Call to Order & Approval of Agenda:

Chris Lizotte (President): I will call this meeting to order at 5:37pm. I'll entertain a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

Colin Bateson (Mechanical Engineering): I make a motion to amend the agenda to add 10 minutes for a Finance & Budget discussion as a new agenda item 7b.

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

Chris L: Any objections? Seeing none, the agenda is amended. I'll entertain a motion to approve the amended agenda.

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

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Alex Bolton (Law): I would like to add another agenda item to add a line for the Washington Student Association.

Chris L: Okay, Eddie would you like to withdraw?

Edward: Sure.

Alex: I would like to add 10 minutes after the GPSS Spotlight.

Zach Williams (Law): Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Okay, I'll now entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Edward: I move to approve.

Alex: Second.

Approval of Minutes:
Chris L: Any objections? Moving on to the minutes. I’ll entertain a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Edward: I move to approve the minutes.

Colin: Second.

**Elections Results Recap & GPSS Spotlight: Department of Rehab Medicine - Occupational Therapy**

Chris L: Any objections? Thank you. Moving on, item number 4 is election results recap. If you were not there at the last meeting or if you cast your vote and scurried off, you may not have known who the winners of the election are. Our President for 2014-2015 school year will be Alice Popejoy. Our Vice President for the same period will be Alex Bolton. Our Secretary will be Natalie Gordon who is also our Office Manager and our Treasurer will be Douglass Taber. So we’ll have more to say about that at the last senate meeting about the transition and everything. For the moment, congratulations. Moving on to item number 6 is on the Department of Rehabilitation Medicine led by Senator Jess Snow and Aileen.

Jess Snow (Rehabilitation Medicine): Hi, I’m Jess Snow and this is Aileen Murphy and we are representing the Department of Rehabilitation Medicine. We’re a part of the School of Medicine and we’re located in the UW Medical Center on the 9th floor. There are four programs within our department: the Occupational Therapy program, Physical Therapy program, Prosthetics and Orthotics programs, the Rehabilitation Science PhD and there’s also a fellowships and residencies in those programs. Aileen and I are in the Occupational Therapy program and I’m in my 2nd year and she is in her 1st year. I wanted to talk to you about today is occupational therapy to demystify it for you a little bit. A lot of times when I tell people that I’m studying occupational therapy, they say, “Wow, that’s so great that you help people find jobs.” It’s so more than that. That’s actually in the realm of vocational rehabilitation. Occupational therapy as defined by those who study occupation science because this is an evidence based practice, occupations are all the tasks and activities that we perform in our everyday life that have meaning to us and our culture. Examples of this include dressing, bathing, eating, sexual expression and functional ability. They also include more complex instrumental tasks involving preparation, grocery shopping, community mobility, money management and those sorts of things. We also have a lot of activities and occupations surrounding school, work, play and leisure, social participation and recently we realized that rest and sleep is also an important occupation. So occupation is those performances that’s really shaped by culture and our physical environment. It’s also shaped by our bodies like our cognitions, physical bodies and emotional well-being. So what is occupational therapy? Now that you guys understand that occupation is much more than a job and it’s all the activities we engage in, occupational therapy seeks to enable individuals facing barriers to overcome them to maximize their participation and living as independently as possible in the presence injuries, illness and disabilities. This is through engagement of meaningful activities, like things that you and I find purposeful in our lives.
We work on multidisciplinary teams within our Rehabilitation department with our cohorts in PT, Prosthetics and Orthotics, psychologists and various things like that. We work in a holistic model to see the person within the context of their entire environment to help them regain and overcome barriers to participating in their environments. A great case study to understand a little bit about what we do is Aimee Copeland. I don’t know if you guys heard of her. In 2012, she had a massive ziplining accident. She had necrotizing fasciitis in her body and in order to save her life, she had to get both of her hands and feet amputated. So prior to this, Aimee was a grad student like most of us. She was a typical American graduate student. Aimee started experiencing, as a result, missing her hands and feet secondary impairments due to her diagnosis. This is important. Occupational therapists don’t treat the primary medical condition. They treat the secondary dysfunctions arising from the condition affecting your occupations. As you can see, there is a multidisciplinary team that is helping Aimee and she’s still involved in occupational therapy. As you can imagine, Aimee suddenly found herself unable to dress, use the toilet and bathroom herself, which you can imagine is a pretty meaningful activity. She probably couldn’t feed herself and she was relying on other people to help do these things. So occupational therapists were looking for ways to help her be independent as possible and return to school. Imagine if you didn’t have hands for writing or doing your computer work. She has these two new prosthetics. These are prosthetics that run on the muscles that are left in her arms and occupational therapists are critical to help her learn how to control and use these. You don’t have hands. You no longer have sensation to tell you how much force you need to use to hold a tomato or shake someone’s hand. These are really powerful machines so occupational therapists in her life are helping her learn how to use these things. These aren’t intuitive either so it’s hard to do simple tasks like buttoning and zipping a zipper. So you can imagine that she had a lot of rehabilitation work and she has gone back to school and is quite independent. So where can you find us? We’re everywhere. You might not have any idea but we’re actually everywhere. We’re in schools, we’re working with people across the lifespan and we work in hospice situations and we work in private corporation because another aspect of occupational therapy is preventative medicine so we’re looking to maybe halt the disability faced by working in unsafe environments. Hopefully you all know more about occupational therapy now as a result of us and can understand its much broader than jobs. If anyone has any questions, I will be happy to answer them.

Chris L: Any questions for Aileen or Jess?

