Call to Order & Approval of Agenda:

Chris Lizotte (President): I would like to call this meeting to order at 5:32pm. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. I would like to entertain a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): I would like to make a motion to remove Adam Sherman to adjourn us and make it Chris Lizotte.


Chris L: Any objections?

Elisa: I would like to make an addition to add Jen Carroll between item 3 and 4 for a 5 minute tops discussion on title 9 and 88.


Chris L: Any objections? Now I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

Yasmeen Hussain (Biology): I move to approve the agenda.

Edward: I second.

Approval of Minutes:

Chris L: Any objections? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. Moving on to the approval of the minutes, I will entertain a motion to amend or approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Eric Scheufler (Germanics): I move to approve the minutes.

Justin Bare (Computer Science & Engineering): Second.

Title 9-88 Presentation:

Chris L: Any objections? Moving on to item 3b, we have Jen Carroll. Could you briefly introduce yourself?
Jen Carroll (Guest): Thank you. My name is Jen Carroll and I'm a student in Anthropology and Epidemiology. I'm actually here representing Amanda Pay who is the Title 9 ADA Coordinator. ADA is the American Disabilities Act. Title 9 is federal legislation which basically protects everyone that falls under the ADA. So that is gender, physically impaired students, sexuality, race and all those sorts of things. A lot of conversations have been had between UW following a particular incident of discrimination against a current student in a department that we will not name. One of the things that we discovered in this particular issue is not only the professor who was guilty of the discriminatory act was not aware of the protections and accommodations of the students that is protected by federal law but neither of the professors really wanted to advocate for the student because they weren't aware of what was out there. With our help, Amanda is doing a lot more targeted outreach and communication training to try and normalize these sorts of things. I know that it's the very end of the year. This is a kind of a quick and dirty method but one of the things that we wanted to do to get started was tapping into GPSS as a resource of a student body and we've come up with this. It's a Title 9-88 temperature check. There's a couple of questions. How well does your department support these particular areas of diversity? So there's gender, equity for those with disabilities, pregnant students, queer equity and things of that nature. We're just asking you to check a box if it's going pretty well or if it can use some improvement in your department. We're aware that you might not have any idea of what pregnant students experience in your department. That's perfectly fine. Worst case scenario is we get to meet each other and we get a little bit of information but this is really to find some places to do targeted outreach and start hitting the road first thing next year. I want to let you know that we haven't told anyone we're doing this. We're not going to push departments and say, "Oh, your GPSS senator has pointed out that you have an issue." What's happening is we're going to take these after the meeting. I'm going to ask you to put them in here. We ask you to put down your program and check it off. You're under no obligation to do this whatsoever. I'm going to look at these, make a little list and shred them today. The only person who will read this is me. If you want to fold it in half, you can do that too. I'll never know if you didn't do it either. So I'm going to be passing these around with pens and I'll be hanging outside to collect them. Thank you guys.

GPSS Spotlight: Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies Department

Chris L: Something that Jen didn't mention is that she's a former GPSS employee. She was our office manager couple year back. Next up, we have our GPSS Spotlight on Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies department by Alma.

Alma Khasawnih (Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies): Hi, I'm Alma. I'm a second year PhD student in the Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies department. I was in Cairo during the Arab Spring and in particular I look at what I'm referring to as transnational political imaginaries. How is the graffiti on the wall reimagining or imagining a different way of a nationalist movement? But this talk is not about me. It's about my department. My department is one that has been existence on campus for the last 17 and some years. It's the first women's studies department giving a PhD anywhere in the US. As a definition, gender, women and sexuality studies aims to
really examine and question and challenge the normative and dominant narratives we see in the world today. Not only in social sciences and history and all of those but also in the myth of objectivity in science. What does it mean to be objectivity in anything and this falls very much under what science deems as true. In 2011, if you’ve been here since then, the department changed its name from Women Studies to Gender, Women and Sexuality Studies because we’re not all women nor are we all women identified nor do we study only women and we’ll talk about that a little bit. Also, the feminist movement has changed and women’s studies has changed. Therefore defining it as gender, women and sexuality is much more in move with the discipline itself. Our doctorate is actually in feminist studies, which is also a political decision that has been made. Not only do we have undergraduates, which I don’t talk about here almost at all, but we have 200 undergraduates who are in the major and several hundred who are minors in the department. We have two graduate certificates. One is in Queer & Sexuality Studies and the other is Feminist Studies, which has been going on since the beginning of the department but only recently has it gotten a certificate of its own in the Graduate School. Alright, about us a little bit more. This is some of the graduate student body. About our demographics, and I talk about these because this is a very special department in a very normative institution. We have a total of 14 students. The minorities are 35% compared to campus wide, which is only 21%. International students make up 21% while campus-wide is only 18%. The total of our student body are these numbers. This is total graduate students. The university accepts about 12,000 graduate students. Only 2,580 are minorities and we are talking about students of color. Please just note the numbers. They are amazing. And with international students, 2,100. It’s quite fascinating. We accept students who are trans, queer, gay, lesbian and we also accept straight identified students. As far as faculty, they are also very special compared to everyone else on this campus. For our demographics, we have 8 full time faculty, part time lecturer is 7, Native American 1, part time lecturer who is also Native American is 1. Again in comparison to campus, we are 40% minorities while campus is 21% minority faculty. With Native Americans, we have 13% of our faculty while campus is 0.2%. So the current scholarships that happens here and I think it’s really important for me as a student of gender, women and sexuality is to understand that our scholarship is not only about women or women somewhere else in the world. The students look at, and I made a bubble. We are an interdisciplinary department but we actually call ourselves undisciplined. Because we do not have a particular discipline that we work in. We work in multiple disciplines. Mine, for example, is Near East Studies, I’m in Media Studies, Anthropology and Geography and that’s only my own dissertation. Other people, they work everywhere. We are on all continents and we look at animals and human animals. The same with our faculty. I didn’t make a bubble for them so you can read more clearly what they do. It’s not really only about women and it’s quite amazing that women studies and gender, women and sexuality studies departments are just about women. Then the other, which I think a lot of you should know is we are on the cutting edge of scholarships that is shaping the US and the world. Two of those are public scholarships and that means that there is a certificate called a certificate in public scholarships and part of the reason they created it is part of our department. Most of the work that we do is very much involved in Seattle and in the world and it needs to be recognized as scholarship. Here are some of the things that we do. There’s a project called Queer in the Museum by Nicole Robert, who works with someone else and for the
first time ever in history of museums ever in the United States has there ever been a exhibit about queer people's work and Mohai has an exhibit there. The other is Women Who Rock. It is an unconferenced conference. It brings comminutes with faculty and university and they work through understanding scholarships from different places where knowledge should be qualified as scholarship. Then there’s my project which I work on gentrification and rezoning of 23rd and Union. Then there is the digital humanities. Some of you do the digital humanities. A lot of the work has come out of our department and some of that work is by my advisor, Sasha Welland. Her book will be online in both English and Chinese. It’s a different way of saying that knowledge also needs to be digital in the ways that we live and the digital space needs also to be criticized as a hierarchical place that was built by certain people and also needs to be, as a platform, changed that allows for multiplicity instead of the hegemonic ways of building it. Then there is Monica de la Torre. She works on building an archive of chicano radio work. Another, I come back to Women Who Rock: The Digital Oral History archive. This is in the University of Washington libraries and will be preserved for 1000 years up to renewal, which is amazing. Who knew that you can make an agreement to save your work for 1000 years? You can and that's it. You can ask me a couple questions.

