Call to Order and Approval of Agenda:

Chris Lizotte (President): I will now call this meeting to order at 5:33pm. I will entertain a motion to approve the agenda or amend the agenda.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): I have a motion to amend the agenda to add a short discussion item on the executive senator vacancy.

Alex Bolton (Law): Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections? Where would you like to add this item in the agenda?

Alice: As soon as possible. I'll defer to you, Chris.

Chris L: Okay, I will add it after the legislative update. How many minutes?

Alice: 5 minutes.

Chris L: Thank you. I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda or further amend the agenda.

Edward Schwieterman (Astronomy): I move to approve the agenda.

Alex: Second.

Approval of Minutes:

Chris L: Are there any objections? Thank you. The agenda is approved. I'll now entertain the motion to approve the minutes from the previous senate meeting from February 12th.

Seyda Ipek (Physics): So moved.


Previously on GPSS:

Chris L: Any objections? Thank you. The minutes are approved. So previously on GPSS. We approved a budget. We approved a level to ask the Student’s Activities Fee for funding. We're actually going to hear from their chair a little later about that. We also heard from Josh Kavanagh, the Director of Transportation Services, about a proposal to reallocate part of parking
fee add-on as collected from the department from the student U-Pass program to the faculty and staff U-Pass program. We heard from the Environmental Stewardship Council and our representative on that, Elizabeth Lindner. We also had a legislative update. Any questions or points of clarification? If anyone has any, please don’t hesitate to contact me or any of the other officers. So, we’re going to start tonight. We have with us Susan Freccia and Ellen Taylor from Student Life who is going to tell us about the sexual assault task force that has been working over the past 10 months. They’re going to tell us what they did.

**Sexual Assault Task Force Presentation:**

Ellen Taylor (Assistant Vice President for Student Life and Director of Counseling Center): Just so people know, we're pretty informal. We were told we would be spending about 15 to 20 minutes including time for questions and we want to make sure there’s time for questions because that's probably the best part anyway. So like Chris said, I'm Ellen Taylor. I'm the Assistant Vice President for Student Life and Director of the Counseling Center here at UW. This is Susan Freccia who was the project manager on the task force.

Susan Freccia (Task Force Project Manager): I do a lot of things but in this case, I’m the project manager on the task force.

Ellen: So I'll give you a quick thumbnail sketch of how it started. Last April, President Young charged a task force on sexual assault prevention and response. He charged that task force to do a quick scan of the campus policy and procedures, programs, services, etc and the current status of where we were at and to submit a report to him, which we did in May. Then we spent the summer doing some work. I'll do a real quick piece about that. First of all, the President charging the task force was not in response to any particular incident. It was a recognition that this was timely and that this was timely for a very long time. We, as the University of Washington, have lots of changes in the national landscape, around the policy at the highest level. What would you call where you were at?

Susan: Violence Against Women Act in Negotiating and Role making at Washington DC.

Ellen: It was really more of a response to the timeliness of the issue. There are a lot of changes going on nationally in policy such as the Violence Against Women act and Title 9 among other things. This seemed like a good opportunity to look at UW and see what are we doing and what could we be doing better and how we become leaders. I think that’s the real goal that the task force articulated, which is that we want to be the best of the best. So we spend the summer gathering information. Susan facilitated 5 focus groups that involved staff, faculty and students from all 3 campuses, not just the Seattle campus. We were charged with looking at the Tacoma and Bothell campuses as well. Then we interviewed folks such as service providers and others on campus to get as much information as we could. That all went into the task force and it resulted in a report. I want to give an immediate shoutout to Kimberly Schertz who’s sitting right in this room was a member of the task force. She was a representative on the task force and
was very actively involved and even calling in when she was away. One of the things about this task force is if you look down at the list of the members, I served on committees and task forces a lot in my career and this is one where I would say every single person who was in charge of it was very actively involved and participated in discussions and the sub-discussions, which I take as a point of pride actually. So this resulted in this lovely report, which I believe you have access to.

Chris L: It’s on the President’s website.

Ellen: Yes, it’s on the President’s website. I didn’t know if a link was sent out to clue you all in. I’m hoping at least that some of you looked at it in advance. I would bore you to tears if I sat here and went through it, not that it’s boring. It’s fascinating but hearing me read it to you is boring. We identified 5 major goals and 18 recommendations for the university that show up in this report and we also made budget requests because you don’t make recommendations about making changes and improvements without identifying resources that are needed to do those. So far, we have gotten a very positive response from the President, the Provost and other university’s leadership. We already had some funding assigned for our first budget request, which was to hire a consultant to work with us to look at rules and policies, the student conduct code and other policies around the university about sexual assault, sexual conduct and other things to make sure we are as up to date as can be and we are working on that as we speak. The next priority is that we’ve identified what we’re calling a placeholder, an education or training coordinator to work with students, staff and faculty. One of the things we really recommend that I think is key we need to touch any student, staff and faculty with any information. We need to blanket the campus so everyone who is on this campus knows what our expectations, what is appropriate and acceptable behaviors, what are the resources available, how do you intervene, and if you see someone or something, say something. Some of you have probably heard of the Green Dot program. It’s a bystander intervention program that’s really fabulous. All the research shows that bystander intervention is the way to go regardless of what the issue is because it shows that communities support each other. Communities that are engaged and active and will step in are the best ways to reduce violence of all sorts. We’re looking at that and looking at expanding the education campaign.

Susan: I’ll just give a quick example because I saw some heads shaking about bystander awareness. One example of what that might look like is you’re at a party and you are drunk and you get interested in somebody and your friend says, “Hey, that’s great. Why don’t you get her phone number and call her tomorrow?” Then your friends take you home and away from a situation that may have been mutually consented to but maybe not have been because if you had too much to drink, maybe that’s something you want to think twice about. That’s sort of the idea behind the most simplest bystander awareness training. We’re all in this together and we’re all supporting one another. It can go the flip side. Male/female of who the potential victim or perpetrator is. Either way, it’s basically about the whole community stepping in and taking care of all of us.
Ellen: Another thing that we have prioritised is what we’re again, just as a placeholder, calling a sexual assault investigator. This is someone who will be, when we do get reports in the university of sexual assault but also other sorts of sexual misconduct whether that’s stalking or harassment. This person would have special expertise and duties to investigate those to the fullest extent that they can. They would be involved in all 3 campuses.