Jess: You all understand it very well.

Chris L: So something I neglected to mention at the beginning of the meeting and I apologize is that if you are a guest and if you like to speak, you must sign in and must get a name tag even if you’re not speaking. You must sign in and get yourself a name tag. Usually we have someone sitting out there before the meeting. Moving on to item 6b. We have representatives from the Washington Student Association. We have Garrett Havens and JulieAnne Behar. Alex, do you want to say a word of introduction?
WSA General Assembly Meeting Recap:

Alex: Sure. So the Washington Student Association is an institution from all around the state. GPSS has a position, ASUW and also Central, Eastern, Western and Evergreen as well as WSU-Vancouver, UW-Bothell and UW-Tacoma. We come together to help be more effective in Olympia and higher education. They have something they would like to share with you today.

JulieAnne Behar (WSA Representative): First we’ll introduce ourselves and we’ll give a broad perspective of our organization. Then we’ll talk about our general assembly meeting from last weekend and what that means for GPSS moving forward into the next school year. So I’m JulieAnne Behar. I’m the Organizing Director for the Washington Student Association.

Garrett Havens (WSA Representative): My name is Garrett Havens. I’m the Executive Director for WSA. The Washington Student Association has been around for a little over 30 years now. It was started by students in 1982 as a result of a 33% tuition increase during the legislative session that year. Students recognized that it was critical to have strong, consistent representative down in Olympia on a consistent basis so students actually created this organization this continues to be funded and governed by students to this day. The organization itself is built around a unique program and it’s unique to this state. We’re the only state in the country that does this. We bring in student representatives from each of our member institutions in our organization, we have 11 members, and throughout the legislative session, there is a student that lobbies down in Olympia for that session. During the session, I serve as the de facto legislative director so we spend a week before the session training the students and setting them out after the legislature and working on a broad variety of issues. Our primary and large victories of this year were, for a second year in a row, securing another statewide tuition freeze for undergraduate students, passing the Washington state Dream Act, where we have coordinators for a statewide campaign on that, and finally we were able to secure instate tuition for veterans this year as well. Probably at least half a dozen or 8-10 other items that have actual significant impact on the lives of students. The Washington Student Association are really focused on three primary colors. The first is working on campuses to engage and educate students about higher education and not just about how to interact with administrations on campus but with the broader community and on a statewide level. The second thing that we do is really work with stakeholders around the state, whether that’s government agencies, legislators and other non-profit organizations that are interested in education or other issues that affect the lives of students. We really do a lot of work in presenting the student voice there to make sure that students are engaged. Finally, we talked with you a little earlier on that legislative component. So I’m passing things off to JulieAnne and she’s going to talk about what happened at our general assembly meeting last week and what that means for graduate students for the next school year.

JulieAnne: As Garrett said, the work that WSA does is really centered on college affordability and accessibility for public higher education in Washington state. At our general assembly meeting last weekend, which was at Central Washington University in Ellensburg, we set our legislative
agenda for the 2014-2015 school year. Among other items on that agenda, we identified 3 as our priority campaign items. The difference between campaign priority items and other items on our legislative agenda is that those are the issues that students on campus will be advocating on. Your student lobbyist, the GPSS VP will be working on a much broader spectrum but the on-campus advocacy work is dedicated to these three. We wanted to come to share those issues with you because one of them is graduate student education. The first one is voter access. We’ve worked a number of voter access bills in the past. Our organization does a lot of voter registration work with schools. So that will be another handy item for us. The other campaign item is, not surprisingly, college affordability. Obviously really broad but one thing we've been working on for a number of years is how do we define college affordability? That’s probably what we’ll be looking at this year. Does that mean going back to a 70/30 model where the state pays 70% and the students pay 30%. There’s been ideas tossed around about tying it to an average median family income. That’s some of the ideas of what college affordability looks like. Our third campaign item is graduate student education. Chris Erickson presented a number of proposals to the body about issues that are impacting graduate students, like more funding for TA/RA positions, state funding to offset cuts to research funding from sequestration. Issues that are really critical to graduate students across the state and we sort of categorize these things as a broad graduate education. Obviously as we get closer to the legislative session, we’ll have a better sense of what actual bills are being dropped that affect graduate students and what specific bills we'll be advocating for. We wanted to make sure that GPSS was aware that the Washington Student Association as a whole will be prioritizing graduate student issues in a way that we haven’t in the past as a campaign item that campuses around the state will be working on. We’re really looking forward to working closer with you this year and answer any questions you might have.

Alex: I want to give a plug about the meeting in Ellensburg. It was really cool. I went with the Chrises by the way, and we proposed the idea of having graduate education be on the agenda and it was actually undergrads from the different schools that said let’s make it a priority. It was really cool to see the rest of the coalition come together and make that a priority. So with that, we’re going to be organizing around that so it’s going to be up to us to help volunteer. They’re going to lay the groundwork by organizing and it’ll be up to us to volunteer on something we really care about. We want to make some inroads and make sure people know and understand that we’re making graduate education a priority. Also, I would like to give a plug that when you register, WSA is an item on there so if these are things that you support, just think about that when you register.

Chris L: Are there any questions for JulieAnne or Garret? Thank you for your time. Next up we have a brief presentation by Alice Popejoy who will be updating us on the senate improvement working group.