Chris L: Is one of your faculty members Richard Negard?

Alma: No, but she’s in Chicago but she is one of the most influential scholars who has changed the face of feminism when you look at transnational feminism. Transnational doesn’t mean globalization. Especially in Political Science and Sociology, it means globalization and that’s not what we mean. It’s a different way of creating connections between people without creating issues so based on hierarchical systems. Negard was a very influential scholar.

Chris L: Okay, I thought she was here and I was just going to brag about that.

Alma: So we can brag about a couple people. Our chair, Prithi Ramamurthy, is an economist from India and actually, she’s understated in our university which is really sad. She’s one of the most important, if not the most important economist who’s working on feminist commodity chains and how this labor is understood if you look at it from a feminist perspective. A feminist perspective, for all of you who are critical thinkers of your own work, it just means that you are not looking from something from one view. You cannot look at class without understanding gender and sexuality, able bodies, location and society; any of those. You must be able to understand the person in their complexity. So Prithi Ramamurthy traveled in January all over the world to meet with people who traveled to meet her in Holland and for them to be advised by her for the whole week. Any of you who are economists and looking at commodities in India and rural agriculture, that’s a person you must talk to. I can brag some more. Shirley Yi, a historian, looks at 19th century African American women but also talks about culture and how gender, class and sexuality played in popular culture even in tupperwares and plastics. I’ll be TA-ing with her in the fall.
Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): I was wondering if you could talk about new wave feminism and the clash of the titans with the old bra burning feminism and the new wave feminism. How does that play out in the university with women at the top? Are they bringing up the ladder behind them?

Alma: Let’s be clear about the bra burning feminists. Despite the fact that I wear a bra everyday, it kills me because it’s painful wearing a bra. Just so we’re clear for those of you who don’t wear a bra. It’s actually like holding your balls and it’s painful. If it’s comfortable without it, I wouldn’t wear one but it’s actually less comfortable not wearing one. There was one incident that people burned their bra in the history of feminism in the US. So feminism has nothing to do with bra burning. New wave feminism is not a terminology that is used in this department on campus. We actually want to move away from the concept of waves in feminism. It eliminates the work that has been done by women of color of feminists and negates the work that they’ve always been doing in the US and outside of it. It’s not a term we use. We move away from those. We think of third world feminisms and it’s not referred to the global south. It’s actually women of color that come from that world, academic school and practice in the US and think of their feminism as third world and it’s similar to women of color feminism. These are terminologies that we use. We don’t have a third wave feminism. This term is heterosexual, white women mainstream wordage. It’s some kind of practice but not one that we aspire to be. Women on top on this campus. I don’t know. I think there are only a few woman on top on this campus and one of the major issues is we have very few anywhere. We celebrate them seldomly and we talk about them rarely and there are few who are full professors. When there are more women to talk about, I can engage with whether they carry other women with them or not but I don’t know any of them and if they carry others or not.

Steve Carlin (Chemistry): You mentioned during your explanation of transnationalism and the north vs. south. In Alice’s question, you used the term global south. I was wondering if you could clarify what you mean by you’re from the south in this respect?

Alma: So one of the things that feminism does is to look at the world from a different perspective. It’s a completely different epistemology. One og the ways to do that is that it’s not first world and third world. This is terminology that doesn’t really work. I’m from Detroit and a lot of people say Detroit looks like third world. It’s in the US. I don’t know what that means. The idea that global south and global north are geographically more fluid and I think it’s important for us to not be able to think of them in certain ways. I don’t know of any other terminology of west and east. I don’t know how else to use that. As for transnational feminism, I’ll use an example. So when I think of transnational political imaginary in the work that I do, I think what does it mean for graffiti in Cairo right now to be speaking to Occupy here or to be speaking to a graffiti movement that is happening in Mexico? It’s beyond the nation state. It’s an attempt to think outside those borders that are already hegemonic in their own ways. That is what transnational is. It’s an attempt to be what transgendered and transcending anything. It’s an inbetween state. So that’s what we use most of the time to try to make relationships between places.
F&B Departmental Allocations Recommendations:

Chris L: That brings us to time for this portion but of course, it's extensible. Seeing none, let's thank Alma. And terms like global north and global south in Geography, I can talk for hours. Actually, this summer you should come and take the class I'm teaching which is titled Geographies of International Development. We'll discuss a lot about those terms and how they are both useful and not useful. The next on our agenda is Genesis who's going to talk to us about what F&B has come up with their recommendations for departmental allocations.

Genesis: We thought this was our last meeting, but we need more feedback from everyone. No one has gone to Colin's website about funding guidelines and levels. This is what we're thinking about. These are the levels and then the amount of money you have. We're thinking that the cap was about $750. The floor is $300. The link will go out in tonight's email but we're going to encourage you guys to participate in the discussion board with funding levels and department sizes.

Edward: I think we decided that the lower amount is $350 so no one will be cut. So the minimum amount will remain at $350 and it will be a way to give more money to the in between departments. There are very few of them but if they do apply, they can get more money while at the same time maintaining funding for the rest.

Genesis: At the same time, these are not hard and fast guidelines. The committee has discretion on how much to give departments. They can choose to do a $10 per student or a $350 amount. It's totally at the committee's discretion. You shouldn't be hung up on certain funding levels on your application.

Chris E: Is that within a certain frame? Some departments have 300-400 students. $10 a student is pretty high.

Genesis: Yes, so it's also at the committee's discretion depending on your department size and what you're asking for. That's also taken into consideration a lot on your application.

Edward: I would say that for the very large departments, there's questions about how many people would actually benefit from the item. We keep that in consideration too. There should be flexibility for the committee. At the same time, if we set $10 per student, that's more than half of the total department budget.

Genesis: So please participate on the online discussion and the link will go out tonight.

Chris L: Any other questions for Genesis?

Alma: So the points that Eddie's talking about being flexible as a committee, are those in writing in some way so when the committee changes, that's still understood?
Genesis: We’re revising our guidelines as well and yes, that’s in writing.

