GPSS Executive Committee Meeting
Wednesday, October 10, 2012 at 5:30pm HUB 303

Attendees
Adam Sherman, GPSS President
Melanie Mayock, GPSS VP
Chris Lizotte, Executive Senator
Kristen Hosey, GPSS Secretary
Amber Trout, Executive Senator
Rene Singleton, SAO Advisor
Trond Nilsen, Executive Senator
Megan Gambs, Executive Senator
Vera Giampietro, GPSS Treasurer
Laurel Rice, The Daily Reporter
Reid Haefer, Communications Specialist

1) Call To Order

Adam: calls at 5:39pm.

2) Approval of agenda

Adam: Any recommendations for amendments?
Chris: Moves to approve agenda.
Kristen: Seconds.

3) Approval Minutes From 9/26/12

Adam: Any motion to approve minutes?
Melanie: Moves.
Amber: Seconds.

4) Summer Recommendations

Melanie: The purpose of this is to make our organization better and the summer is important time. This is when new officers can get up to speed. I want to bring this up now. Budget items or election packet items. Not necessarily asking for action tonight but input tonight could be used. I wanted a discussion about few things: 1) Upping the hours for officer over the summer. Attracting officers through internships or how to get larger commitment. Need people to know that a certain amount of time during the summer is required 2) Just a recommendation but in general, it is best to not take a vacation after Labor Day from my experience.
Adam: You mean you would recommend putting it in election packet?
Melanie 3) Most of staff hires a year ago happened after class started. It takes time to hire people so doing it when class starts is difficult. There should be some encouragement for careful planning. Starting in the summer? ASUW hires in the springtime. This should
be looked at. 4) Internal thing for treasurer, institutionalize processes. The most concrete
is number one with budget implications. Now I want to see what feedback you have?
**Kristen:** I would like to add something in for committee appointments over the summer.
Maybe after we monitor them this year.
**Adam:** Certain activities we can pursue over summer and activities to get people
interested.
**Trond:** We talked about the idea that chairs would be appointed in last part of spring
quarter.
**Adam:** We’ve run into problems in terms of our ability to reach out with people and get
them to sit on committees.
**Megan:** Do officers get benefits in summer?
**Adam:** My insurance covered me through summer.
**Megan:** If you up it to 20 hours then according to union, you get benefits.
**Melanie:** I will make a note.
**Kristen:** How does the GAIP thing work if we move out of the union?
**Trond:** If you move out of union you will have to negotiate things again.
**Melanie:** Does anyone have yay or nay?
**Trond:** For what, workload or particular jobs?
**Kristen:** Orientation was big too.
**Amber:** If we want to start advocating for equal pay.
**Melanie:** For us to be affective as an organization, work over summer is necessary.
**Chris:** I agree, 20 hours a minimum.
**Trond:** Does anyone not agree?
**Adam:** For anyone coming into GPSS as officer there is steep learning curve.
**Trond:** If we don’t tell them upfront they will get the work dropped on them anyway.
**Melanie:** Elections packet. Some type of conversations about elections packet.
**Kristen:** For elections should we have Research Analyst develop a report? It’s not an
officer.
**Trond:** It doesn't matter the officers helped the committee along in the past.
**Adam:** Those packets need to be updated, there are still arcane references to Washington
Student Lobby. Things they aren’t familiar with that the officers are. I don’t think any of
current officers will be around next year. Maybe the Research Analyst would be a good
person to act as firewall.