Colin Bateson (Mechanical Engineering): Out of curiosity, one of the criticism I’m aware of on this issue is the school trying to keep it within the school’s jurisdiction and not involving the authorities. So I’m curious to what this person's role would be in collaboration with the authorities or not involving the authorities. Why not just pass that information along to the police?

Kimberly Schertz (Law): A lot of it has to do with victim based needs and working with the victim. Sometimes they don’t want to go to the police. Sometimes they just want to deal with it within the school so recognizing and honoring the victim in that.

Ellen: It also allows us to hold a perpetrator, assuming that they are an alleged perpetrator, accountable even if the court system is not able to hold them accountable. There’s different standards of evidence and so on that are applied and that’s under federal law that we apply a lower standard of evidence under the student conduct code than the court of law and the consequences are very different. It enables the university to do that kind of investigation and holding accountable without having the courts to do that.

Susan: It’s a really good question. It was discussed in DC and there’s a lot of emphasis being put on schools who are trying to, whether intentionally or not, the effect is that it’s slowing down investigations and encouraging victims to not report and not allowing it to happen. There’s a huge push from the federal level to make really clear and consistent the disciplinary process at a school and to share it ahead of time so everyone knows what’s going to happen and what the process looks like, who is involved, what could potentially come out of it. All those things are being worked on and the primary funding we received was for the student conduct code consultant. She is a SAG, a special assistant attorney general, who’s working on ensuring our policies are up and in place. That’s all the disciplinary piece and what Kimberly was saying is equally important. It had to get into the system so that we can provide services. We have SARA and the counseling center which provide lots of services on campus that can provide support for someone whether they choose to report it internally or not. The police is actually an entirely separate piece. So someone can do one but not the other and choose to report it to the police. UWPD is also very involved in this process and sensitive to the needs of the victim. There’s also a crime victim advocate, Natalie, who works with victims of both sexual assault and survivors of sexual assault and also of other crimes.

Ellen: Yes, absolutely. Are there other questions?

Karen Michael (Public Health - Environmental and Occupational): Are you guys the same as the rape aggression defense, RAD, classes?
Ellen: No, we're not.

Karen: I just know that a couple weeks ago, a couple people from my department have actually gone and done the first part of the training. It’s only open to women and there are classes for men but it’s not on the UW campus and it’s through the UW Police Department so it seems like this would be right along what you are doing.

Ellen: Yes, that'll be something that we will look into that. The task force is sort of interesting in a way. When you think about the task force, we’re the umbrella. We’re not the service providers, the trainers, the judicators or anything. What we are is the ones who put forth the recommendations and we will be charged by the President over the next couple years of following up to see what happens and also to see the oversight of the recommendations. Thank you for mentioning that because that’s something we can put it. We didn’t hear about that through the entire process or if we did, we didn’t register it. That's another potential partner in the work.

Susan: I think we did a really good job of identifying people for the task force, we also had 36 people who were involved in the focus groups and who did very thorough information gathering with them and we’re very careful to include faculty and staff and researchers and service providers and students in a very wide range. I’m sure we missed things. This is a huge institution and there’s so much going on that we just don’t know about so any additional resources that you all know about, absolutely may be completely supported. It just hasn’t shown up in this one effort.

Ellen: If you look through this, when you all go home and say, “Wow, that sounded like a very exciting report. I am going to read that.” Our contact information is associated with this. You’ll look on the President’s website, you’ll see the report and you’ll definitely be able to get touch with either Susan or me. Questions, comments, ideas, whatever. We’re absolutely available and we are dedicating a certain amount of our bandwidth to advancing the recommendations of the task force.

Chris L: We do have a couple of more minutes. Does anyone have any more questions?

Ellen: You asked for questions, so I’ll wait.

Chris L: I have a questions but it can wait until you’re done.

Ellen: I will say one more thing. I was actually meeting with the Provost Advisory committee for students last Friday and one of the things I was thinking about coming out of that was I imagine some of the folks in this room are thinking what does this going to mean for graduate and professional students in particular? And I think about TAs and RAs in the room. You interface with the university in multiple roles. You’re a student and many of you are an employee and are
often doing a juggling act in terms of what your role is. I mentioned the educational component where we’re hoping to get funding for a coordinator. One of the things that we’re thinking of is when I talk about an education program, I’m talking about a comprehensive and touch everyone and touch them multiple times. I want it to be multi-faceted. One of the things we’re talking about is making sure that it is developmentally appropriate. This is one of the things that came out of the task force’s conversations. Obviously as a graduate student, you don’t want to or need to hear the same information in the same way as someone who is 18 years old and fresh out of high school. You’re at a different place in your life. Some of the information needs to be the same but in terms of tending to the developmental needs of all of our students and our employees and where you’re at and also thinking about building the educational program, so that the third time you’re hearing it, you’re hearing something that’s a little different. I had someone use the example of not attending the same class over again. Why would I want the same information around this over and over again? It should build on itself. It’s complex and is a very complicated issue actually. Power based interpersonal violence is very complex so we want the educational program to reflect that complexity. One of the ways that it will affect TAs and RAs is you will get the information through your role as a student and your role as an employee of the university and employees of the university have reporting obligations and various other considerations they need to take into account and be aware of. We need to make sure everyone knows what are my obligations as an employee of the university regardless of what exactly my role is? I guessing you all in the next two years will start to be impacted by this.

Susan: We will also do awareness training. We heard from a lot of the focus group participants that they don’t know what to do if someone discloses something that happened to them personally or through a friends. So we have a community-wide effort to insure that we’re teaching all students and faculty and staff about that as well.

Chris L: So we’re at the end of time but I do have a question so I’ll need someone to extend time for me.

Dawn Roscoe (Communications): I move to extend time by 5 minutes.

Kimberly: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Thank you. My question is what can GPSS do to help implement some of these recommendations?

Ellen: That's a great question.