Chris L: Good question. The best intentions don’t mean diddly if they’re not in writing.

Genesis: If you want to be on F&B next year, keep it in mind.

Chris L: Any other questions? Seeing none, we’ll truck right along to Smoking Site Survey by Yasmeen and Ragan.

**Smoking Site Survey:**

Yasmeen: Hi everyone. Remember how we did a smoking site survey at the end of November? So we wanted to come back with the information from our survey. It’s still preliminary and we’re still working on analysis. The survey just ended a week and half ago but we wanted to let you know some things before the year ended.

Ragan Hart (Public Health Genetics): Yes, and to provide a visual update. So we’ll start with a little bit of background about the survey which you should all be familiar with since we gave a presentation about getting the link out. Our incentive was offered for those that participated in the survey and it was sent out to students, staff and departmental listservs as well as different organization, like FIUTS to try to reach international folks. We also reached out to the Graduate School, the faculty senate and staff had access to the survey link as well. Additionally, there were several different collection dates to garner in person survey responses outside the HUB.

Yasmeen: How that worked, I asked about it and basically they sit out there with a bunch of printed copies of the survey and a sign that said “Win Prizes” and the people fill out a survey and they win prizes.

Ragan: An additional avenue of dissemination was announcements were posted in the designated smoking sites, and on actual areas around campus on some of the flyer boards and in different departments. As Yasmeen said the study period was December through a week and half ago. The goal of the survey was to collect pilot information and data on the attitudes and beliefs towards the designated smoking areas on this campus. We’re going to present some of these results. We had about 482 respondents and the breakdown of the affiliations in UW can be seen here. We have about 36% undergrad students, 40% graduate students and it trickles down to 7% faculty and nearly 15% staff. Of the students, we had 9% who were international students and about 17% lived in UW Housing. Additionally, almost 11% identified themselves as smokers.

Yasmeen: This is an interesting thing to try to pick out. We didn’t ask them “Do you smoke?” We pulled that out of other responses. For example, “I am a smoker and I would like to continue smoking.” If they answered that, then we counted them as someone who wanted to smoke.
Ragan: So moving on to some more results. We have, again, the total number of respondents, which was 482 and you can see that there’s an equal number of respondents who were bothered by designated smoking areas and those who are not. Also, there are a number of respondents that didn’t answer.

Yasmeen: Also in this part, these were checkboxes so people didn’t have to fill it out. 17% said they didn’t even encounter smoking areas on campus.

Ragan: So that’s something to consider as far as the location about the designated smoking areas and who doesn’t have to be exposed to those areas and who does based on daily schedule and routine. Moving on, we asked some questions on whether there should be more smoking sites, fewer smoking sites and no smoking sites. For more smoking sites, only 14% said yes and nearly 70% said no with about 90% who didn’t respond. For fewer smoking sites, 41% said yes, 39% said no and about 100 respondents who didn’t answer. For no smoking sites, 30% said yes, 60% said no and significantly fewer proportion weren’t missing from this question.

Yasmeen: We’re actually looking at this question and wondering if this is a more polarizing question when people say “Yes, definitely there should not be” or “Yes, definitely there should be.” There is more leeway in the questions themselves and more fewer people who didn’t respond. We also had a lot of qualitative response and a lot of the comments said things like, “Oh, it’s fine as it is.” That can be where some of these people are falling out where it’s somewhere in between.

Chris L: So real quick, we’ve reached time on this. Can I get a motion to extend time?

Gary Hothi (Social Work): I move for a 5 minutes extension.

Douglass Taber (Evans School of Public Affairs): Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Ragan: So most of the designated smoking areas were cited as problematic. In fact, nearly 15% of respondents identified at least one designated smoking area as problematic, 24% identified 2 or more as posing a problem and 33 of the 38 sites were actually identified as problematic.

Yasmeen: It’s either 37 or 38. Some of them are closing or moving so they were hard to keep track of.

Ragan: That can be an issue as far as...well that’s for later interpretations.

Yasmeen: Basically, these are the sites ordered as most cited as problematic. The ones that are squared are sites that have been closed. One was closed due to EH&S, Environmental
Health & Safety’s, decision and others were closed or moved because of construction. Some were closed de facto because construction occurred on them so they’re gone. So that’s useful to know. Some are falling out as more problematic and some people don’t care for others. This is a little graphic to show you where the sites are that were identified as problematic and how many people thought how serious they were. The red ones that are mentioned more often so 30-55 mentions of that site. You can see that a lot of the sites cluster on areas on campus. I don’t know if you guys have seen this map but this is where the smoking sites are on campus and they are those yellow tiny boxes. Then the big yellow, red and orange boxes designated how many people cited them as problems. So people were also asked to rate how problematic they were from one to five, where five being the most problematic. So you can see they kind of all fall into the 3/4 range. Maybe not extreme but on the problematic end. We looked at this for the sites that people chose to designate how bad they thought it was so the number was smaller than the number of people who rated it and we also looked at the most cited sites. UW affiliation might partially explain some of the smoking attitudes on campus. So when we look at undergraduates, graduate students, faculty and staff, the breakdowns do change a little. The faculty seems pretty evenly split and undergrads, grad students and even staff seem like more people leaning towards the no. They think that there should be some smoking sites. So for international students, 63% who would oppose complete ban and 37% would support one. So this is a graphic that shows the sites that were cited as most problematic matched with the sites that smokers said that they used. So as you can see, they are exactly the same. The ones that are popular are the ones that are most problematic. Some qualitative responses said things like, “When there’s tons of people using the area, that’s when I have a problem.” This could explain why it’s happening. It’s something to consider where smoking sites are placed in the future.

Smokers also provided comment. 10-11% of the survey respondents are smokers and a lot of them said they felt harassed, stigmatized or criticized for using smoking areas. This is a direct quote from the survey. Interestingly, this is the number of people who said they would continue smoking or quit smoking who answered those questions. Other takeaways from this survey, particularly enforcement. Some people said people using smoking areas isn’t a problem. The people who aren’t is the problem. Sorry, I’m on the wrong slide in my head. So this is the placement of sites. So when people stated problematic sites, whether there were smokers or non-smokers, they said things like, “It gets in the way.” So non smokers said they received smoke when they weren’t intending to and smokers even commented that they didn’t want to be in the way of pedestrians. Some people experienced smoke drifting into buildings. They said “The wind traps smoking down the hall,” or “Smoke traps and goes into my dorm room.” They also said, “There’s smoke sites to the IMA or to the Health Center,” and they had problems with that. A lot of people had specific suggestions. They were really helpful. They suggested moving it down to a corner or be an enclosed areas.

Chris L: Just a quick question, how much more do you have? You are at time again.

Yasmeen: Approximately one more slide.