GPSS Improvement Working Group Discussion Board Presentation:
Alice: Alright, so who saw the link on the last email about the Catalyst website? So either that means you guys don’t read those emails but that’s okay because I’m going to use Elisa as my guinea pig right now to show you how easy it is to get to the Catalyst webpage that Chris so kindly shared for us and we as a working group added discussion groups. Here’s the link and you’re right there. You’ll go through your UW web login but if you’ve already done that, there’s a list of all the discussion areas that you all have identified as areas that you think need addressing. There’s a GPSS LinkedIn group that Dawn put together for us. The idea behind that is to get senators both current and past connected together professionally so we can engage that way. We’re not going to have a big discussion right now because we’re going to keep the discussion on the discussion board. The wiki came up awhile back as an idea to keep all of our minutes, our documents and our committee work all up on a website that we can all access and make edits to and download things from and edit our documents together. The bylaws suggestions of how the bylaws can be revised to make us more efficient. Parli pro. There’s a lot of different ideas of how we can either modify or make it even more accessible. Then there’s the senator peer mentoring. When you’re a new senator and you show up. How do we orient you and how do we connect you to people? There’s a few conversations started within each of these discussion but I think most of them are from people on the senate working group to get it started but unless we have feedback from you guys, we’re going to come back with recommendations that are only representative of the committee. There’s 5 or 6 of us. So we want to hear from you but we don’t want to take up any of your meeting time so if you could just take five minutes and if you care about one of these topics, give us some feedback so we can come up with some recommendations that are truly representative of your ideas and what you want to see happen next year. That’s all I have. Questions?

Chris L: So please go to the website. Okay, Colin.

**Finance & Budget Departmental Allocation Discussion:**

Colin: So I threatened to do this a couple of meetings ago. We are updating the departmental funding guidelines. I’ve asked you multiple times to come and fill out the application so we can give you guys money. It’s been a moderately successful plea but this is how we decide how much money we’re willing to give each department. The first column is students, then dollar amount. This has been arbitrarily set well before I got here. It seems like decades ago. I did a quick breakdown of where the percentage of departments of where they fall into these groups. As you can see, almost everyone falls into the lowest. We have no one right here and we have only a few groups, I think four, that break into the the 700 range. We thought this was ridiculous because we’re giving everyone $350 regardless of how big your department is so we wanted to brainstorm ideas. So we have two ideas that we wanted to present to you. They are totally just ideas but I wanted to start some discussion and maybe get some feedback right now but I also plan to put together something. Maybe I’ll put together a Catalyst. We’re going to see the pros and cons of the platforms in just a sec.
Alma Khasawnih (Gender, Women and Sexuality Studies): Sorry, our department only has 14 graduate students so I love the number.

Colin: So quick rundown. Obviously $10 per student. There’s some departments with less than 10 so they’re not getting much money. A couple beers per person but not that we can fund that. So obviously there would be a minimum and maximum. These are just ideas up here. The other one is this two part funding guideline plan. Most of our purchases or applications fall into two categories: capital purchases, like karaoke machines, fridges, kegerator, microwave, furniture and things that last for a long time and retreats or events, which are only one time and value for only the attendees. So we thought maybe we would have two different criterias on how we fund those things meaning that you get less money for the retreat one time, but if you’re going to purchase a table, and I have some table in my department that are 30 year old, we’re willing to give you more money because we see the value over the years. Again, this is the dollar amounts. These are flexible and I want some input depending on what you guys think of the value or impact because Alma wants a little more money than for 14 people's worth. I don’t blame her but I’m in a different department so I have a lot of cash. So not necessarily fair. Everyone deserves a couch, a place to eat and a microwave. One microwave can serve a lot of people. Anyway, here’s the background. Keep in mind that we only have $7000 throughout the year and roughly 15 applications. We don’t want ideas that will make us go through the money right away. I can put this all up where you can find it again. If someone has something screaming to say, I’m willing to hear it. Otherwise we’ll move on since I stuck myself in the agenda.

Chris L: Any questions for Colin?

Christine Stawitz (QERM): I’m also a tiny program that doesn’t have many people…

Colin: But you deserve nice things.

Christine: I’m biased but I sit in the School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences which is a bigger program. I want to point out that smaller programs have no departmental resources so SAS, even though it’s under 150, they also have other funds that they can ask through that school and I imagine it’s the same for larger programs. I think the idea of two funding guidelines is great but I ask that you don’t take money away from the current status since we don’t have a lot of other funding.

Colin: We’ll will keep that in mind so that no one ends up getting less money.

Yasmeen Hussain (Biology): In response to Christine, I would say that this gives more money to smaller departments because of the $300 minimum whereas before it was $350 which isn’t that much more but for those departments in between, it can add a lot.
Colin: Like I said, these numbers came out from 10 minutes of discussion today. This is not something I’m asking you to vote on. We want input.

Alice: My question is why stick to the per student or program size guideline for amount of funding? Why not just focus on what the departments are asking for and in their proposal they say we need it because we have this many students and then accept or reject based on departmental needs and already available funds?

Colin: I see a lot of validity in that point of view and agree with it. We tried to address that in this bottom idea. However, I would also entertain an argument that a program with 20 people doesn’t not have the same needs as an 800 student program. One, a mini-fridge will serve 20 people but it won’t serve 800 people so at some point there is a sense of scale. It’s a matter of figuring out where that is. If we ended up doing a much larger maximum, we would be more critical of the applications and not just willing to give it away. I hear you on that one.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): We also look at what you’re asking for. It’s not solely based on the size of your department or how many students are enrolled in your program. It’s also what are you asking for and what kind of retreat or purchase. That weighs a lot and it’s not just on the size of your department.