Susan: This is not a cop out but my first question would be to bounce that back to all of you. I would encourage you to take a look at the report. It’s not a dry, boring report. It’s actually very active and engaged. It talks about cultural change and ways to approach that. It’s not only about compliance and not only about service providing. It’s about the full thing so I encourage everyone to look at it. Then let us know what you would like. I would say as a quick second option, there’s
a lot that administration can do as support and providing services and as much as Ellen and I feel very strongly about culture shifting, and we’re not administrative focused type of people, were not students. There’s a level of activism and power that comes from grassroots movement and only you students can do that. We can’t. So if that means doing some awareness campaigns and there’s a number of different things you can do in terms of activism and awareness campaigns that will complement what the task force is doing. It doesn’t necessarily go through the task force.

Ellen: I’ll just add a piece to that without taking you over your time and that is also talk about this. In your role as senators and your role as students and as concerned members of the university community. Listen for opportunities to say, “Hey, I was in a meeting and I heard about this task force and the work that they’re doing and the work that they’re trying to promote.” Listen for opportunities to educate your peers and your classmates about the task force and the cultural shift were trying to create. I think that’s an important piece. Cultures don’t change unless everyone is involved in the process. I think this is an issues that can only be addressed by a cultural shift. It's not just about following the rules. It’s about thinking about relationships and being with people differently. So I think that's what we hope for from you all.

Susan: So feel free to contact us. There’s a link on the President’s website of the task force. The report is there along with the final goals and recommendations. Our contact information is there. Feel free to talk to us anytime.

Ellen: And ask Kimberly as well because she was very involved.

Chris L: Thank you very much. So hopefully that was informative. I was building up to it all year and here it is. I would like to do a future senate meeting once everyone has had a chance to look through the report, to think of some concrete things that GPSS can do to implement the recommendations of the task force or complement some of the recommendations. So moving along, we have our GPSS Spotlight on ASUW Arts and Entertainment.

**GPSS Spotlight - ASUW Arts & Entertainment**

Ryan Baker (Director of ASUW Arts and Entertainment): Hi everyone. My name’s Ryan Baker. I’m the director of ASUW Arts & Entertainment. We’re the programming for on campus entertainment and programs from the undergraduate student body. So we plan a lot of the large concerts throughout the year, film screenings, and kind of edu-tainments if you will. I’m here to talk to you guys about the spring show. For those of you who don’t know, ASUW and other hosts of on campus partners get together every year and throw a big, end of the year concert in a central location on campus. For the past few years we had it on Rainier Vista and Red Square. This year, we’re having it at the HUB lawn. Like I said, it’s kind of a year end blowout. Everyone gets together and has a good time. With GPSS support in the past, we brought artists such as LCD Soundsystem, Arcade Fire, T-Pain, Kendrick Lamar and the Dream. That's just to give you a sense of the scale of the show. From Genesis has told me, you guys are interested
in pitching in another $10,000 this year, which is the standard sponsorship level that you guys have included in the past and we’re really grateful for that. A lot of success has come over the last couple of years in getting those big names to get a lot of the students out for this event for our on campus partners. My main goal is to tell you the process we go through and ask if anyone wants to be involved in the planning process in terms of the curation of the event. What we really want our partners to have coming out of this is a sense that you guys are getting your interest represented as we’re deciding artists. That probably hasn’t been that realized in the past but that’s something we want to change this year. To give you a glimpse of the process, we have all the infrastructure down. It’s on the HUB lawn at Saturday, May 17th. I think that’s week 7 of spring quarter. We have all the infrastructure in place. We have sound, light and stage setup. At this point, we’re looking to curate the event and find that big headliner that the majority of the student body will want to see. With that, we’re going to be having a task force meeting for the rest of winter quarter and the first couple weeks of spring quarter to collaboratively decide who that artist will be. We will be meeting with the ASUW Director of Programming and we’re looking for 1-3 or as many of you as you want to be involved in the process. So basically, we’ll draft an ideal list of artists that we think students will enjoy. One of the ways that clues us in on that is an online survey that we distribute to the student body and from there, we’ll reach out through a bunch of booking agencies to see if those artists are available. If they are not or they’re too expensive, we reevaluate and go through what’s called a middle agent to see basically an aggregated list of a bunch of artists that are available that day and who is in our price range. I have a feeling I’m probably getting short on time. Thanks a ton for supporting us this year. It’s good see a bunch of on campus partners together. It’s going to be really fun. Our budget is solid so hopefully we can get someone that everyone will be excited about. Just quick raise of hands, is anyone interested in being on that committee? You’ll be working with undergraduates to decide who’s going to come. What I’ll do is I have a couple cards but I’ll leave them up here. If you have any questions, I’ll direct you to Genesis and you can just give them my email if that makes sense. Thanks for having me today. If any of you didn’t raise your hand and want to be involved in the process, more the merrier. Hopefully, you will get your interests represented in the process.

Chris L: Could other grad students who are not senators can join?

Ryan: Absolutely. If you guys have friends who tells you about the hottest new trend in music, send them our way.

Dawn: What’s the time commitment and do you know the day of the week that the meetings are on?

Ryan: Generally how we’ve been meeting is we’ve been doing an hour every Friday afternoon around 11:30-12:30. That being said, we’ll try to be accommodating to whoever’s on the committee.

Dawn: And you said already have a list or are you still taking submission?
Ryan: Yes, we’re trying to get the committee together to formulate that list.

Chris L: Any other questions for Ryan?

Ted Chen (Bioengineering): What other events do you guys have?

Ryan: Right now this week, we have our Geek Week. It’s a week of different RSOs and ASUW affiliations putting together a bunch of events to celebrate gaming culture and geek culture. Tomorrow, we have Ken Jennings doing trivia in the ballroom. We also do another big concert in the fall called the Fall Fling where we get a big headliner and a bunch of openers. We also do a bunch of comedy shows throughout the year as well.

Yasmeen Hussain (Biology): I know the survey was sent out to ASUW members but not all graduate and professional students are ASUW members. It’s an optional thing. Is there anyway to send that link Genesis or whoever to get it to graduate students?

Ryan: So basically how the link is set up, anyone with a UW net ID can fill out the information on there. I’ve also recently added an option to specify whether you’re a graduate or an undergrad so we can see what you’re thinking in a broke down list. So you should be able to access in the Catalyst webtool with a UW net ID.

Chris: Make sure you get the link to us and we’ll get that to all of you which will then disseminate to all your constituents.

Kiehl Sundt (SAF Committee Chair): To clarify, you mean to tell me that 74 time Jepardy winner, Ken Jennings will be on campus?