Chris L: Then I will exercise the chair’s prerogative to let you finish it.
Yasmeen: Thank you. So enforcement, people are saying that not a lot of enforcement in non-designated smoking areas. Responders were also saying that if people remove the sites, smokers will smoke wherever. Some people expressed confusion on smoking sites on campus. So, “I was under the impression that this campus banned smokers.” Also, “I was under the impression that this area I was smoking was a smoking area.” So lot’s of confusion. Maybe getting into that a little bit. Last slide, so limitations. Despite our best efforts, it’s not a representative sample of the UW population. There’s firstly the response bias. There were people who opened the survey and then 30% didn’t even submit the survey. 63% of the campus is undergrads and only 30% of our respondents were undergraduates. In retrospect, some other questions would have been useful like sex, race, smoking status, etc. This is all informational since we’re out of time but I’m going to be here after and we’re hoping to disseminate this as a larger report with more information and I would appreciate some comments on how to best do that.

Elisa: Could anyone who still has Jen Carroll’s ADA thing pass it to her?

Jen: I’ll also throw my email on the board for anyone who wants to get in touch for any reason.

Chris L: Thank you Ragan and Yasmeen. Since this is an issue that’s being discussed on campus and is a matter of policy that is being looked around, it’s really great of you guys to do this. Could you provide context for this project and why it was done? Did you do it on your own accord?

Yasmeen: I tried to contact the EH&S people about a smoking site and there was no comment system so we figured we would get some information on what people thought of.

Chris L: That is so cool. It is being talked about there is policy under consideration so the fact that you two took the initiative to do this is something that they now have information.

Gary: I second that.

**Senate Improvement Working Group Update:**

Chris L: Thank you. Next, we’re going to from Alice to hear an update on the senate improvement working group.

Alice: Hi everyone. I’m here to report back. This is from a really good work. Can I have everyone from this committee stand up if they’re here? These people are so dedicated. Every single week we’ve been meeting tirelessly to discuss all the issues that was brought up not only in the focus groups of the senate but in the discussion that we had here that Chris facilitated and the responses on the Catalyst. So we talked tirelessly on these issues and what the different things are and the angles and what’s going to be the best for GPSS moving forward. We’re working on a written document right now for recommendations. This is just an update and
overview of the things that we’re talking about and you guys will have another week to give further input on the Catalyst website. These are the main themes we came up with. One is the GPSS atmosphere, parliamentary procedure, online community and connectedness, roles and responsibilities and GPSS bylaws. The first one basically is the senate meeting atmosphere. We feel like we struggled with this over the years to determine if it should be a more conversation deliberation space or do people just want to come here to get information. Striking that balance is difficult and we really liked how it felt at the meeting that Chris facilitated, the temperature reading or State of GPSS where we were in small group discussion and having really structured area for people to deliberate and talk about and bring to the whole group. We like that feel of the participatory model but we also recognize that people say, “I want to come to the meetings to get information.” So we want a balance. So senate responsibility, we want people to read materials ahead of time and come prepared and having some people come from the outside and give us information at the meeting. We want to be more inclusive and focus on interactions between senators. We also wove in the idea of the new senate orientation to have quarterly orientation for all senators. That includes new students but also just so everyone is on the same page to recap what we did the previous quarter but to remind everyone the procedures and to talk to each other. Maybe having a different meet and greet model in case there are new people and get people talking to each other to build relationships and a community within senate. We also talked about revamping the senator handbook. How many have you seen the senate handbook? That’s more than I would’ve anticipated but we want everyone to be on the same line so we’ll talk a little more about that in our recommendations but we really want there to be comprehensive senate guide with all the information that we need. As far as peer mentoring goes, we talked about it and we would like it to be an informal way but still structured. We’ll give an opportunity during senate meeting for people to meet and talk with different people where you can identify who is a senior senator and to find someone you jive with and not someone you’re forced to talk to. Parliamentary procedure. We wanted to give it its own category because it was such a big topic. We wanted to acknowledge the value of parli pro and give a nod to Chris for his excellent execution of parliamentary procedure last meeting which really called for it with difficult discussions like that where you have a lot of people speaking at one time. It’s a really useful model and he demonstrated that really well to really understand the benefit of that and it should be used as a tool for democracy and not as limiting factor from keeping people from saying the right terms. We want to reiterate that it’s more important for your voices to be heard than to use the precise language. It would be great if the correct term was used and people use them as a way to speak up in a discussion that you think is going the wrong way.

Chris L: Just to exercise an element of parliamentary procedure, we’re at time for this but I’ll call for a motion to extend time.

Alex Bolton (Law): I move to extend by 5 minutes.

Aileen Murphy (Rehabilitation Medicine): I second.
Alice: We also want a poster for parli pro and at every meeting, have the terms of parli pro written on the poster. We’ll work on that with the Secretary over the summer. Also, someone had the brilliant idea of having a parli pro cheat sheet behind our name tags. So just to make it as transparent and easy as possible for people to access. Online community and connectedness. There’s a sign-up sheet in the back for anyone who wants a training session with Dawn. For her job, she helps people set up LinkedIn profiles and as a graduate and professional student, I recommend you have a LinkedIn profile and she’s offered to help people do this. If you have a resume already and meet with her, she can help you right away if you’re interested. She created a LinkedIn group for us. If you’re not already a member, it’s a way to connect current and past senators to get some historical perspective. Also, there’s this GPSS wiki that’s what you call a myth. There is a wiki.

Chris L: It has been rediscovered. We found the lost city of Troy.

Alice: Good way of putting it. It’s actually super easy to find. It’s the gpss website slash wiki. We really want to revamp that and make sure anyone can go to it and have access to it. We can use it as kind of an information, minute/document holding workspace so groups can use it, committees can use it to do a lot of their work on it and it will also have a lot of information for people who want to learn about GPSS. New senators can go back and read old stuff. We think it’s going to be great so I’m not going to spend more time talking about that. There’s our LinkedIn page, yay. There’s our wiki, yay. So rules and responsibilities. We talked about basically changing the way we do senate roles and responsibilities. Right now, you come to meetings, you take information back, we send you an email and you forward it. We really want it to be a participatory model where you not only identify with what your responsibilities are and you are not using language that I just did. We say “you” a lot, like you the senators or you the officers and you the committee. It shouldn’t be like that. It’s all of us. It’s we, the senate. Things don’t happen unless we do it together so I think focusing on that next year would be cool have us all talk about ourselves like that and to see ourselves like that and take responsibility in the senate. If the senate is not doing something, it’s our fault. It’s not your fault. Then Executive committee members talked about maybe having some alleviated responsibilities with senators sitting on more committees. Also, to just clarify the responsibilities of the executive senators who are representing all the senators in the Executive committee. We also talked about doing quarterly reviews of GPSS officers and staff. Then the bylaws revisions. Chris has some recommendations and ideas. As a committee, we thought this was beyond the scope with what we were charged with doing and we hoped that some members and people interested in working with next year’s officers with developing a plan for bylaws that will be voted on in the fall. So if anyone is interested in that, we would love to hear from you and that’s all.