5) PACS Update

**Adam:** This was second PACS meeting. Melanie mentioned earlier for regular PACS
updates. Hopefully we can do PACS updates as part of normal agenda. 2nd meeting. This
was the 1st meeting without administrators. We reviewed policies and budget principles.
There is some concerns about how the principles are communicated, and should we
update them? Between now and the next meeting we could come up with things that
should or should not be in there. Make sure PACS principles reflect those of GPSS.
**Melanie:** I went to the meeting. One thing we discussed was the role of Dean in
budgeting graduate tuition. There is hesitancy among deans. Fee-based programs. Student
input and holding bigger meetings with students. Differential tuition. Information about
degree completion. 55 or 60 percent of undergraduates graduate within 6 years.
Chris: Can you be more specific about the way the principles are being communicated?
Adam: More about language being used. Principle 1. I didn’t know if emphasis should be on that we are public institution. My proposal was take 2 lines, flip them, and make one below the justification for why this is important. Is just about where you throw the emphasis. It will guide how you react to it and how it is created into policy.
Trond: Is this drafted by PACS?
Adam: It is drafted by PACS committee members.
Trond: What guidance do we give PACS?
Adam: We appoint PACS members. Our role is to appoint people that we believe make good decisions. This is a worthwhile topic. There is a tension. It was intended to maintain some autonomy after we appoint members to it. We have authority to recall people and reappoint them. Charles saw this analogous to STF. This is not a committee that we have direct oversight over.
Trond: We write and they approve or they write and we approve?
Adam: STF proposes stuff, such as yearly funding categories. X percent of budget goes towards category A and then we approve that. The principles are that analogue.
Melanie: At the next exec meeting we should vote on it.
Adam: Are we proposing to add this to next senate meeting?
Melanie: Maybe just an intro. It mentions maintaining teaching positions. We don’t necessarily need the phrasing undergraduate in 2f, principle 6.
Trond: I would like to see something in principle 6 for the university to negotiate in good faith because they currently are not, in response to disputes. There are lots in here that encourage PACS to do stuff.
Adam: I can bring that up. Other comments?
Vera: What is the timeline for this?
Adam: Michael Kutz was hoping to get this done before end of quarter. End of quarter is timeframe.
Megan: Statement and principle 2. Cost savings to students.
Trond: Reducing time to graduation is good thing. This is framing thing.

6) DRAC Update

Chris: Not much to report. We have a new member. Need several more members.
Kristen: Met with Susan Neff, the Ombudsman to look at bylines.
Adam: Do you have any strategies to recruit people to DRAC?
Chris: Other than pitch it at next senate meeting?
Kristen: This one has to be senators.
Amber: Similar to committee problem.
Adam: Everyone think of people that would be good on DRAC.

7) Committee Appointments

Adam: We do have some volunteers that we need to approve through exec.
Melanie: Government Relations Committee, I’m recommending 5 senators for that one.
Nathaniel McVicar, Electrical Engineering
Russ Hugo, Linguistics
Jorge Rojas, Economics
Evan Firth, Oceanography
Kevin Cummings, Education.

Those are the five. I made folks fill out an application. Criteria: people have some sort of policy experience, broad range of departments, and enthusiasm.
Move to approve five members for Government Relations Committee.

**Kristen:** Seconds
**Adam:** Objections?

**Melanie:** Federal Legislative Steering Committee
Jessica Birklid, Evans
Chris Westgard, Evans
Marie Jackman, Evans
Matt Portwood, Jackson school.
We have room for up to 7. I move to appoint these five.

**Trond:** Second

**Melanie:** State Legislative Steering Committee:
Caitlin Connelly, Genome Sciences
Colleen Silcox, Evans
Clarissa Marks, Evans
Nathanial McVicar, Electrical Engineering
Chris Erickson, Evans.
I move to appoint these five to state Legislative Steering Committee.

**Chris:** Seconds.

**Kristen:** Travel grants ad hoc committee:
Daniel Coslett, Committee Chair (Built Environments)
Onyinye Edeh (Global Health)
Bjorn Hubert-Wallander (Psychology)
Rita Ismail (Nursing)
Stephanie Cruz (Anthropology)
Amber Trout (Built Environments)
Melissa Kramer (Museology)

**Vera:** Seconds

**Kristen:** Communication and Outreach Committee:
Ryan Shandera, Chair (Law)
Nicole Secula (Music)
Lianna Wood (Pathobiology)
Meg Grounds (Psychology)
Adrian Manriquez (Teacher Education)
Justin Dickson (iSchool)
Andrea Salaiz (Drama PAPT1)
I move.