Ryan: Yes.

Kiehl: When and where?

Ryan: Tomorrow at 8pm in the ballroom. It’s going to be wild. I have to jet. Thanks for having me.

Chris L: Just to clarify, last year’s senate was unhappy that we gave $10,000, which is something we’ve been doing for years and years, without getting any input in the process. So Ryan coming tonight and putting out the call was in response to a resolution that was passed that was infamously known as the T-Pain resolution.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): I want to come to Ryan’s defense though. Last year, there was a breakdown of communication between the treasurer’s office and ASUW Arts and Entertainment. That the fact that we needed someone to work with them was not communicated to the senate
but ASUW Arts & Entertainment did want someone on their committee.

Chris L: In any case, this is a huge positive step forward. Anyone here who is interested in serving that committee, we will also put it in an email to send out to your constituents so you can solicit from the larger graduate and professional student body. Okay, we have another presentation from the chair of the Services and Activities Fee committee. These are the people that fund us and pay the officer’s salaries and pay for our socials and basically everything we do.

Genesis: Come on down, Kiehl.

**Student Activities Fee Committee Presentation:**

Kiehl: Good evening everyone. My name is Kiehl. Chris asked me to stop by and talk to you about what we do and also talk to you about an opportunity for involvement. I’m the chair of the Services and Activities Fee and while I don’t get to play rock or pop concerts, I am the part the 9 person student’s committee that distributes $27 million a year of your dollars to fund operating and capital projects on campus. So I’ll start with a brief history. A long time ago when Odegaard was a president and not a library, tuition was dirt cheap and fees were also cheap. Those were the two components of your tuition. Then the fee started going up and up and students got upset and they talked to President Odegaard. He said I understand and I’ll set up a task force and from that task force came from state law the Services and Activities Fee in every public college in Washington state. So right now with our paid tuition, you notice there is a Services and Activities Fee component, a facilities and renovation fee and also a bond fee which all comes to be around $750 per year which comes around to $27 million for UW Seattle. What does that money go to? A lot of things. It funds around 16 units on campus like the HUB, the IMA, Hall Health, Schmitz Hall which is not one of our most aesthetically pleasing purchases. Then there is also the recently renovated Samuel E. Kelly Ethnic Cultural Center. We fund a bunch of units on campus like GPSS, ASUW, Hall Health, the Key Center, the Counseling Center and then a number of others on campus. We have a lot of things and quickly here I’ll talk about the committee for a bit. As I mentioned earlier, it’s with 9 students with a number of ex officio faculty and staff each year. 5 undergraduates get appointed from ASUW and 4 graduates from GPSS. Together, we build a budget over the course of the year and that goes to the Vice President of Student Life and then to the Regents for final approval around June. It’s a lot of work to handle at a relatively short amount of time. There may be an open volunteering opportunity on the committee. If any of you are interested, I encourage you to get in touch with me at safcom@uw.edu or talk to Chris or Genesis and they can forward me along.

Chris L: And I believe we have 2 vacant seats at this point?

Kiehl: Probably down to one. So I’m probably bumping up against my 5 minute time. I’m happy to open the floor for questions or comments.

Kimberly: Are the spots open to all graduate students?
Kiehl: Yes, there are no formal prerequisites for applying other than being a UW student.

Ted: What issues or topics are SAF focusing on this year?

Kiehl: So each year, we take a hands on approach. Each unit submits a budget request in the spring and we go through and set funding levels and tell them how much money they have. Then it’s very hands off. As long as they aren’t doing anything criminally stupid or illegal, we give them a lot of leeway until next year. We assess what they’ve been doing with their SAF support and look at building bonds and ways to save students money and to improve the quality of life on campus. Our mission statement is to enrich the out of classroom experience for all UW Seattle students. That’s our primary focus. To give you a couple of fun examples. if you see a drone flying around campus, it’s called the Quadcopter. That is a daily drone purchased by the SAF fund last year. If you see a predator drone that is firing missiles, that is not ours.

Chris L: Any other questions for Kiehl?

Bonnie Lau (Speech and Hearing Sciences): What's the time commitment?

Kiehl: Our committee meetings are 1:30 to 3:30 every Friday. On top of that, we sometimes go over in the spring. We generally we have an overflow meeting if necessary and if extra things need to be ironed out. I will also meet with committee members in sub-committees outside the regular committee time. For instance, we’re going to a department to go over some bond estimates. So I will open that to a couple of my committee members to come along so two or three will go to that. So 1:30-3:30 is the core committee times. That’s all you need to make to be on the committee. If you want to get further involved, there are other opportunities too. This is a great opportunity who wants to do something professionally that involves a lot of budgeting. Again, we deal with $27 million so it’s a great experience for that. It’s also a great opportunity to learn more about resources on campus.

Chris L: That is time. We will need to extend time if anyone wants to ask more questions but thank you. This will be sent out in an email that we will send out. This email will have a lot of opportunities for different committees like SAF and others so we really need you to send these out but we'll do our part to get these emails in a coherent and convenient fashion and it’s on you to forward it on. Right now, we have Chris Erickson with the federal legislative agenda for discussion and approval.

Federal Legislative Agenda Discussion and Approval:

Chris Erickson (Vice President): So Yasmeen, tell me how this works. I’m trying to do it in spirit of your resolution. So what you see here is, we sent out a document and everyone read it and combed through it. These that you see here are the edits. So hopefully it’s clear that what was struck out or put in. If you look here this the clean version of that. What I want to do really quickly is go through these edits because these were seen as friendly amendments. A lot of
them weren't substantive. They were actually more grammatical. Maybe a word worked better.

Yasmeen: Point of clarification, is this a resolution?

Chris E: No.

Yasmeen: No need to do the whole thing then.

Chris E: Oh, it doesn’t matter? Sweet, but I do want to go through it since this is a different document than what you saw last Wednesday. Really quick, if anyone sees anything that jumps out at you.

Dawn: Could you make the font larger?