Evan First (Oceanography): Also, if I remember correctly, in the actual application as it stands now, these are guidelines. They aren’t strict maximums. Finance & Budget can opt to fund at higher levels based on the merits of the application. These are just guidelines to give people an area to shoot for so that we can make our money last the entire year.

Colin: You need to know what’s not ridiculous and what is ridiculous.

Soh Yeun Kim (English): Will you provide a list of capital items we can apply for. For example, the English Department shares one fridge for 200 people.

Colin: I will strive to make our past funded applications available so people can get an idea.

Haley Mckay (Architecture): This is my first meeting as a senator and I don’t know how to access the application or what that process is.

Colin: gpss.uw.edu. Services and Funding. It’s up there on the website. I’d be happy to show you later. If you go to to Services and Funding, it’s at the top across the banners, the applications are there and the guidelines are there for you too.

Edward: I wanted to respond to questions about why the funding max are set there. I think it’s important to give guidance to the people that are applying so we don’t get absurd request and also, when they request for items, they’re likely to be successful the first time they come to us. It takes up our limited time especially when there are a lot of applications pending. We view
departmental and special allocations at the same time and for the special allocations, they're usually asking for an event that’s happening soon. So we want to make sure that the people that come to us are likely to succeed the first time out so they don’t have to go back and redo their applications several times.

Colin: So think about these. I would love some constructive feedback or dollar amounts or how this will impact your program positively or negatively. If you have any input on this departmental allocation process, it's not very well utilized in my opinion and I would love to spread this out to all of you because we all contribute to the SAF fees and our goal and our job is to give that money back to you. We'll make it easy for you to do that so please comment.

Genesis: And we have about $3200 left in the account so we only spent half and we have 4 more weeks in the quarter. If you apply and you are funded, you have to spend the money by summer. You can’t apply now and use if for the fall.

Colin: Not out of this budget. You can apply next year though.

**PeaceHealth Resolution Discussion & Vote:**

Chris L: Moving on to our next resolution, which will be colloquially called PeaceHealth resolution. Before we begin, Joseph?

Joseph Telegan (English): I would like to make a motion to table this resolution until the next meeting. Request permission to say why.

Chris L: First of all, is there a second for this?


Chris L: Are there any objections?

Yasmeen: I would like to hear the reason why.

Joseph: We had some contentious conversation regarding the language of this resolution both internally and externally. We would like to encourage an open standing dialogue between concerned individuals prior to revisiting the bill at the next meeting. Further details, questions?

Gabriel Dawson (Dentistry): Where would that discussion take place?

Joseph: We’re encouraging it to be open.
Chris L: We’ve been holding it on Google Docs, which is a place that makes it easily commentable. There’s been a lot of discussion already and that seems like it’s a good place for it to keep happening unless there’s a better platform.

Gabriel: Do you see foresee us getting together somewhere and discussing this? What’s your idea on where we discuss this?

Joseph: I would agree with Chris that the Google Docs format has raised a lot of really positive conversation and those of us that have already taken part in that form are on the same page. The vast majority of us, I would consider doing a continued dialogue in the same format.

Halee Hyatt (Dentistry): Would that be open for revision?

Chris L: Not in the same way but it’s still amendable.

Halee: Is there any way to do it today?

Chris L: Yes.

Maryclare Griffin (Statistics): I recall that they have a deadline in mind. How will tabling this affect the deadline they had in mind?

Chris L: If this is tabled, the earliest it can be brought up again is the next senate meeting in two weeks and I’m not aware of a deadline.

Elisabeth Vodicka (SPHERE Representative): I’m the co-leader of SPHERE and our deadline is May 31st. When is your next meeting?

Chris L: Before 31st. It’s on the 21st.

Gabriel: How much time do we have allotted for this today?

Chris L: 25 minutes. I can also speak to another reason why I believe Joseph’s motion has value. This resolution was initially drafted in a limited capacity to call the University of Washington administration to essentially restate, since this affiliation began last July or August. This is not a new thing. This has been in place for almost a year now. During the drafting of this document, and I actually take a lot of responsibility for this, it got away from that. It became much more expansive and it started to tread into territory where the authors started feeling uncomfortable with prescriptive statements that we were making about belief systems and I will say that I personally take responsibility for that. It was in fact one thing the chair of a parliamentary position is to do is to remain impartial and neutral and in this particular instance, I failed at that task because it became clear to me and other people that I had an emotional response to this particular resolution that was entirely inappropriate. So tabling this would allow
us to not actively remove but at least have a plan for reworking and amending when it comes back up for discussion so that’s one factor.

Joseph: I would like to add that over time as we continue this dialogue as admirably Chris painted this situation, we move toward reconciliation and that is why the idea of having a couple more weeks to hammer this out. We do believe we can hammer out differences we have.

Alma: Point of clarification, are you asking to take time to rewrite and make sure the language is working as you find fit and opening it again for conversation or for us to continue having a conversation.

Chris L: It’s the second. So technically, if we table this, we can’t open it for re-editing under the process that we have, we can open it for comments. You can set the Google Doc so it’s commentable but not editable. It’s not in a smoke filled room. It would be open to anyone and comment on but only comment on. We would ask that people propose amendments would bring those in writing so that they can be made expediently. So there’s currently a motion on the floor.

Yasmeen: I withdraw my objection.

Halee: Are there folks that are here today to speak on this issue that would be disenfranchised by the date? There were a lot who exited who might have wanted to speak to the issue. It seems to me that in order to bring out the issues that people are thinking but maybe not comment on a very long thread on the Google Doc. We may consider a certain period of time if there are people here that need to voice some concerns.