**Trond:** Seconds.
Kristen: Diversity sub-committee 4 senators:
Henrik Sperber (LGBTQ Community Senator)
Megan Elizabeth Crenshaw (GO-MAP SAB – MPA/JD)
Keon Vereen (GO-MAP SAB – A&A)
Finis Ray (Landscape Architecture)
Keolu Fox (Genome Sciences)
Noralis Rodriguez (Gender, Women and Sexuality Studies)
Move to appoint.
Trond: Seconds.

Chris: Moves to add Michelle Dylan from library sciences to DRAC list
Kristen: Second.

Vera: Social committee is almost filled out, required work is to write paragraph. Will Copeland did write a blurb. You may have met him at the open house. He has great ideas for social committee. I move to appoint him to social committee.
Megan: Seconds.

Adam: Michelle Dylan said she would like to be part of Academic and Admin Affairs. She has proposed some interesting ideas for fee0based programs.
Melanie: Moves to appoint Michelle
Trond: Seconds.

8) SPS

Kristen: We are having panel on November 1st from 6-8pm about marijuana legalization. We will have 2 scientists and 2 policies-makers for and against 502. Also working on clean energy panel to be held on October 30th.
Rene: There is some securitization with paying for speakers to come. We have been clear about not paying for it with fund sources that we can’t.
Trond: It’s less about arguing policies and more about where is the lack of clarity. It’s fact-based rather than policy-based
Rene: But the partisan description...
Adam: How many people, who are our target audience?
Kristen: Mostly grad students.
Trond: Bit of an experiment. We want to do smaller events. Research resources to fact find. We did those only 3 weeks ago.
Adam: Could we get a story covered about this?
Kristen: We will be filming it. There will be posters. Most of events have been getting 50-60 people.

9) GPSS Priorities Revisited

Adam: Melanie did great job of compiling ideas from the senate meeting. Some specific, and some general. I’ve pulled out some themes. 1) funding issues 2) student fees 3)
community events- smaller events around colleges. Those were the big topics that we could incorporate into our priorities

Melanie: The one tricky issue is student fees.
Adam: People are not aware that fees being imposed on them have been imposed by the student government.
Melanie: It has to be a conversation.
Megan: Fees at almost 500$ are too much.
Adam: Is this something better suited at different item agenda. There is a difference of opinion on how to deal with this.
Chris: Move to move to swap 10 to after fee-based programs.
Kristen: seconds
Adam: Fees for TAs and RAs are already part of our priorities. Any other feedback?
Chris: Community seats. If anyone can help me discern what they are trying to say. I don’t understand ‘departments of underrepresented groups’?
Trond: More representation in departments with less representation.
Kristen: We have only 3 community seats, Native American Students, and LGBTQ Students and FIUTS. Diversity comes up in a few of these and we need to focus on that this year. Diversity committee can work on some.
Chris: Maybe diversity should be its own bullet, not sub-bullet?
Melanie: Next week bringing back to senators. I don’t think we should vote on this at senate.
Trond: This is the third meeting of us talking about our priorities.

10) Fees Forum

Chris: I had conversation with my department about fees. This is from my department. Information on fees in general is not very clear. They are not itemized well. Better communication of fees. The information regarding fees is scattered. Transparency is the main issue. Building fee is part of our tuition. Lack of transparency. Some TA ships pay some of building fee and others pay less. Priority 1 is fee transparency. Fee forums-> we would bring in people from various groups responsible for the fees and explain each fee. Basic points of information. Would go far in assuaging people’s fears.
Adam: Quick question? Forums don’t help people who don’t help the forum. How can they access info without going to forum.
Chris: Forums at least put the people responsible for fees in personal contact with students. In longer-term project, I would like to get a central thing (website maybe) to project fees. Further, I would like to petition UW to change their system.
Melanie: Regarding tuition website, we’ve tried but we have reached roadblocks.
Adam: I don’t recall it being included in transition documents.
Rene: I recommend tech person to address feasibility.
Megan: Since GPSS and ASUW created the universal U-PASS. If we put info on our website then you don’t have to go through the university.
Adam: What are reasonable next steps?
Chris: In the next 4-6 weeks a public forum with fee representatives. After that start talking with those people about centralizing all the fee information. Sooner rather than later, a centralized fee information.
Trond: I’m in support of this transparency issue. Talking a bit more about transparency. The entire university budget should be presented to all stakeholders. My previous university presented their entire budget.