Chris E: Pretty standard stuff. I think it strengthens it. Again, this is an internal document for the federal legislative committee to work with the SAGE committee as we get ready for the Day of the Hill. That’ll be April 7-9. This will guide the federal committee as they set up the white papers. The white papers are the documents that we will hand out and give to people. Those are the ones that people will actually see. Members of the committee, feel free to add in or stop me. I do want to give a big thanks to everyone but especially Matt and Steve who did a lot of the editing on this document. That’s Portwood from the Jackson School and Carlin from Chemistry. We’ll go through and I just want to say another thing. This is pretty much tit for tat from last year but with some upgrades to make it 2014. The issues are still big: students indebtedness, research funding and immigration. So with that, I’ll switch over to this final draft and I want to make this more interactive. This is the time now to say I don’t like this, this seems better or let’s vote on this sucker. So graduate education funding, revenue, financial aid access, improved efficiency, academic excellence. Nice buzz words. It doesn’t mean anything but we’re going to go talk about it anyway. Anyone? Just to test me if I know what I’m talking about. Alright so I’ll hand it over to Chris.

Chris L: I have a question. Are there any specific bills or are there bills that we’re looking at or had they not been introduced?

Chris E: We do have an executive order but this document like the state one, we don’t have specific bills. We’ll talk care of that in the white papers.

Matt Portwood (Jackson School - China Studies): Under academic excellence, its consideration of an FRPA Act. It would extend efforts to make publicly funded research and publications and data more accessible. It’s more just floating around out there. That’s the only bill that’s even mentioned in the agenda.

Chris L: Follow up question. I can’t remember the exact terminology but the system that was proposed by Obama, for a lack of a better term, race to the top for colleges. The benchmarking
and that stuff. Did the federal steering committee consider any of that?

Matt: Not in the agenda but they will come up in the white paper.

Kimberly: Can you explain to everyone what a white paper is?

Chris E: Yeah, it’s a fancy word for a one sheeter. If you’ve ever done an executive summary for a paper and they said, keep it to a page. It’s pretty much it. So we’re trying to contain the entire information of what’s important to us to one page so we can just hand it out and use it as a reference.

Matt: They’re tailored to three topic areas, which are student indebtedness, federally funded research and immigration. Once we write the three white papers, the two delegates from the federal legislative committee will take those to Washington DC to meet with a group of students advocating for graduate education. That’s what the real purpose of the white papers is.

Chris E: If anyone wants to be a part of that they can. They’re split into teams: immigration, student indebtedness, and research funding specifically with science and sequestration. We can actually have 6 people going with us this year. It’s pretty awesome. We have our 2 SAGE delegates as well as myself and Chris Lizotte and then we also have Kiana Scott and the student member from the Washington Student Achievement Council who is actually a medical student from the University of Tacoma. So it’s a pretty broad group and on that process, we do have two federal legislative people. Christy Gullion and Sara. They’re some of the better people in DC and people from other campuses will tell you that. They’ll be working with us so we get the right bills. One thing that is important is the Higher Education Act, which will hopefully be reconsidered this year so that’s a big thing. Possibly the Carl Perkins Act.

Dawn: Are there any bills on the federal level about the fee based programs?

Chris E: Not to my knowledge. The fee based programs things is really specific to UW and how that works. We’ll be talking about that considerably.

Yasmeen: When was this sent out, the federal agenda? I don’t see it in my last email.

Chris E: Last Wednesday. It would have been an email from Elisa Law. I know it went out because it also had information about the hearing tomorrow on House Bill 1669.

Yasmeen: The one on the 20th? There’s two attachments. One is the senate agenda and one is senate minutes.

Chris E: I think it would’ve been Wednesday or Thursday morning. Chris L: While Elisa looks for that, any other questions for Chris pertaining to the content?
Ragan Hart (Public Health Genetics): Who are some of the other SAGE members in DC?

Chris E: Good question. These are all federal R1 members in the top tier. That includes University of Michigan, UNC, UCSD, UCLA, Texas A&M, UT-Austin.

Chris L: Michigan State.

Chris E: This was actually a smaller group and one of the founding members was from the University of Washington. It grew out of this idea that there is a group called the National Association of Professional and Graduate Students, NAPGS, and that kind of focuses on graduate education. This group was formed specifically to deal with federal research funding. We don't want to make value judgements of who's better. It just makes sense that in that group, we just focus on how research is important piece for us. We’re the number 1 public but number 2 overall institution in the country in federal research funding. I think it’s $1.4 billion a year. So 10% of a billion dollars is a lot of money so it’s really important to us.

Elisa Law (Secretary): I found that email and that's my fault. I didn’t attach the agenda. I just attached the notes from the fee based program meeting so I apologize for that.

Yasmeen: So can we table this vote until everyone has had a chance to read it?

Chris E: I would entertain a motion to suspend the rules to take this vote.

Chris L: Did this get sent out last week?

Elisa: No, it did not.

Chris L: I just wanted to clarify it. I will now open the floor.

Josh Calvert (Medicine): I'll entertain a motion to suspend the rules to vote on the agenda.

Chris L: Because this is not a resolution, there is no particular bylaw that says anything about a minimum notification.

Yasmeen: I would like to strongly object to that because we haven’t actually fully read it and there might be some people here that have comments, suggestions or disagree. I never the whole thing. We just scrolled through it.

Chris L: There is a motion on the floor. Is there a second?

Kimberly: Point of information, when do you need to have this finalized by? Are you hitting a deadline?
Chris E: I mean, you know, we can just do whatever. I guess we’ll approve it at some point.

Seyda: Is there another meeting this quarter?

Chris L: Yes.

Seyda: Then I think it’s not important.

Chris L: There is a motion on the floor. There needs to be a second or not.

Matt: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Edward: I object to suspending the rules. I think everyone should have a chance to read it.

Chris L: Any other objections?

(English): It sounds like we have both content and consequence questions here on what’s going on. Perhaps it be best to articulate those? What are the consequences of the vote?

Chris E: I would say if it did get sent, I’m questioning the percentage level on who read it and how different that is.

Chris: We’re still entertaining objections.

Devin Bedard (Earth and Space Science): I’m going to object to the suspension of the rules since there’s no rule to suspend. There are no bylaws saying that we need to vote on it so it has no actual meaning.

Chris L: You are correct.

Colin: Point of information, how much time do we have for this thing?

Chris L: We will need to extend time.

Matt: I vote to extend time by 3 and half minutes.

Douglass Taber (Evan’s School of Public Affairs): Second.

Chris L: Time is extended. The floor is open.
Kimberly: Final point, do we have quorum? The room looks empty.
Chris L: We would have to count and compare that to the total number of senators.