Chris L: Is that the case for anyone? Is there anyone who feels that they wouldn't be able to speak adequately if this were tabled until next senate meeting?

Halee: Conceivably, could we defeat this resolution and reintroduce it be edited until 48 hours of the next meeting?

Chris L: Conceivably, yes. That is a parliamentary-ly sound option to defeat the motion and redraft a new one.

Joseph: However everyone in this room has the opportunity to embrace the Google Docs and therefore I don’t think it’s necessary to result to that tactic.

Alice: I’m not a fan of doing this, but is it possible to just suspend the bylaws to open it for re-edits? If there is a defeat of this particular resolution on the books and a different one. Yes, procedurally that works but it shows on the books that we defeated the resolution and that could send mixed signals if we still, as a body, had the intention of doing something. Could we do that?
Chris L: Yes. Do you have a particular problem with tabling?

Alice: If we table, there won’t be an opportunity to edit it. It’s logistically messy if we have 30 people that want to make amendments.

Chris L: I’ll remind you that edits on a resolution still do have to be accepted by the author so it’s not just an open editing session. The advantage is that they can be made before it comes back.

Joseph: Point of clarification, amendments to the resolution can be proposed prior to the next meeting.

Chris L: No, not unless we do what Alice is saying. If the resolution is tabled, then it has to stay in the same state until it comes back up, which means that comments can be made, amendments can be prepared, but the document itself cannot be changed. Alice is proposing to suspend that particular bylaw so that amendments can be proposed and made as long as cosponsors of the resolution accept them as friendly. Otherwise they have to be brought back to the body and voted on.

Colin: Point of information, currently we have a open motion on the floor that needs to be defeated some how in order to do what Alice would move to do.

Gabriel: I think it’s a good idea to suspend the bylaws because I foresee that there’s going to be 30 different amendments and it’s going to take a long time. We can suspend the bylaws, it would expedite the next meeting as well as allow there to be a good discussion.

Alex: I call to question on tabling.

Chris L: Does everyone understand that?

Joseph: Second.

Chris L: We will now vote to immediately vote on Joseph’s tabling motion.

Alex: If you would rather suspend the bylaws to allow edits, this is the first step we need to take.

Chris L: Any objections to the motion that is currently on the floor which is calling to question? Seeing none, all those in favor please say aye. All opposed say nay. Any abstentions? Okay, we will table this resolution to the next senate meeting. All those in favor please say aye. All those opposed please say nay. Any abstentions? It’s opinion of the chair that the nays have it the so the motion is defeated.

[Abstentions: Griff Bell (Epidemiology), Durmus Karatay (Physics)]
Chris L: Okay, so the floor is open for motions.

Alice: I move to suspend the bylaws pertaining to our inability to edit this up until 48 hours of the senate meeting so that we can continue to make amendments at the Google Doc, accepted as friendly and voted at the next senate meeting.

Yasmeen: Point of clarification, I’m looking at the bylaws, particular the resolution one which we did amend this year and it doesn’t say you can’t reopen the discussion, nor does it say you can. But it also doesn’t say you can’t. So we don’t necessarily have to suspend the bylaws.

Alice: I withdraw my motion.

Chris L: Since I’m not entirely sure what the correct parliamentary thing to do in this situation, I’ll entertain a motion to table this resolution until next senate meeting and reopen the collaborative process that is outline by the relevant bylaws.

Alex: So moved.

Douglass: Second.

**ASUW Divestment Resolution Presentation:**

Chris L: Is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion carries. Thank you for muddling through that. That was parliamentary procedure, which is good because we’ll need it for the next item. Before we start the next item, I would like to say a few things. First of all, the question at hand is not a GPSS item per say. We are considering a document of another organization that has been drafted by parties from that organization. Our job is not to edit the document or read into the document and it is not to judge the document other than on its merits of what is in the text. Having said that, for this discussion, there are certain aspects of parliamentary procedure that we don’t normally follow closely because we don’t find it necessary to. For this discussion, I’m going to enforce these strictly. Under Sturgess's parliamentary procedure rules, there are no limits under the times that a person may speak on a particular topic. Under Robert’s rules there is. However, it says that no one may speak more than once on this topic until all there are no new people seeking to speak on the topic. The second point is that in the agenda we have two time periods set for arguments, we have one time period set for questions, which we normally do. In normal parliamentary settings, you don’t do that kind of thing but it’s fine. All questions should be directed to the chair, that’s me. I will then redirect the questions to the relevant party. Normally, they will know so all I would have to do is to look at the person. I just want to highlight that questions should not be directed toward the person being asked. They should be directed to me. After the question period, we have a period to take action on a vote. That is where we look for a motion. At the present time, I don’t think there is sufficient amount of time for that. Our thought process was not correct in assigning enough time. So before we start, I'll entertain a
motion for that part of the agenda. Once there is a motion on the floor, all discussion much be
germane to that motion and that motion alone. Any discussion that is not germane to that motion
will be cut off. Again, all comments should be directed to the chair, all arguments directed to the
chair, all questions directed to the chair. The point of parliamentary procedure, as cumbersome
as it may seem, someone recently in the WSA meeting said the point of parliamentary
procedure is so the majority can’t shut down the minority. That’s why we follow these rules. So I
intend to follow them very strictly for this conversation so we have a productive and civil debate.
Having said that, I’ll entertain a motion to extend the time for item 12 to 25 minutes.

Edward: So moved.

Colin: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Seeing none, the motion passes. We’ll now move to item number 9.