**PeaceHealth Resolution**

Chris L: Are there any questions? I would like reiterate my thanks for what this group is doing. They’ve really taken everything we did at that last meeting and ran with it, developed it and fought through it. Please go to the Catalyst page so you can see all the things such as what this
President Lizotte has suggested. I also want to reiterate the importance of thinking about these things for the summer. The Executive committee usually meets monthly but this year they have chosen to meet more than monthly. The summer is a really important time to really hammer out these details so the implementation can happen rapidly. I'll stop yapping about that. Next, we have the resolution we tabled last week. I'll just make a quick observation about our resolution process and that it's rusty. The machinery is rusty. This is the second resolution that we have considered as a senate. For reference, the ASUW Senate, not to be like them since they have 3-5 hour meetings, but in a typical meeting they'll be hearing and considering at least 5-6 resolutions every week and we've done two all year. That's not an indictment of anyone or anything but it does demonstrate that our process for resolutions and deliberating resolutions is out of practice. Keeping that all in mind, the sponsors of this resolution took it back and it's been available on Google Docs. This is the version which existed 48 hours ago. There was one comment I removed from the top but this is how it existed 48 hours ago through which changes may be suggested. We have tried to strip down the resolution to something that we feel is much more in line with the original intent which was simply to ask the admin to clarify their position between themselves and PeaceHealth. Having said that, I have some amendments. First I want to open it to the floor to see if there are any amendments to be made.

Maryclare Griffin (Statistics): I don't know about everyone else but I don't know what document it was mine was stubbed.

Yasmeen: Maybe you can make it smaller?

Chris L: Yes, that is the entire resolution.

Haley Hyatt (Dentistry): It was stubbed on the Google Doc.

Chris L: Somehow that was taken out and I put that back in myself. That's what was missing. You're right. If there are none, I would like to offer amendments. One of the other co-sponsor is here. She may, as she wishes, accept them as friendly amendments or if not, they can be voted on by the senate. After the 3rd whereas clause, so after line 19, adding another whereas clause, “Whereas affiliations between public university teaching hospitals and faith based medical providers are nearly unprecedented and therefore the future impacts of the present affiliation are unpredictable; and.” Esra, do you accept?

Esra Camci (Oral Biology): I accept.

Chris L: Next one, striking all of the next whereas clause and replacing it with “Whereas previous communication by the UW and UWMC leadership regarding the affiliation with PeaceHealth including impact or lack thereof at UWMC facilities on research, medical training, and medical practice is not easily accessible, and contained in multiple and disjointed online and offline places, and therefore difficult to understand as a complete and coherent statement of values; and.”
Maggie: Could you scroll up? So we can actually see it.

Yasmeen: I have a question as to how the previous paragraph not being clear? Does it not describe what you wrote?

Chris L: The issue is that there have been definitive statements made. It’s been all over the place. To find them, you have to go on a mushroom hunt through Google. It’s not contained in one easily accessible, easily findable place.

Yasmeen: A follow up to that is does your next amendment on how they should say this?

Chris L: Yes.

Maryclare: I was a little concerned about the specific referring to the UWMC facilities because it was my understanding that some of these concerns were to situations that arise for University of Washington medical students who receive training in other PeaceHealth facilities.

Austin Wright-Pettibone (GPSS University Affairs Director): I have two points I want to make here. One, this is the end of the whereas statements. “And” doesn’t have to be there. Two, the amendment has to be accepted as friendly for discussion on the amendment to occur. So you can either choose to accept it as not friendly, in which case you will speak to the amendment and then discussion can occur or you accept it as friendly and you go back to the resolution as a whole, in which case you can make an amendment.

Esra: So in the interest of discussion, I will accept it as friendly.

Chris L: Then we can discuss the entire resolution when finished. So next, striking all the first that clause and replacing it with or adding, “That the GPSS urges the UW and UWMC leadership to consolidate all pertinent statements and announcements regarding the UW/PeaceHealth affiliation in one easily accessible online location so that the public may clearly understand the nature of the affiliation between the two organizations; and that the GPSS directs the GPSS President to monitor UW Medicine policy by whatever means he or she deems appropriate in the event that such policy is altered as a result of the affiliation such that it impacts student training at UWMC and other facilities where students admitted to the UW School of Medicine are trained, and advocate on behalf of medical students as needed.” I’m going to change “he or she” to “they” and “deems” to “deem.”

Matthew Aghai (Environmental & Forest Sciences): Also, accessibly should be accessible.

Chris L: Do you accept these as friendly, Esra?

Esra: Can I change a wording and add after medical “and other clinical students?”
Chris L: Yes.

Esra: Then yes.

Chris L: Seeing as how all amendments have been accepted as friendly amendments, debate may now begin on the resolution as a whole.

Jenny Taylor (Microbiology): I have one another amendment. Could you scroll up? The third whereas statement, striking after PeaceHealth so striking the third lines.

Chris: Can you get rid of the other strikethroughs so we know where we are? Esra?

Esra: No, I don’t accept.

Jenny: So the reason I think that it is not necessary and pertinent to this resolution is the whereas statement below clarifies the whole point for sticking everything in one place and all the examples I could find were two hospitals where one then changed their policy and procedures and things based on ERTs in one of the cases of the mergers and it’s not a public institution like UW affiliating with a private faith based medical practice. It seems like these examples aren’t directly pertinent to this case. I feel like the next whereas clause states what this case is, that it is different from what’s happened before and that’s the rationale behind this clause and resolution.

Chris L: Would anyone like to speak against the proposed amendment?

Alex: I have a classmate that was a nurse in the Franciscan system and she brought that up to me as something to look at. I take your point that mergers are different than agreements but I do think that this was something that was a concern of some of the medical students so that’s probably why it’s in there. I think it’s unclear whether or not it needs to be in there but maybe to address the concerns of medical students, we should.

Chris L: I’ll entertain a motion to extend time since we are over time.

Alex: I’ll extend by 10 minutes.

Maggie: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Haley: I don’t know if we have the factual basis for that phrase and maybe it’s a potentially safer way of stating that. I do agree with the amendment on the table though. I think that those two lines don’t serve any purpose other than being accusatory.
Chris L: Anyone would like to speak against that?

Elizabeth Vodicka (SPHERE Representative): What we heard from medical residents and people who are involved in this letter is that they're concerned less about how it will affect the work of the UW Medical Center and more about how it might affect the type of training they get when they're working in residency in PeaceHealth. One of the clauses is that they're going to expand locations for more residents in their training program and so I don't think this is necessary but I do think adding in a clause where students at UW can voice their concerns regarding the affiliation and the potential impact it might have on them and the type of training they're able to receive when working in PeaceHealth facilities and facilities that do follow ethical and religious directives.

