have the line thing?

Chris L: Yes, it's totally legitimate. Adam would use a speaker's list.

Rene: But you don't know who's in the room.

Chris L: I do, as the chair of the meeting, I can prevent people from just shouting out. I can maintain order. I can't not recognize people who asked to be recognized but I can do crowd control.

Rene: If the crowd is a little anxious, exec officers are expected to help out to the soothing of the group. You can take a recess. You can say, “We're going to a recess and step outside. The plans is ABCD.” and go back in. There's a lot of flexibility. There can be two passionate people that are there and rest are quiet. You don't know. It's hard to tell. You'll be fine.

Genesis: It's better if we plan for the worst.

Chris L: I was little disappointed when we brought extra snacks before the ASUW forum and a lot of people walked out.

Alex: It kept some people.

Chris L: It wasn’t the exodus we had that one time. Is there anything else to add to the agenda?

Elisa: Adjourn.
Alex: I don't know if you want to do it in your report or in announcements but getting people thinking about Executive committee?

Evan: I might just make an announcement.

Chris L: I have a time for it.

Alice: This is awkward but is there going to be acknowledgement of the election results? Do you want to do that with the executive senator announcement?

Evan: We can do a Previously on GPSS.

Chris L: Anything else to add?

Alice: So are we not doing that? The acknowledgement of election results. Just a slide for people who had to leave the meeting.

Evan: That’s important. One slide with a quick rundown of the elections results. That’s it.

Alex: A lot of people left after they voted.

Chris L: Anything else?

Alex: Do you have the time?

Chris L: 83 minutes. Then I will entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Genesis: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Okay, executive senator reports.

Evan: None.

Alice: I was going to recap of what we talked about in the senate improvement working group. I don’t need to say much because it’s on the Catalyst webpage but there’s some good discussions going on. One thing is about the wiki. If you guys haven't been to it, it looks nice, I think. It’s the gpss website slash wiki and we talked extensively on why people weren’t given access in the past and ways to get around it. We think, as the senate improvement working group, the wiki can circumvent the inflexibility of the GPSS website. There could be really interactive links to and from and that could be a way to really keep things going with archive and doing stuff on it. That was one thing that was hotly contested on last year and I want people, like exec to be supportive of this and participate in the Catalyst disucssions.
Evan: I was curious, who is your institutional knowledge?

Alice: Russ and I also emailed Trong. He has the backend password in a lockbox and he said I’m going to hold on to that unless someone needs it. I have his personal email address so I can be in touch with him.

Chris L: The website is meant to be fairly static. We don’t update it as much as we need to but the wiki is meant to be updated on a minute to minute basis and a website is not so it’s a good complement.

Alex: That’s the discussion we had on seeing as a complement to the website.

Alice: We really talked it to death. We came up with the idea that you guys had discussed previously but we confirmed to have an email address for each committee.

Genesis: We already have those. F&B has one.

Alice: We do? Does S&P have one?

Rene: Yup.

Genesis: It just sits there.

Rene: I can give you guys the stuff.

Alice: So using those, that there could be a block to the wiki. One concern that came up and one that I think everyone should be well versed in this that anyone can come and deface it. They thought through this process very thoroughly and they were initially planning it and it got derailed in the full senate meeting. There are two different places that people can be blocked access. The first is the UW net ID access. It’s only routed through UW ID and it’s restricted to the list of senators which gets automatically updated every year. So if you’re a senator, you use your UW net ID to get added to wiki to view it and once you’re there you can create your own username to make edit. Any senator can do it and it’s tracked by individuals so you can revert to a previous version and there’s someone who approves the changes from senate, exec or an officer and for people who are not senators, they use the committee email login to get past the initial first pass and they create a username to access the wiki as well. So that is what we discussed with all the information from Russ and if we lay it out plainly like that, we won’t run into the same problem we did last year where people were confused.