Colin: I would like to move to email this out since most of us have smartphones and you read it in the next few minutes and vote later or go through this quickly. I’m going to move to do a quick read through for everyone’s benefit for 10 minutes so we have a better idea of what’s going on.

Chris E: Can I propose something different?

Chris L: There’s a motion on the floor.

Chris E: Point of personal privilege, it would please me to let people know that there is a standing document of last year’s federal legislative agenda standing until a new one is voted on. If it would please people to know that waiting two weeks isn’t a big deal if people choose to do that.

Chris L: There is a motion on the floor. I’m looking for a second. If there is no second, the motion dies.

Steve Carlin (Chemistry): I move that we have a vote to have a vote.

Edward: Could someone move to table?

Steve: I move that we vote to table this.

Ted: Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections?

Josh: What happened to my motion?

Chris L: There were objections. This item is tabled until next senate meeting.

Alice: It died in the process.

Josh: I don’t care. I was just trying to expedite the whole meeting.

Colin: Point of information, do we now vote or does anyone object against tabling?

**Graduate Peer Mentoring Group Discussion:**

Chris L: There were no objections to tabling this discussion. We will make sure this gets set up properly the next time we do this. Several months ago, we’ve been bugging you about this working group that has been convened to work on a system of graduate and professional student peer mentors. We are at the point where we’re ready to move toward implementation
but we need some feedback. These are the people that have been working on the group. We have Ragan Hart who is with us tonight from Public Health Genetics. We have Sara Diedrich from Public Health Nutrition, Gary Hothi from Social Work, Esra Camci from Oral Biology, Mike Babb from Geography and myself from Geography. So what I'm going to do is briefly describe 4 key principles that we've come up with that we think need to be in place, which that can be debated but I think they're basic enough. This is not specifically what we're asking feedback on but please say something if you think of something. The first principle is that this should truly be a cross campus and cross disciplinary program. A lot of places of peer mentoring programs for specific programs. For example medical schools often have peer mentoring programs. Law schools often do. There are peer mentoring programs directed toward certain constituency groups. The idea of this is there is no restriction on who can participate other than being a graduate and professional student. Anyone from any part of campus can be matched with anyone from any part of campus. That's the first principle. The second principle is that we can't do this by ourselves. We've solicited advice and feedback from the Graduate School and the Counseling Center and they have enthusiastically offered logistical and administrative support for this program. Ellen, who was here earlier, is an ardent supporter of this. The third principle; this is not meant to be a replacement for professional mental health services. This is very important. Peer mentoring is meant for graduate and professional students to get together and talk about issues that are common within them. It can be a whole wide range of issues. It cannot and should not replace actual mental health services for people who are in crisis and who are in need of those services. So built in to our program is the opportunity for people to refer people up the chain with confidence. Finally, people who sign up to be peer mentors need appropriate training. This is something we talked to Ellen about. The kind of training she has in mind is called gatekeeper training. Essentially, it’s a base level of knowledge when someone is at a point when they need professional services where you as an untrained person cannot provide. Those are the four basic principles. Also, ongoing support services from the Counseling Center where we’ll also build in a monthly meeting for mentors to get together and talk about their experience and what they do. That’s the four basic things. Any questions or comments before we move one? Now, here are some of the questions that are still open. We would like to pilot this program in spring quarter, which is an ambitious task but we can do it. We have a draft of an application going, we have a draft of an executive summary. We’re presenting this to the Graduate School executive committee on March 6. This included other units like GOMAP, but we need to think about somethings. First, what kind of qualities do we want in our mentors? Second, what should we ask for a minimum time commitment? Should it be a quarter? Should it be an entire academic year? We are all busy and have complex lives. At the same time, this requires continuity for some people who participate for it to be successful. What should we reasonably ask these people? Third, what level of demographic specificity should someone who wants to be mentored be able to seek in a mentor? What I mean by this are some basic things that I think someone should be able to request. Someone of a particular gender, someone from a broad area of study. Is there anything else? Someone with a student parent. Should we allow them to request another student parent to get feedback from? And also that gets into issues of privacy and confidentiality for the mentor. How much data are we willing to collect from people and have that hanging around? Finally, what kind of oversight should GPSS have? GPSS is a
somewhat transient organization. The leadership turns over every year and the large part of senate turns over. To ensure that the program doesn’t simply die the couple years out, what kind of oversight structure should we have? Standing committee? Ad hoc committee? Simply keep it in the office among the staff? I don’t know and anything else that I haven’t thought of. These are the questions I’m asking. Gary and Ragan, have I forgotten anything?

Gary Hothi (Social Work): Everything’s great.

Kimberly: Have you thought about posting at least the first 3 question in a survey to the graduate student body level?

Chris L: We have not. That’s a possibility. My response would be do you want to form the program first and then present it to the student body at large or solicit information from them? Which is totally fine. My initial thought was that it made sense for a smaller and more contained group.

Dawn: For the structure, I would say it would be better for a quarterly training and quarterly mentors because that would then perpetuate the program even beyond the training and there would be more people from last quarter who did it and there’s an alumni effect.

Chris L: That’s a good thought. We do intend that it wouldn’t just be a beginning of the year training but there will be check-ins and ongoing resources. You do bring up a really good point of how consistently you make that official this recruitment process.

Thomas Edwards (Chemistry): One of the things maybe is to request is a knowledge for a certain language because there might be, to certain students, some things that are harder to express in english. Maybe you're more comfortable in another language. If your mentor knows that language, it’ll be easier to discuss the issues.

Chris L: That’s an excellent point and not one or any of us had thought of.

Alex: Did you have a task force that had any initial thought on any of these or did you just generally want to present them to us?

Ragan: One things that we discussed is a mentee might be interested in a mentor with a similar interest or hobby but there is a handful of things that we will need from both sides of applications and we want to figure out what to include in that list and what we shouldn’t.

Ted: I think a lot of that should be voluntary. If they want to be with a student parent, they can do that but it shouldn’t be required. I think that the general area. the gender and the language are good to ask and everything else is open.

Yasmeen: I was curious if this program is a one on one mentoring? It sounds like it.
Chris L: Yes and I did not specify that.