Melanie: Priority one should be a website. GPSS and ASUW together should make website. In terms of a forum, how do we want to approach that?

Chris: The fact that the fees exist is irrelevant to union’s grievance. It’s a separate issue. There are a lot of people who would appreciate face-to-face interaction with fee people. Universal U-PASS was 70% passed by students.

Adam: Make sure forum is about fees, not about arbitration decision.

Chris: Union is having their own forum.

Kristen: In the past we have had a Guide to Life and the NFT’s. It had student information about these topics. This would be first step to providing information to students again in a handbook, but instead posting it on the website.

Chris: Student life subcommittee that works with fees

Vera: How willing will fee people be to come to forum?

Chris: To a shaming ceremony? That’s not what I’m envisioning.

Vera: Certain departments have different fees. What does that mean?

Chris: Theoretically all ASE’s should pay the same amount

Trond: Administrators around the university all interpret rules differently. There is no system of handling discrepancies

Kristen: Who actually would show up? ATF? And are the medicine fees different?

Chris: Building fees are mysterious

Adam: The building is not too mysterious. 5% across the board.

Chris: What does it exactly pay for?

Rene: some things within building fee are student generated. You will have to explain all different parts of this fee. You will have to educate people.

Adam: We need to extend time or should Chris and I put together a proposal to approach them?

Melanie: We should think about whether we want to make an announcement

Adam: People got interested in Academic Affairs Committee when they heard about fees.

Melanie: Suggestion to add to the agenda. Feedback for nomination for executive officer?

Melanie: Add exec senator election.

Trond: Seconds

11) Fee Based Programs

Adam: A new degree program is being proposed: Supply chain trans and logistics, which is a fee-based program. It is dying as a certificate program and being brought backed as fee based program. Supposedly there is a moratorium on transferring from certificate to fee based programs.

Trond: Tuition gets paid straight to the course rather than the university. It was already an oddball.
Adam: I’m not so opposed to a creation of a fee-based program, but I am concerned that there was no discussion of principles. Despite my call for thought on this, it deserves to come before exec
Trond: There should be some hard thinking on university’s part on why fee based is better than other professional programs. There need to be rules.
Kristen: I have been told that after a few nursing programs transferred to fee based, that there is a process that it takes a year to jump into this program. They have to get approval from school dean, provost. I think they are not telling you about this process.
Melanie: There is piece of paper that that talks about fee based programs. There are some criteria posted online. They are clearly not following that criteria. We have been emailing other fee-based programs. Hopefully this fits under the Academic and University Affairs subcommittee. It is possible to do a resolution that is more preliminary. This is a huge problem that has not been talked about publicly. I really want us to do something about it this year.
Kristen: I have been to a lot of meetings where the university is bragging about this as a ‘sustainable’ model of schooling
Chris: ‘Sustainability’ is arguable. Geography GIS program is subsidized through our department.
Adam: This is a great issue to bring to committee. These are things that committee should really dig into.
Trond: No constituency exists to yell about this. Midwifery was dying and this one is dying. Do they present evidence that it is dying? It sounds like they may be making something up
Adam: There were surely not questions asked. This forces them to ask questions
Megan: We should look in tandem to cohort funding. It’s not fair to triple tuition for people already in school.
Adam: Another question is cohort tuition modeling for this committee
Kristen: For nursing, you can work at hospital and only pay a couple hundred bucks a quarter when paid under state tuition. But, now that programs are in EO this is not possible. As far as killing midwifery programs, the reasons for getting rid of it was not because of economics, as it was already in EO when it was on the chopping board last year.