Evan: So there is no way for non senators to access the wiki?
Alice: So that was something I was curious about but we didn’t get to it because we belabored it. I think it should be open to the public because it would fulfil a lot of our public meeting requirements, like having our minutes up there. The only thing is that there would be working documents that we would want the public to see. Frankly, I don’t think that many people are too interested in looking around some committee’s working document. I would personally like to see it open to the public and the user login will be the pass at which you would control it.

Evan: There may be a way to implement every step we talked about after the edit click and there’s also a way to implement that on certain pages that are still under discussion internally, but Russ will probably say yes or no.

Alex: But you need a net ID to see it.

Alice: No that wasn’t it. We can work it out. We can move it to the Catalyst. I just wanted everyone to know that this is a thing for certain and all other discussion things. Please contribute.

Chris L: Who is Russ, by the way?

Alex: He is on the state leg committee and he’s a senator. He came and volunteered, after we did the first presentation to the senate and he brought the wiki to us and is its main advocate. Then the only other thing is that we want the discussion to be on the Catalyst site before we make any decisions so please go the Catalyst site.

Chris L: Especially with bylaw suggestions. Any other executive senator report?

Alan-Michael: So I have two things I’m working on. One is the men’s sexual health clinic at Hall Heath and I also, I took up the performance evaluations to see what we can do to make sure it’s not gender biased or discriminatory whatsoever. As far as men’s sexual health, I found out very quickly that I’m entering into a field that I have no knowledge about so I get easily lost in the jargon. It would be very nice if I can get someone to help along this side. I can only use the language so much. So I met with the Director of Hall Health. His name is William Neighbor. He actually mentioned joining both your concerns and mine together at the next meeting that he has coming up. He’s going to set a date and shoot us an email but he was wondering if we would like an agenda item there so we can talk to the committee. He said they were very interested and that men’s sexual health is something that is cropping up as of late so I’m right on target with bringing it on. He just said we would have to account for funding and what to actually consider under men’s sexual health. It’s quite a linguistic game so that’s why I’m asking for something to work with and figure out what are these concerns and what are they called. He said there’s a big difference between a physical exam and preventative care examination. So we just have to get the people to get it done. Any recommendations that you may have for people to get in touch with. I was thinking of reaching out to the people in senate that work in Public Health.
Chris L: Do you mean like medical terminology?

Alan-Michael: Yes.

Alice: in the School of Public Health, there’s Health Services and Health Administration. Those people might know. Actually, Beth Vodicka is a PhD in that program. I can forward you her email address and you can ask her. Health Services would probably be good.

Alan-Michael: William Neighbor talked about crafting up a survey to be sent out to UW's graduate community to see needs and perhaps draft up some things that can be put under men's sexual health. So for the other thing, I got in touch with Natalie, who works in the office and she gave me a lot of information on the job descriptions and however that staff salary increases haven’t been part of the conversation because we are hourly and our budget is established at the beginning of the year including how much is allocated to pay for each position. So given that, that means we only have to account for, if a salary increase is made after the time, I think this is quite easy to get done. I was wondering who would be the people to review this. I was thinking of contacting some people like Jennifer in the Q Center to review over some documents because i know she’s done work in policy.

Chris L: That’s awesome. Thank you for taking on these two initiatives.

Alan-Michael: That’s all I have.

Chris L: That’s pretty good. Any other executive senator report?

Alice: Since we didn't finish the thing about SPHERE, I haven't heard back from Beth. Could i request that we, in the event they have to send the letter before the next meeting and Beth asks me that GPSS signs on, that we vote now to say yes? That we hold off on actively informing her until the full senate meeting and bring it to the vote then if she hasn’t asked for final confirmation. Is that a fair compromise?

Evan: I lost you.

Alice: Say tomorrow, she says we have to do it now, can I have exec's permission to say yes considering the very positive discussion and lack of opposition we had to the idea of a resolution at the last meeting. In the event that I don’t hear from her, I hold off on saying anything to her about it and we bring it up as discussed at the next meeting for the resolution to vote on it and in support of the letter.