Haley: Could Jenny accept that as a proposal to her amendment?

Austin: You can make an amendment to an amendment. It's amendable.

Chris: If you have an exact wording, then we can work with that.

Elizabeth: Give me one minute to write it out.

Yasmeen: I wonder if saying more vague language would help as opposed to removing this clause. It sounds like the concern or part of the concern with forming a partnership but instead of saying that secular hospitals may be or often are moved to adopt when they form mergers clarifying that you know it’s been done before and then in the next clause, you can say it’s a different situation so it’s not predictable. You can say there’s a history why were talking about out this and say here’s why we need to clarify.

Jenny: I feel like that is open to accidental misinterpretation. I don’t know how many people are really aware and cognizant enough to differentiate a merger and an affiliation. Sticking those back to back unintentionally links those. The case of the matter is, it’s already stated below that there’s a precedent. The fact that this happened in the merger is not directly relatable to what’s going on here and my concern is that it will be confused with what’s happened in this case. Someone would say, “Okay, you’re talking about a merger here,” and not really fully realize that its a completely different situation.

Maryclare: In that case, can we add an additional sentence that says affiliation are not mergers? I think it’s misleading to say that it is not a precedent. Merger is a loose precedent to an affiliation.

Chris L: We have to consider the proposed amendment before but the point is well taken. Rather than proposing new language or language that is already there, let’s speak to the amendment.
Maryclare: I was saying that that amendment proposed would be fine if we made a change in the following one.

Elizabeth: So what about something like, “Where of the students of the University of Washington voiced their concerns regarding the affiliation of UWMC and PeaceHealth and the potential impact it may have on their ability to receive comprehensive training that they are able to receive when placed or working in facilities that follow ethical and religious directives.”

Alma: Can we type that out?

Chris L: So this would be replacing the struck language. Okay, Jenny do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

Jenny: Not as is.

Chris: Okay, is there a second for the amendment to the amendment?

Haley: Second.

Chris L: Then we’ll discuss the amendment to the amendment.

Jenny: So my difficulty with this is “their ability to receive comprehensive training.” That’s judgmental language at this point. The potential impact this affiliation has on their training.

Haley: So is that an amendment to the amendment?

Chris L: Let’s start with do you accept that?

Elizabeth: i accept that.

Chris L: Then you may strike that.

Alma: When we remove comprehensive, there a particular thing we’re talking about here and I think it’s important that comprehensive remains. It’s not just ability to receive training. They’ll be receiving training but it won’t be comprehensive. It needs to be comprehensive training so I’m proposing we leave comprehensive in rather than leave it out.

Chris L: We’ve already accepted that change so we’ll have to amend again.

Alex: We’ll have to vote this down.

Chris L: Is there any further discussion?
Edward: Point of order, could you clarify when Alma brought the issue?

Chris L: So in order to add in what she wants to add in, this amendment has to be voted down or be approved in another amendment proposed. Is there any other discussion? Then I will need to call a vote. So all in favor of this amendment please raise your hands. All opposed? Abstentions?

Alma: I have a point of order. When does the question putting comprehensive come up?

Chris L: So this amendment is accepted so you can take out this stricken out part.

Austin: To point us back to where we are right now, we've just amended the amendment. We still have not passed the language that we want. What Alma's doing is making a new amendment to the amendment that we proposed. So we're going to discuss that and move to vote on that amendment and move to vote.

Chris L: Yes, thank you Austin. What we just voted on was this. We're striking that part.

Haley: We voted on the three last lines.

Chris L: Yes.

Alma: I'm proposing we keep the word comprehensive since that's the contested situation.

Edward: Second.

Yasmeen: The language is there receive comprehension.

Elisa: So back to the original.

Jenny: Point of clarification, I'm now lost on what level of amendments it's been. So what has been accepted and what has not?

Chris L: This has been accepted and this is now in motion. The word comprehensive is the word in question, whether to include or exclude. There's a motion and a second. Are there any objections?

Jenny: Objection.

Chris L: Alma, would you like to speak to your amendment?

Alma: I will say that I think that the whole resolution or a large of the part of this resolution is we're concerned about the kind of training or the comprehensive training that medical students would
be getting at PeaceHealth. It’s important that we keep comprehensive training in the training because they will definitely be able to get some sort of training at PeaceHealth but they won’t get the comprehensive training that we’re concerned about because of that affiliation.

Jenny: My understanding of how the medical school rotation works is limited at best but as I understand it that UW has a commitment to training in rural areas. As such, I would imagine that a lot of the facilities that students are training in in rural areas are, by nature, limited. The fact of the matter is smaller places are going to be limited and it’s not just that it’s Catholic. It’s a rural hospital and they are training in rural hospitals that are not considered as comprehensive training so that’s why students do a number of rotations so they get a diversity of experience and over the training and no one site is the end all be all of what they learn. I don’t think you can get comprehensive training at any one of these rural sites because they are limited.

Chris L: Before we continue, I’ll need a motion to extend time.

Yasmeen: I would like to move to vote instead.

Chris L: Before that, I saw one hand so I’ll allow one last comment.

Leah Johnson (Oceanography): I see where you’re coming from but I want to point out that students of the UW have voiced their concern and I think it’s important that their concern is addressed and not necessarily how it compares to other internships.

Chris L: Thank you. There’s a motion to call to question. Is there a second?

Haley: I’ll second that.

Chris L: Any objections? All those in favor to move to a vote, please raise your hand.

Cindi Textor (East Asian Literature & Language): Point of clarification, if we vote yes, that includes the language that Alma said?

Elisa: Only this underlined part.

Maggie: Can we highlight what we’re voting on?

Chris L: We move to the vote. All those in favor of accepting the highlighted language, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Eyes have it. Amendment to the amendment stays. The next vote is on the first amendment.

Austin: One other parliamentary point, since you called it to question you will go through all to the amendments now and immediately vote on the final passage.
Chris L: That’s clearly not what I meant to do, we’ll pretend.
Yasmeen: I said that I would moved to vote. I did not call to question.

Chris L: I misputted.

Austin: There will have to be separate motion for each of these.

Chris L: These three lines have been accepted. Now the motion at hand is to accept the amendment to strike these two lines. Any discussion on this amendment before we move to a vote? Seeing none, all those in favor of accepting this amendment to remove the struck out language, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Abstentions? Eyes have it. Unless there are further amendments, that is all the amendments.

Alex: In some places it says UWMC. It should say UW Medicine. UW Medicine is the larger overarching thing with the Med Center, Harborview and all the neighborhood clinics.

Chris L: Will you move to do that?

Alex: I move to do that.