Colin: Point of information, we haven’t killed many motions in this body since I’ve been here. I
don’t know how I would go about doing that if I disagreed. How do you defeat a motion?

Chris L: You vote against it.

Colin: How do you vote?

Chris L: So once a motion is made, if it receives no second it dies. Once a motion receives a
second, there can be an objection. An objection opens the floor for discussion and during that
time, someone can do what Alex did during the last item and can call it into question, which
moves directly to a vote, that which also has to be voted on. Once there’s an objection and
discussion is open on a topic, then we move to discussion and debate. Once that period is over,
we move to a vote.

Colin: So in short, if you want to force a vote on a motion, someone need to object to it.

Chris L: If there is a second and no objections, the motion carries.

Alma: Also point of clarification, what is our aim today?

Chris L: Our aim is to adopt a position on this resolution that will instruct our two representatives
in ASUW senate on how to vote when it comes up for a vote. Is that clear to everyone? We are
not stating the opinion of GPSS other than as it pertains to this document and how we want our
representatives to vote on it. Any other questions?

Caitlin Palo (Guest): Could you clarify at what point are any guests are able to speak?
Chris L: Guests may speak. Senators have speaking priority but guests can speak according to the same guidelines that I just laid out. Once until there are no new speakers. Guests may not vote. That's about it.

Caitlin: When you’re instructing the GPSS senators how to vote, are there two options or three? Vote yay or nay or abstain? Or just vote yay or nay?

Chris L: Someone from the ASUW Senate or someone familiar with it will have to answer that.

Austin Wright-Pettibone (GPSS University Affairs Director): Two options. You can’t have an abstention unless you have a direct interest.

Rene: They have three options.

Austin: According to the ASUW bylaws, you can’t abstain from a vote unless you’re not present or you have a financial or personal interest in the matter.

Zach: Then you can just not go. So we still have three options.

Chris L: Yes. A final thing I want to say is if someone has the floor and is speaking, it’s a matter of courtesy to not seek the floor or in other words, raise your hand. With that said, we’ll move into item number 9. This is a presentation from one proponent of the resolution.

Adam Yahyaoui (Evans School of Public Affairs): Hi, I’m Adam. I’m a 2nd year in the Evans School of Public Affairs. I recognize some of you. A few of you were at the ASUW Senate meeting yesterday. Who has actually read the resolution by a show of hands? A few of you. I’m a part of SUPER, which stands for Students United for Palestinian Equal Rights. We brought this resolution to ASUW in response to a call from the Palestine Civil Society and this is outlined in the whereas clause 3. The call from the Palestinian Civil Society is a part of BDS movement. BDS is Boycott Divestment & Sanctions. This is a non-violent resistance movement focused on putting pressure on the Israeli government to cease violations of international law on human rights, abuses that have been cited extensively in the resolution. Sources from the United Nations Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch and these violations should be a specific concern to those of us who are citizens since we give money to Israel of $8 million per day. Beyond this being a response to the call of Palestinians living under occupation, I also feel that this is an opportunity to support the ASUW in the right direction and aligned with a previous resolution. So ASUW has a precedent. They passed R-18-19 which encourages the university to pursue socially responsible investments, which many of these companies we focus are are in direct contradiction to. You’ll see in the whereas clauses, the specific companies we’re focusing on and they clearly fall short of the standard outlined in ASUW.

Chris L: I’ll entertain a motion to extend time for both speaking parties to 5 minutes rather than 3 minutes.
Evan: So moved.

Soh Yeun: Second.

Adam: Thank you. So precedent. This is part of the reason we saw a space for our organization to make an impact because there was precedent. I think that really matters for an organization that’s trying to set the standard for students. We also really want to emphasize that this is a growing movement. BDS has really been spreading around campuses and personally, I’m a social justice activist and I believe in collective action. This is something that’s running and there are dozen of campuses that have passed resolutions and I can name them. We would hope that UW would have the courage to add their name to the growing list. How many have you have this packet or have seen some of the letter of support inside.? That’s great. I’m going to ask for those back because we have to give them to the undergraduate senators. In this packet, there’s a letter from the National Lawyer’s Guild which is really informative and the resolution is framed specifically for in the back, within the bounds of fiduciary responsibilities for the Board of Trustees and the Treasury department who have already been contacted. We’ve been in discussion with the Board of Trustees and the folks at administration so we understand that some of this might be sensitive. Some of us don’t want the university to lose money and we don’t want scholarships and programs to be unfunded. This is all within the bounds of the law and the bounds of fiduciary responsibility and that’s really important. Divestment is entirely achievable without harm to university. Chris did a really good job outlining it but this bill might conjure up some emotions but I really hope this can be a time for us to talk about this. This is an issue that is really important for me personally but it’s an issue for us to think about as students of conscience which the bill opens with really nicely. This is something that can connect us and help situate ourselves in a globalized world that we find ourselves in and that’s really about cool about BDS because it’s a way to put social and cultural pressure on an oppressive government. The companies here are part of this apparatus of occupation. This isn’t a divestment bill from the state of Israel. This is a divestment bill from the companies outlined. I’m really happy to take any questions.

Chris L: That is time and we will now hear from the opposing argument. Again 5 minutes as opposed to the three that were originally outlined.