Yasmeen: If someone applies to be a mentor, it might be hard to get people to apply to be a mentor because I know many graduate students in their last year and they still feel like they need to be mentored or have someone to talk to. One thing I’ve seen in AWS is they do a group mentoring thing. They do 2 or 3 mentors and 2 or 3 mentees so there are cohorts to work together. That might be hard to implement in the first year but it might be something to look into since I suspect a lot of people will be like I couldn't mentor someone. I need help myself.

Chris L: That's a really good idea. Little mentor groups or nodules.

Yasmeen: Right, so they help each other out.

Dawn: At the women's center, there's a reentry mentoring program. You guys might want to check out their model just to see how they do that. I don't know if it’s staff run or peer run. That might be a good way to build that.

Ragan: Just to add to Yasmeen’s thought, we had discussed that in terms of some people are more comfortable in not a group setting so having that one on one but having the group mentoring would be a great idea further out.

Duru: I had a quick question about offering facilities and locations since not all the groups are offered offices and some people would want to meet at an offsite location like Starbucks.

Chris L: One things that's happening is the College of Built Environments is they're piloting a peer mentoring program for international students matched up with domestic students. They're given a coffee card so they can go not at their own expense.

Chris E: This isn't a judgement but a good question in the idea of whether you’re competing with or coordinating with other existing programs and what's' unique about this that it means it would need to be created in and of itself rather than tying it to something else? When I think about where to house this, I think GPSS is one the last places I would look. Probably the Graduate School and or a host of others that are set up with capacity and long term needs of sustainability.

Chris L: Part of our discussion did actually revolve around trying as hard as we could to not replicate what already exists. As far as we can tell, there is no other program certainly not on this campus. It doesn’t really look like there is any on any other campuses, at least not a campus wide one. The second one is also a good one about capacity and overextension, which is why we’ve talked with the Graduate School and the Counseling Center. Actually, the Graduate School has been really generous in their offering of administrative support and a person's time. In fact one of our earlier discussion is how do we get this out of the hands of GPSS as quickly as possible precisely because of the turnover and burden? Not in the sense of how do we get it out
of our oversight and control but how do we get it to a place where it can be stable? Those are certainly well taken.

Colin: I wanted to support the idea of setting the minimum commitment around a quarter. It might seem short if you want to keep mentors around but if they’re motivated to be mentors, they will naturally hang around. The quarter will really dictate your workload and classes so you won’t know how your spring quarter will look necessarily.

Gary: Ultimately this won’t happen with four or five people in the task force. People in different types of mentoring program on campus, I would encourage you all to reach out to them and friends and yourselves to step up and help make this happen. We need to work together to make it happen. It’s a pilot program so definitely the quarter program is good. So it’s not like oh my god, I have to do it for a year. We can tap into some existing programs just as a pilot to create something new that is campus wide.

Chris L: The task force is open to always open to anyone so feel free to join us. So Dawn is the last one since we’ll be out of time unless we want to extend time.

Dawn: Is this something that GPSS could start and is spun off to a student group?

Chris L: That's the idea. If it goes along the lines of what we're thinking, eventually over a couple years, it manages itself.

Gary: I’ll reiterate that mental wellness is the overarching piece here. Definitely the retention and the support is great but mental wellness is what we’re after.

Chris L: Thanks for your feedback and this is open to anyone that wants to participate so please let me know if you’re interested. Moving along, we have the legislative update.

Legislative Update:

Chris E: This one will be quick. This is the one time I will beg you to do something for me. Dawn tomorrow is going with me to Olympia. Part of the email that got sent out is we’re having a hearing on the fee based programs bill. It would be nice to have set up a week in advance but only Dawn and I’m not sure if she’s even in a fee based program is going. So let’s back up. What is a fee based program? So within the university, we have all these kinds of things. Have you heard of an executive program or a certificate program? There’s 300 some program at the university that are fee based. That means they are self-supported. You pay fees to pay the entire cost. What happens when it’s a fee based program is that there is no state funding going into that program. They take themselves off that state funding. So the big reason in doing this is to say we have a program and it’s going to fail because don’t have enough money to make it happen anymore so let’s instead of having it subsidized by the state, increase tuition rates to make students pay what it actually costs and it can be self-sustaining.
Gary: I’m in the school of Social Work and it’s a fee based program. The way that I was told is that there was no state funding. It run out so we couldn’t subsidize it so it’s a way to bring more students in. Just wanted to add that in as well.

Chris E: This bill is not whether fee based programs are good or bad but this is the background of what they are. So Gary’s very right. The university is put in a situation of no money because $400 million got cut out of the higher education program. So we can either scrap it and get rid of it or move to the fee based structure and within that, there’s this idea that you can actually expand faculty spots with that extra money. There’s a few different things that happen. One, costs are going to increase and over a course of a couple of years, a lot of public health and/or masters of library information students saw a 75% increases. They also said when you sign up, actually we’ll make this decision after you choose to pay. So students showed up and it was just a lot more to go to their program. All this bill says is if you want to change from a regular standard program to a fee based program, you need a 6 month notice to the students. I think this is a pretty baseline thing. It just is literally saying raise it if you want to raise it. Students can make their own choices about what’s good but you need the time to figure out substantively or financially if that’s your program or maybe somewhere else is better. I think this is an easy thing. I think that the disconnect comes when I signed up for this but when I showed up on day one, it was a different scenario. There’s been a moratorium now on fee based programs. When Midd Whiffery and MLIS, there’s was an uproar and the university said no more. We’re going to put the brakes and quit doing this for awhile but that runs out at 2015 so they can go back at anytime. Also people who are TAs or RAs, you get a tuition waiver. If you’re in a standard program, your tuition waiver will pay all of your tuition. If you’re in a fee based program, it will only pay the part that’s not state funded because state dollars. Even if you’re in a program where a lot of it is if you’re an instate student, you’ll get a grant from your department for your first year but you can't have that state money if you’re in a fee based program so private funds have come in.

Dawn: I was informed that most of those positions if you’re in a fee based program, you’re not eligible to even apply. We don’t get them at all. We don’t get tuition waivers.