Maggie: Second.

Chris L: I’ll accept that as friendly.

Cindi: Where is it being changed and why?

Chris L: The difference is the medical center, the building over there or the institution.

Cindi: And which places is it being altered?

Chris L: Wherever it makes sense. Like going back up, the UW Medicine leadership.

Alex: On 25 and 26 too.

Chris L: Any further amendments?

Haley: I think in line 39, its unwieldy and it sounds unpolished. I think it might sound better if it said, “That the GPSS directs the GPSS President to monitor UW Medicine policy and in the event that such policy is altered that it impacts student training in UW affiliated facilities advocate on behalf of UW medical students.” Remove from first line by to through appropriate.

Esra: I accept.
Haley: On the second line, “as a result through affiliations” and switch “other” to “affiliated.” Is that friendly too?

Esra: Yes.

Haley: Then strike where through and.

Chris L: That I do not accept. The issue is that we’re talking about students who are admitted through the UW School of Medicine and that can be through the WAMY program so I think it’s an important aspect of this. We’re talking about students who get admitted to the UW School of Medicine and are trained wherever.

Haley: So it impacts student training. Does student training not encompass all of that? I think the problem with this is that admitted doesn’t mean training and it seems unwieldy to me wording wise but students admitted through UW Medicine have nothing to do with being trained.

Chris L: Do you move that amendment?

Alma: Can I ask a question? Your concern is that there the training up there that encompasses all students who come to us from other universities and other facilities versus being admitted in the UW Medicine?

Haley: The distinction is that it sounds like to me that those students admitted to UW School of Medicine are not the same students that are ultimately trained by UW Medicine. Admission has nothing to do with matriculation. It would be simplified.

Chris L: I’ll accept that. I misunderstood you. Okay, any other proposed amendments?

Zach Williams (Law): You need “and the event.”

Chris L: So the difference is one “directs GPSS President to monitor policy at all times” and one is “directs GPSS President to monitor policy in the event that”?

Alex: It says monitor at all times.

Yasmeen: It says monitor in the event that it’s changed.

Edward: I’m not sure if it’s appropriate to say that but if you’re not monitoring policy you don’t know it’s changed.

Chris L: Line 39 “policy, and.”

Esra: Accept.
Chris L: Any other amendments to be made? Seeing none, we'll move to a vote.

Yasmeen: What is our quorum?

Chris L: I'm not sure. We'll have to have a call to quorum.

Yasmeen: How many people are a quarter?

Elisa: Give me a second.

Alice: If there is an official call, to quorum and we don't have quorum, that means we can't vote on this today.

Yasmeen: This is not an official call to quorum. I was just asking.

Chris L: The answer is I don't know.

Yasmeen: I move to vote.

Alma: Second.

Chris: Any objections? All those in favor of accepting this resolution as it is currently phrased, please raise your hands. All those opposed? Abstaining? Thank you. Motion carries and this resolution passes. Thank you. Moving right along, we have an issue we tabled at the last senate meeting on the ASUW resolution concerning divestment from certain companies invested in Israel. Just to provide a quick update, the ASUW resolution was defeated last night in senate and the question of how to instruct our delegates is now mute. They abstained. Nevertheless, we tabled this so it automatically comes back up and I'll open the floor to discussions and questions.

Alma: So the last time we tabled this, it was because most people to abstained. I was curious to know because most of you wanted to go back to your constituents, how many of you did actually speak to your constituents? How many of them supported? How many yes?

Matthew: From representation?

Alma: From the way they decided to go talk to their constituents.

Adam Yahyaoui (Evans School of Public Affairs): Really quick, I just wanted to give a brief update. First of all, thank you for sticking with it. I know it was a long meeting and there was lot said. I admire you all for hearing me out and it was great. So last night, the meeting went until 9:30pm. It was a long meeting and there was a lot of good discussion and a range of critical thinking and sophistication to the arguments presented, but overall it was a positive experience.
for me. Really what we wanted to do was raise this to the floor. I think it's bad policy to profit from an occupation. I'm a member of a student group who cosponsored the bill so I do have an interest in this resolution passing. I'm looking forward to working with GPSS in the future along this issue. It's an important one. Another update, a couple who were here at the last meeting is Craig and Cindy Corrie from the Rachel Corrie Foundation. Rachel Corrie is mentioned in the resolution as an Evergreen student who was killed by a bulldozer. The Evergreen College endowment is housed in the UW endowment. They voted to divest and it can't fully divest unless there is divestment from UW. So a news update. They're making their case to the Israeli supreme court and if you're interested in what's going on, I encourage you to check it out. It's an interesting process. Some policy are being decided and we are really chipping away at this culture of impunity of this idea of the Israeli military. They are really encouraging to speak with because they are tireless activist. anyway I wanted to say thanks and Chris, you did a fantastic job. Also, Isaac, the speaker for the ASUW did a really excellent job last night. If any of you know him personally, just a nod to him. That's all.

Alma: Just to follow up on the Corrie case, it's not because the Caterpillar crushed her that there is a case. It's because the Israeli military they stole her body cells. The other is I actually, after two weeks ago, I went out to other people's constituents and I have now 60 signatures from people in different department. So just so you know, when you talk about constituents, these things matter. They are issues that are huge and very personal. The least you could have done was done a little bit of homework before a major issue that everyone knew if it was going to be on the agenda.

Chris L: I share responsibility on that. I didn't distribute the ASUW resolution in a timely fashion. So a lot people only had a couple days.

Alma: But also, we just voted on another resolution and everyone felt very comfortable voting on it on behalf of their constituents. I think it's very interesting when we choose to vote on behalf of our constituents and when we don't. I just want you to think about it. Just a PS.

Yasmeen: I wanted to clarify that we haven't received the resolution a day and a half before reading and the PeaceHealth resolution, we had for a longer period of time and that's why I felt pretty comfortable.

Cindi: I want to add my voice to Alma was saying. I was very disappointed that we abstained last week. I know there were issues with the distribution of the language and this is a very divisive issue and there are strong arguments on both sides. I think it says about the GPSS that we weren't able to contribute to this discussion and we only care about buses and tiny issues that affect us day to day on campus and we can't get up when it's big. I was upset and I'm upset to hear that it went by without us and next time we need to do a better job.

Adam: Hopefully, there will be a next time soon.
Haley: To defend people who did abstained, we know people in our program who represent both sides strongly and it didn’t that it was appropriate for us to rule against any of our constituent's wishes. It's a divisive and delicate issue and that’s why we abstained.

Alma: What I’m trying to say here is I’m curious how many of us in the two week have talked to their constituents about the PeaceHealth resolution and gotten their opinion on it? Seriously, how many shared it to their constituents and gotten an opinion on the language being spoken? Here we are. We voted for it. I’m saying that we arrive here as representatives of our departments and we speak all the time on their behalf. We need to be very aware of when we do that, when we’re comfortable doing that and take our role very seriously about these things.