**Divestment Opposition Presentation:**

Robbie Ellahorn (ASUW Divestment Opposition Presenter): Hi guys. My name is Robbie Ellahorn. Thank you guys for having us out here to speak today and this is something that I’m also very passionate about. It’s something that’s very important to talk about. It’s going to be hard to explain all the things wrong with this resolution which is very complex. Firstly, just as a student of UW, I really sincerely believe that there are more pertinent things to legislate out related to improving our education and student life here and I hope we can agree on that. Secondly, a little bit of context. The resolution dropped before ASUW is part of the Boycott
Divestment and Sanctions movement or BDS. It's a global movement that aims to delegitimize and demonize the state of Israel. R 20-23 is one of the many tactics of the BDS movement which includes boycotting Israeli artists, cultural institutions and academics. The academic boycott of Israel, which is advocated by BDS, is something our university has already taken a stand against. Additionally, the language of the resolution is extremely bias and tends to simply one of the world’s more complex conflicts. The conflict is presented in a vacuum with no mention of the other side of the story. Such bias narrative, extremely reliant on historical omission has no place in the academy. It is intellectually irresponsible to talk about Gaza while turning a blind eye to the fact that it is governed by Hamas, who has launched thousands of rockets at Israeli civilians. It’s not responsible to talk about the security fence between Israel and the West Bank without mentioning the reason why it was built. The constant suicide bombings which took the lives of innocent Israelis as they ate in restaurants, partied at nightclubs and watched movies in movie theaters. If the senate passes this resolution, it’s saying that it accepts and endorse this kind of simplistic narrative that pushes a bias of the conflict and neglecting to look at the issue with nuance. Now, I’ll be the first to tell you. There are many things wrong with Israeli policy. However there’s a distinct line between legitimate criticism to critique policies and rhetoric intended to delegitimize and demonize Israel. The supporters of the resolution constantly compare Israel to apartheid South Africa and refer to the Jewish people’s right to self-determination as a colonialist project. In fact in a letter of support on page 15 in the packet in front of you, it claims Israel’s occupation of Palestine is the most bizarre and barbaric land grab and control of people in the history of colonialism. This sort of demonizing speak isn’t moving us toward productive conversation or solution where each side is about to reach out and reconcile their hardships. It is directly and intentionally put there to demonize Israel. This extremist rhetoric is dismissive and destructive. Peace and reconciliation will come by reaching out to understand each other’s hardship and challenges, not fingerpointing which only puts the blame on one side. Should our student senate decide to pass or entertain a resolution of the Israeli and Palestinian conflict, it should be one that promotes a balanced narrative worthy of the academy and is nuanced that supports dialogue, coexistence and a two state solution. I’m not saying that student activism isn’t important. We’re university students and we have a role in shaping and bettering our world but I’m asking us to go about conducting these conversations in a way that is worthy of the academy. We need to be having open dialogue and we need to be looking at all sides of the issue. I think anyone who reads this can see that there is a lot of historical omission and not telling both sides of the story. So my opposition to this resolution isn’t to say that student activism isn’t important. I just think we need to go about it in a better way. I thank you guys for letting me speak and I urge you to oppose ASUW Senate resolution 20-39.

Divestment Question Session for Senators:

Chris L: This next 10 minute period, which is extendable by the senate, is this time be used for clarification rather than for debate because there will be time for that later. The floor is open for questions.
Maryclare: So there was mention of other resolutions of similar objectives passed at other university. Do you think the language in any of those are more acceptable? Is it an issues with the language?

Robbie: I think that many of these resolutions in other universities often tend to fail because of a lot of the same language.

Maryclare: What about the ones that succeeded?

Robbie: I haven’t read every single one and compared the language but I would venture to say that the ones that have succeeded probably were amended or had less harsh and onesided language than this, although I’m not an expert.

Monica De La Torre (Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies Guest): I have a question about where exactly the demonizing language is and if we can get a specific example.

Robbie: Thank you. That’s a good question. So within the actual document, it’s more a matter…

Chris L: I’m sorry. Just to clarify, are you talking about this resolution or this packet?

Monica: The resolution.

Robbie: Within the actual resolution, it’s more that this is a completely simplified, one-sided narrative to one of history’s most complex conflicts and I think it’s in things where there is no mention of the second Intifada or the reason why a security fence was built. There’s mention of Gaza but in a vacuum. There’s no mention of Egypt’s policy towards Gaza or why Israel picks certain policies that it does or why Gaza is governed by Hamas. I would say it’s more of the language you see in the packet and the supporters of the resolution that is demonizing.

Joseph: Could we get clarification on what precisely is being boycotted in this particular resolution?

Adam: I think this is a really great question to address right now. This resolution stemmed from the BDS movement. However, it is a divestment resolution so there isn’t any boycott reference. It is purely divestment from the companies in the whereas clause.

Yasmeen: Point of clarification, we are voting on how our people vote on the resolution and not the packet?

Chris L: The packet is supporting material that has been provided. I was not requested. We’re not dealing with the packet.
Adam: The reason I handed these out because I didn’t have physical copies of the resolution. These packets we prepared for the undergraduate senators so that’s why there are supporting letters that were referenced.

Michael Serbin (Pharmacy): How much money has UW has invested in these companies?

Adam: Right now, the estimates, and I want to remind everyone that these change a lot, is Hewlett Packard,$1.4 million, Northrop & Grumman, $1.5 million, Albis Systems $0.25 million.

Douglass: I would like to know if we could find out where that money would go instead.

Adam: That is a really good question. This resolution for the undergraduate is a first step. This will signal to university that students are behind it. The next step is for the financial managers to set up a screening. The UW Divest group already managed to have a really great win. They have now a research assistant in charge of vetting some of the investments we have. We’re asking for an additional screening. So what other companies they invest in is really up to the university and their financial managers just to keep in line with the fiduciary duties. That would be up to people that are much more savvy than I am.