12) Senate Meeting Agenda 10/17

Adam: I thought it would be useful to present a “previously on GPSS” to help orient people. This will include a discussion on GPSS priorities, fee-based programs as an immediate tool to get involved in the Academic Affairs committee
Chris: Linking the issue to committee immediately would be a good idea.
Adam: This is good to demonstrate to senate we are listening and incorporating their ideas. We had discussed the senate not voting on GPSS priorities. Fee based programs-highlight important issue that’s impacting students. Get students involved in crafting solutions. Informational sessions. We could have Rosie Lindeke (Midwifery) present it
Melanie: 20 minutes seem a bit long.
Adam: Ten minutes?
Vera: Being mindful that the senate minute should be useful information
Melanie: Big policy issues should be voted on during senate, but this senate meeting should have brand new people.
Kristen: Instead of lecturing, we could have more of a discussion about a topic
Melanie: We want participation
Trond: More like a Q and A.
Vera: We talked about sending out information ahead of time so people can be prepared.
Chris: Why not send out the criteria?
Adam: So having a description of this item in the email we send out, and then saying that there will be an opportunity for a discussion.
Kristen: Who is going to put that together?
Adam: For fee based programs, put me as the sponsor.
Trond: It should be a quick summary, to the point
Rene: When you guys are showing slides you can put it up on the slides. Do it graphically.
Vera: There is a UW website for fee based programs
Kristen: As far as the next item, DRAC needs to be filled
Adam: ASUW and DRAC?
Melanie: Earlier I brought up concern about spending time on this. Not just this time, but there have been complaints. We should have a session for new senators at 515.
Chris: Can we tie Academic Affairs and Student Life to call to attention?
Adam: University Affairs has not been filled. We’ve got 2 people tentatively interested in Graduate Program Review Committee. That one can wait because we aren’t meeting until the 23rd.
Chris: Can we put together a more precise vision of DRAC?
Kristen: It would be nice to talk about subcommittees
Adam: Important decisions about policy need to be clearer.
Vera: I have item that needs to be added, presenting the budget.
Adam: Put it in there under 9
Vera: It needs to be closer to the beginning
Adam: Ok, put it closer to the beginning of meeting. Can we justify why we are presenting the budget
Vera: Transparency and bylaws.
Rene: Be prepared for people to ask lots of questions. People are interested in this topic so send it ahead of time.
Melanie: The most important thing is that we be on top of the agenda
Adam: Officers make the nomination
Trond: We don’t need to go through the whole paper version of the budget.
Melanie: Have we thought of putting outcome, follow up on the senate agenda we send out?
Trond: If so we need to be careful of language we use.
Megan: Or you could keep outcomes for us.
Trond: Maybe just give it a try and see what people think?
Melanie: What about “follow up to confirm agreements.”
Adam: Is this something for exec to handle or something to do after the meeting?
Chris: On follow up, please don’t be afraid to say that this is something that is going to come up again. something we are monitoring consistently.
Megan: Maybe just put an explanatory blurb under each agenda time.
Adam: I like the simplicity of having an agenda like this.
Trond: We should allow you and Kristen handle this.
Megan: We need to add fall social to agenda.
Kristen: We need to add the science and policy event.
Rene: People leave after a particular time. At one hour and 45 minutes they start wiggling.
Melanie: We need to move fee-based programs down. We don’t want people to miss PACS, PACS can be Q and A
Trond: I don’t care if the budget is presented. We are trying to make room for other important things.
Melanie: We shouldn’t start meeting by mentioning how long it will be.
Vera: We are setting a weird precedent by presenting information and giving them homework. We need to incentivize people to read the material before the senate meeting.
Melanie: Send the background on Monday? Or on Sunday?
Rene: Let yourselves trust your senators. Be comfortable that they understand what you just told them.
Trond: Anything not about this should wait.
Adam: Is there a motion to approve agenda
Trond: Move to approve the agenda.
Chris: Seconds

Election of New Exec Senator
Melanie: Officers nominate one person for the vacancy. Criteria: 1) diversity of programs, potentially natural science or humanities 2) need people who will speak up 3) someone who can put time in.
Chris: I have been soliciting volunteers
Trond: diversity is important
Melanie: I was referencing PhD vs. Masters students
Megan: I ran from the floor so keep that in mind
Adam: We can make our nomination

13) Executive office report

Adam: I would entertain a motion to table officer reports.
Vera: Motion.
Lots of People: Seconds

14) Officer reports (Tabled)

15) Announcements
Vera: Recruit people for fall social
Kristen: Would like to bring people in to talk about transit station.

16) Adjourn
Adam: Motion to adjourn
Megan: Seconds