Evan: I’m still hesitant in doing it without the exclusive approval but I’m still in favor of if we can sign on as GPSS Exec committee, that way we have something to put there rather than nothing at all.
Elisa: I agree.

Alice: Okay.

Chris L: Do you want to make a motion?

Alice: It doesn’t matter who sees the thing but a committee versus the entire graduate and professional school is a pretty big qualitative difference and I guess I don’t understand the opposition since we have the authority to do.

Alan-Michael: I understand what you mean but you’re going to risk the senate getting angry that we done something on their behalf and that might come to bite you in the ass. So I would be wary of that.

Elisa: I think the topic is sensitive too. If it wasn’t so contentious or had the possibility of being contentious, it would be within our purview and I would be more comfortable voting on behalf of the senate.

Alice: Is it contentious though?

Alan-Michael: With the religious dimension, I would say yes.

Alex: What I would feel comfortable with is if you do get an email back saying we have until Friday or something, since we talked about it so much here, you can send an email and we voted over email. We’ve talked about it and if we need to, at the very last minute, get our name on it, I would be okay doing an email vote. It does go against letting the senate vote on it but at that point we'll know whether or not to have our name on the materials that has to be submitted.

Evan: Is that asking exec to vote on behalf of the senate?

Chris L: This is what I'll say. While I fully support their position, it’s incumbent on them to tell us what they need from us and not give us a vaguely defined timeline. In that respect, I don't feel like it's our responsibility to tie ourselves in knots to meet their needs when they haven't articulated those needs to us. That would be my main objection. We're not even sure what we're being asked to do. We don't know when we're asked to do it by. If they said it last week, we need this by…. then I would be much more in favor of voting on behalf of the senate but they haven't and it's their responsibility to do that.

Rene: Didn’t you ask senators to talk about this with their constituents? If you sort of tell everyone to do that and they do that and come back, that;s very harmful. Remember you guys have power against the whole senate.
Alan-Michael: I think it’s wise to wait because of that bit of information and because they haven’t given us clear expectations yet. If they try to sign us on now, we’ll say we had not heard back from the whole senate.

Evan: If you’d like to do the same proposal but with just the executive committee, I would be okay with that just to have something but if you’d rather wait as a whole that is cool too.

Rene: If you have that piece of legislation ready for the next meeting and if you need to, bring it to the floor and do it right.

Chris L: We’re doing that.

Alice: It’s just that they have a separate letter to sign on as a supporting organization, which is separate from the resolution that we’re also writing in addition. The reason that I brought it up is to have us vote as an organization is we talked about it in support of it and saying additionally what their concerns were and what their specific departments that was more or less effective and what they were doing about it, which is why I thought there was overwhelming support already. But all of these points are taken. Honestly Evan, I think that if it does say GPSS Exec committee, that’s still an endorsement from GPSS and if were going to take that action we may as well make that decision to vote for GPSS. I think it’s just a technicality that gets around speaking on their behalf but if it’s an endorsement, might as well make it GPSS. If they haven’t given us a solid deadline, we don’t have to put ourselves in a bind. The only reason I brought it up is because I don’t think it’s contentious. I don’t think anyone in the senate would actively say that we should merge with a catholic institution and have the services currently given by UW Medical Center be restricted by ethical or religious directive. I personally don’t think that so that’s the only reason I felt comfortable voting on it.

Alan-Michael: I think with me, the formality of having it voted upon, then no senator can go back and say you did this without asking us.

Genesis : We have the public record as well.

Alan-Michael: Yes, as long as you have that closure, then I think it’s fine but without that, it’s a recipe for future trouble.

Elisa: The endorsement could be easily taken down or reversed.
Alex: And make GPSS look bad.

Chris L: Any further discussion on that? Moving on to officer report, we already heard from the Vice President so Genesis.
Genesis: I haven’t heard back from SAF on my presentation in my fifth revision. Our social is on Friday and our Science & Policy Summit is in two weeks and we have three panels for that. That’s all that I have.