Maryclare: I feel like we have parliamentary procedure to sort of mitigate this type of conversation. Right now, I’m feeling attacked. I would like to let you know that I also talked to my constituents about this.

Zach: I move to move on.

Chris L: Is there any further discussion?

Cindi: I think it might be useful to clarify what abstaining means. Does that mean our constituents are divided or do I have the responsibility to make that decision when my constituents are divided. I was wondering at the last meeting what does it mean to abstain and what are the appropriate reasons to do so?

Alice: I can speak to that. That is a very personal decision. Especially sitting in front of the room, and after the fact, Geography was very important. Like this half of the room that was mostly for it voted for it and this side, the pro-Israel side, voted against it. That speaks to people’s personal indecisiveness or that they didn’t have a personal feeling about it one way or the other. It shows that we were easily swayed by testimonies from both sides by people that we were sitting close to. So I think people have their personal reasons for abstaining and also I think, with this type of an issue since it is so big and emotions are strong, people are subconsciously swayed by situations and circumstances so one thing we talked about is so controversial, it might have been appropriate to have a ballot vote or something along those lines to make it more productive.

Executive Senator Elections:

Chris L: So if no further discussion, I’ll say one thing and we'll move on. So we’re really out of practice for discussing even minor issues. So an issue that is this big and divisive and important and this stirring of emotions, we’re really not prepared for. I think we did a good job but what we’re experiencing right now speaks to the fact that we haven't been called upon as a body to something like this in a really long time. I would encourage everyone to have compassion for themselves and other people because collectively we were not equipped. to do this and hopefully
we will be better in the future. I can't think in the last several years that we had to grapple with something this tough. Also, we were talking about the resolution of another organization. I would've preferred, and this will probably happen in the future, if we had our own resolution and own voice and not another organization's words. So moving along, we now have executive senator elections. I'll now hear nominations for executive senators which we have two open spots.

Alex: I nominate Yasmeen.

Yasmeen: I accept.

Adam: Point of information, are the positions different?

Chris L: No.

Russell Dietrick (Astronomy): I nominate Eddie Schwieterman.

Edward: I accept.

Adam: I nominate Doug Taber.

Douglass: I'll be on it.

Adam: So that's not allowed?

Douglass: No, I'll be Treasurer.

Adam: I nominate Alma.

Alma: No, thank you.

Chris L: Since we have two positions and two candidates, would people like to hear from them?

Alma: Yes.

Chris L: You don't have to but you may.

Edward: I can say a few words. This is my fourth year in GPSS and I've been here since my first year in grad school and my first meeting was in 2010 in Condon Hall if you guys remember when we had it there. I've been on the Judicial committee, F&B committee which I chaired for a couple quarters last year. I've really enjoyed being in GPSS and working with all of you and everyone on the committee and I think it's a vibrant, awesome place and I want to support the GPSS more in depth as an executive senator so thank you.
Yasmeen: Hi, I’m Yasmeen from Biology. I have been in GPSS since my first year also. I was kind of roped into it actually. One of my classmates had become a GPSS senator and was in it alone and I went and I had a good time. I don’t tire in long meetings and I’m excited to be on the executive committee and hear more of the in depth discussions and reasoning on why things come to GPSS and why we discuss them so I think that would be great.

Announcements:

Chris L: The incoming Executive committee will be excited to have you. I’m sorry I didn’t get to work with you but I’m sure you’ll be great. Just a quick aside, one of my bylaw changes is to clarifying the language in executive senator elections. If you go look at it now, it’s extremely unclear and it’s extremely undemocratic. We’re actually not required for the senate to vote on it except to confirm officer nominations. So it’s a really weird procedure that needs to be changed. Moving on to announcements.

Alma: I sent an email about the Wednesday meeting, how do we decide if it’s happening or not? Or did you decide?

Chris L: I decided. Sorry, I think it’s been on the calendar for awhile but it’s not one of the meetings we officially voted on so since we had so much to get through this meeting and typically we like to have a more relaxed meeting and a recap and have a party afterwards. I thought it would be nice to have one more meeting in the quarter. So, any announcements?

Edward: I have one quick announcement. Astrobiologist, Steven Benner is coming tomorrow. He’s going to be speaking in Kane Hall about alien life and creating life in a lab to more accurately understand how life on earth started and also how to find life elsewhere. It’s going to be really interesting. There’s an email out that Elisa sent that has all the information. It’s going ot be in Kane Hall.

Elisa: I’ll also send out another email. I have an announcement as well. The 29th will be our last diversity forum on veterans. So please do get that information out to your constituents and anyone who you know is a veteran. It’s for them and for people who they know to talk about their particular story. It’s the 29th and I’ll send that information out as well.

Alice: I have one more announcement. I don’t think we discussed the results of the ASUW elections which we were all able to vote in but Christina Xiao was voted as the ASUW President so for the first time in…

Austin: She’s is the first woman of color to be voted to ASUW in 10 years.

Alice: Since four years, there are female presidents in ASUW and GPSS so that’s exciting and the chair of the provost advisory council of students and the President of Tacoma. Anyway, a lot of female representation in student leadership and that’s really exciting.
Chris L: As Alice was saying it was 2010-2011 was the last time. It was Sarah Reyneveld and Madeleine McKenna. I have some announcements. We are recruiting for very important committees. We are recruiting for the Student Advisory committee. We need one GPSS representative to replace Elise Randall who is graduating. It is our turn to appoint the representative on the faculty senate for budgeting. It's a very important committee. It reports directly to the provost. She attends most of their meetings personally. They're one of the top faculty policy committee around and we'll be appointing people to the Services and Activities fee committee, the Student Technology Fee committee.

Austin: And ASUW. Someone should take over for me.

Chris L: Yes, that means you can go and sit in on 3 hour meetings and represent GPSS. And Bookstore trustee. You actually sit on the Board of Directors and make decisions on it. It's an independent corporation that is not under the UW.

Edward: How many those positions have to be senators?

Chris L: Zero, I believe. Sorry, ASUW liaison. I doubt we'll get a crushing number of applications for that one. I just want to point out 2 hours is long for us but compared to what they go through, it's not so bad.

Justin: Question about the things that were mentioned, are those voted on this meeting?

Chris L: those are all appointed positions. There's an application period, then it closes. Depending on when the application period is, the current Executive committee will look at the applications, they will be taken in for an interview and the committee approves the selections.

Justin: And that is for senators for the fall?

Adjourn:

Chris L: They're for anyone. They're open to anyone who is a graduate and professional student so we'll send that out tonight so you can get it out to your people. If there are no other announcements, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Zach: I motion to adjourn.

Adam: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?