Chris E: Good information there. So this is why regardless of whether you’re in this program, this is the idea. We’re leaving tomorrow at 11:30. We'll be done at 3:30. If anyone in this room wants to go, I need one more person and I know that a lot of people are in the programs. You would be doing us a solid. We need to have bodies. If not, I'll make it happen but I’m wanting this one time to count on you. If you can't, I forgive you and it's totally okay. This is hand feeding right here. If you can copy this and put your name and department and send this email to and you'll get the email as well. You can even call as well. This is one of those things where we don’t like to over inundate people but I think if we still get a lot of calls saying this is important and we haven't bugged you all year. We saved it and we waited for this moment. This is the deal.

Gary: If this can be sent to me, I'll send it to my cohorts and my school. It’s a fee based program and I would encourage anyone else in a fee based program to please send this to their cohorts
and constituent members.

Douglass: Does it matter if you're a Washington state resident or not?

Chris E: No, not necessarily. This isn't necessarily a fee based program issue. What a lot of the colleges are talking about is getting rid of instate/out of state tuition and having one baseline. So instate would go up and out of state would go down. The other big things is that if the money comes back, they won't go back to the standard. I don't want to put this as an indictment of the university. If the state pulls out money and you have to make choices about whether you do programs or not, you have to run like a business and it can't go both ways. It can't be like we want to subsidize but you won't give us any money. It's what it is. For us, undergrads, everyone talks about how there's no differential tuition. We already got it. They said they capped tuition. Unless you're in two or three graduate programs, your tuition raised this year. Maybe only $1000 but that's still $1000. What this bill specifically does in the end is if you're going to switch it up, give notice. I think we can all get behind that. Jason from Library Information Science said actually I chose to come to UW because it switched over to a fee based model and it worked for me. Awesome. I want to support that. If that is what works best for you, let's do it but the information. I don't think anyone can argue with the fact that if you're going to change it, you should let people know. There's my schpeel for that. You will get this. If anyone else is feeling good tomorrow, I'll be there. Me and Dawn will be there fighting the good fight. Even if you just want to go to Olympia, you get a free ride with me. I really want to put importance on this because if people don't call or feel that this is important, they will drop it. No matter how much I can do or rub shoulders with people, if we say hey this is important to us but then no one shows up, then that's what it is. A little bit of realism there too.

Dawn: Could I suggest that we can put it on the GPSS Facebook page as instructions on what people can do? Then I can share that around in my program.

Chris E: We can do that but I'll give you another idea. If literally half the people in this room do it, it'll be enough. If 15 or 20 people, it'll make enough of an impression that people cared. It's even written in there. I couldn't make it today but I still wanted write. A lot of times, we don't want to piss people off because people don't like the form stuff too much. It's a pain in the ass and people don't like it. You don't want people to not like us because we send a bunch of spam mail. Literally 15-20 people do this, that's awesome and that's great. If we can get half the people in this room. Literally tonight you'll get it and if you can spend 3 minutes on this and say for the whole year that you did your part. Next thing is Metro. The King County Council voted unanimously to put Prop 1 on the ballot. This is a measure for funding to save Metro and the routes. It's next Wednesday, March 5th. It's from 6:30 to 8pm. If you're not in the exec committee, you should be available maybe. Just one last time, tomorrow is a big day. We need your help tomorrow.

Chris L: Any questions for Chris? Thank you. The next thing is Alice for our executive senator vacancy.
Executive Senator Vacancy:

Alice: We have an executive senator vacancy once again. We’re hoping that someone will step up and we’ve talked to you guys before on why it’s so important so I’m not going to bore you. I would encourage you to contact someone on the committee or one of the officers and next meeting we’re going to have a vote. We will elect a new executive senator. If you’re interested between now and then, come to our meeting next Wednesday at 6:30pm at the GPSS office and see how the meetings go. If you know of someone that had to leave early just let them know and if there anyone that knows if they might be interested, please state your name and department so we can get it on the record.

Douglass: Douglass Tabor. Evans School of Public Affairs

Alan-Michael Weatherford (Comparative Literature): Alan-Michael Weatherford, Comparative Literature.

Alice: Alright. Hope to see you at our meeting next Wednesday.

Announcements:

Chris L: Now announcements.

Elisa: The elections committee need to form because elections will be coming up rather soon. It’s 4 at large or active senators. One will be a chair. You meet as many times between now and elections as the chair deems appropriate. This is the officer elections. We need to form this committee as soon as possible. We have moved the officer election date back a few weeks from when it was last year. Is anyone interested in being that elections committee? The responsibilities are to making sure that the GPSS elections are fair and transparent and inclusive. That you update this elections packet and that you conduct the elections when they happen on April 23rd. It’s relatively simple. One of the former member of the elections committee is here. Did you want to add anything, Duru?

Duru: It’s a really simple job to do. You just make sure that everything that was done last year is done this year and Joshua is here also. He can attest to this as well. Just make sure that everything we did last year is good for this year. The only hiccup we had last year was that it was a really close election so we just made sure that what we did was by the book and that resulted in a proper election.

Josh: It’s an easy job.

Elisa: Is there four people that just want to say like I will commit to make this happen.
Duru: If you’re in the Judicial committee, you can’t serve.

Elisa: Yes. You can't serve if you're an officer or if you’re running. You have 35 day before the election to pull yourself out of the elections committee if you're interested in doing that. So if you guys, Joshua and Duru, maybe stay afterwards and answer any questions, I would really like to see a couple more people volunteering?

Steve: What specific time would this be at?

Elisa: That would be up to the committee to decide.

Duru: Most of our communication was over email. We only met twice before the elections.

Dawn: If I don’t have to meet I can.

Elisa: Thank you, we have four. If those four can come see me after the senate, we can connect you all and Joshua and Duru can answer any questions you guys have. Thank you.

Chris L: Are there any announcements?

Alan-Michael: The Diversity committee is putting on a new forum this Monday 12:30 to 1:30 in 214, here at the HUB. It’s on Gender, Sex and Sexuality. What we’re talking about is the student teacher relationship in the classroom and how to build a vocabulary when you're in the classroom. If you’re interested, please come on out.

Elisa: And please take a poster.

Gary: Tomorrow, for the $15 an hour deal, there's a meeting here at Thompson Hall, room 135. If you’re interested in fighting or working towards that or seeing that realized, it’s Thomson Hall, room 135 tomorrow at 5:30.

Chris L: Any other announcements? We don't have quorum to close this meeting so we can’t adjourn. So this meeting is done.