Elisa: Archival books are going to the printer. GPA of the Year Award, things are flowing in now so it’s awesome. Is there any particular way you would like those to be presented to you since the exec committee votes on it.

Genesis: Can we just get the top three that gets the most nominations?

Elisa: We’ve been getting a lot for a few but the statements for it are not robust. I think that quality of statement should be considered a factor.

Genesis: How many are we talking about?

Elisa: At this point, 10-15.

Genesis: I’m going to object that. I’m not going to sit here and read 15 nominations. I would rather we look at people who get more than 1 or 2 and look at the top three or five.

Elisa: I’ll make it a summary. I’ll go through them and present them to you in a way that makes it more manageable.

Alice: Chris did it for the Science & Policy committee. He had a decision to make about the people to send to AAAS. Instead of 15, he said these are my top three. They’re my favorite and I think their statements are the best. I trust you to make that determination.

Elisa: There may be someone from my program which means it needs to be out of my hands.

Genesis: Then you would need to give it to another officer or exec.

Chris L: You can have an A list or a B list.

Genesis: But just so we have a list and not have a us read all the nominations or applications.

Elisa: Sure. Diversity forums are all happening this month. Allyship is this Monday, How to Start a Diversity Committee is the 15th and Veterans is the 29th. That will go out to the senators this evening.

Chris L: And an all grad student email. Okay, AS UW left I guess.

Genesis: Who is she?
Rene: She’s the F&B Director and a sub for Evelina.

Genesis: ASUW had a report last week but Evelina sent it to my Facebook so I didn’t see it. So she did have something but it’s too late to read since it’s irrelevant.

Chris L: Sounds good. So peer mentoring project, getting that off the ground has been my major undertaking these past few days. We still have some kinks to work out and we’re admittedly pushing out fast to meet the deadline for the Graduate School since we don’t get another crack at this blog post for two weeks and we like to get it out sooner rather than later. I think we’ll be ready and we’ve got a great steering committee and a great working group. Honestly, not all that much to report other than that just basically I’m really grateful to the senate improvement working group’s work and really carrying forward the work from the last senate meeting of the winter quarter which was potentially one of the most important things we did this year. It really will help bring us go forward. I hope when we come forward with bylaws suggestions that we keep in mind that side of collecting the knowledge and information from people that’s been around to make sure that the people actually going to be living in it can implement it, especially for the budget, which necessarily has to get voted on the year before, you would inherit it and say I would never had done that and like this thing of the committee coordinating board. So keeping a balance of that. With internal committees in general, Alan-Michael you made me think of this but totally awesome work that you’re doing for men’s sexual health and our hiring processes. In a perfect world, committees would take that on. I’m hoping that and I’ll talk with Alice on this that changing the way we talk about things in the senate and by changing the process we do resolutions, that committees will have much more reason to exist on their own without having them to generate all of their own content so they can be given things to do from the senate like resolutions to look over and do these kinds of things. I think it'll be hard since as graduate students, the commitment varies wildly depending on what we're passionate about. We don’t meet weekly like the ASUW senate does so we don’t have the same consistency where they see the same things over and over again. They can't read something one week and already having it read through the committee unless you want to start meeting every week. My point is that I think we’re really in a good place to take the changes that the restructuring committee recommended but they didn't really think all the way through the implementation. We’re in the place where the implementation is starting to make sense and it’s largely because of the senate improvement working group. That’s all I have. I dont think I have any other news or announcements other than I made 6q in karate on Sunday.

Genesis: So the spring social is this Friday. If you can volunteer and you already haven’t signed up, we would really appreciate it. It will be just as big as the fall social and we’ll need as just as much help as possible. Chris and I are going to be bartending to control the flow of alcohol. What we saw in the Valentine’s Day Mixer was ripping up their tickets and making it look like they had a whole ticket in their hand and it got ridiculous. Some people I had asked to leave. This is something for the incoming officers to think about and how you’re going to control this. If you guys haven’t signed up to volunteer, please help us out so we’re not here until 11.
Chris L: Any other announcements? Then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Evan: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?