Chris L: Just to clarify, what Adam is referring to is a divestment from fossil fuels.

Evan: To follow up to the question that asked how much we would be divesting, I wonder if we can get the rough percentage of the total amount that UW invests? How much total is being divested as a percentage?

Adam: I sincerely apologize. I don’t know the total amount of endowment but it’s on the UW’s Wikipedia page.

Thilini Kahandaweraiaichem (Jackson School - Southeast Asian Studies): Can I get information about the affiliation of the advocate of the opposition?

Robbie: Am I a UW student?

Thilini: Yes.

Robbie: Yes, I’m a sophomore student in international studies.

Thilini: Does he work for any organization that is listed in this bill, like as an intern?

Robbie: No, I do not work for or affiliated with the companies or corporations on the resolution.

Gabriel: We looked up the endowment and it is $2.1 billion which is 1.4%.
Joseph: Does the language in the resolution include specific indication of delegitimization of state?

Robbie: The actual resolution doesn’t explicitly say that this is intended to delegitimize the Israeli state. The way I see it is as endorsing this resolution and the way it speaks about the conflict is to endorse these movements as well.

Adam: I’m sorry. Could I clarify?

Chris L: Yes.

Adam: I don’t mean to interrupt you Robbie, but Chris really made it clear that we’re talking about here is not what you read into it. So just to clarify and with all due respect. Does that make sense?

Chris: Yes, but I think the point still stands especially given the supporting material that have been handed out that add more depth. The comment is valid.

Rayhaneh Rajahadeh (SUPER Representative): I would like some clarification from the opposition. If the belief is that by supporting this bill makes UW take a stance on this issue, what do they think about the fact that not supporting this bill and investing in these companies that violate human rights, how is that not taking a side on the issue?

Robbie: I would say that to look at it through that lens, the way in which the university invests probably would have it taking a side on most of the world’s conflicts and probably on both sides. There’s a difference between looking at it through a lens where the university is investing its money somewhere and making a leap to that taking a side on a conflict versus resolutions with language like this that seem to be very one sided.

Chris L: We are at time. I’ll entertain a motion to extend time. I will remind everyone that if we want to remain in the questions period, please try to ask questions around clarification rather than debate points that were presented by both sides.

Ted Chen (Bioengineering): I move to extend time by 10 minutes.

Alan-Michael Weatherford (Comparative Literature): Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Yasmeen: I think we started leaning into the debate portion, no? I withdraw my objection. I thought it sounded like debate already.

Chris L: Are there any other objections?
Christine: I agree with that as well. The questions aren’t clarifications anymore so I think we should move on to the debate section.

Cindi Textor (Asian Language and Literature): If we move to the debate portion, can we still ask questions to get clarification?

Chris L: Yes. Nothing is preventing you from asking questions. I’m suggesting that there is a period specifically before we start so we are as informed on an issue that none of us are experts on.

Cindi: I withdraw my objection.

Chris L: Is there any other discussion?

Cindi: What is this discussion on?

Chris L: This is a discussion on the motion to extend time, which there were objections so we would need to discuss or have a vote.

Justin Bare (Computer Science & Engineering): I still have a question.

Chris L: Is that an objection?

Justin: Yes.

Chris L: Are there any other points of discussion on the motion to extend time? Hearing none, we’ll move to a vote. All those in favor of extending time by 10 minutes, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Chair rules that the no’s have it. We will move to the next portion. The floor is now open for motions.

**GPSS Divestment Directive Vote:**

Ted: I have a question. Is there a reason why this resolution only focuses on Israel and the Palestinian territory? Why not include North Korea, China, Russia and all these other countries? Why just focus on Israel?

Adam: A few thing, this is focused on companies that are profiting on occupation. I would encourage anyone who is passionate about human rights and activism to talk to me about things that you see as important. There hasn’t been a movement coming from North Korea, for example, on their occupier and the occupation. In Palestine, there is an occupation and they have called the global community to engage in this movement so the occupation ends. There is
no occupation in Israel. Hamas is not occupying Tel Aviv and we're not boycotting Hamas. The US government already does so that's not an issue.

Robbie: I think that's a fantastic question that strikes at the heart of why I feel the BDS movement singles out and demonizes Israel. When we talk about academic boycotts, we're going to boycott Israel and only Israel when there are barriers to academic freedom and human rights violations all over the world. Again, not to say student activism is not important, but we do have a role in changing things but these boycotts are going to start with Israel and end with them and that's why I feel that it's singling out and demonizing Israel as a whole.

Gary Hothi (Social Work): It's not a point of clarification but we're moving to resolve what our two senator-representative should be voting. I'm carrying the vote of my constituency and not necessarily what I think but what the School of Social Work on my behalf thinks. I might believe a certain way but I have to balance that with what I think my constituents think, what the School of Social Work thinks.

Chris L: That was well said. Thank you Gary.

Alan-Michael: This is directed to the opposition. I would like to know what are the subsequent anticipated action in the case that this resolution goes down just to understand their actions thereafter.

Robbie: I think if there is anything positive to come out of this resolution, which I hope will be defeated, is that it important that we have this conversation because I think this tremendous suffering needs to be addressed to better the lives of both Israelis and Palestinians. It should be through conversation that is open to hearing the other side to try to get the two peoples to try and reconcile each other's hardships and understand where they're coming from and work together to understand each other and move toward a solution. I don't know if itself is another piece of resolution because my personal view is that the ASUW student senate has things that are more pertinent to student life but hopefully, I would like to facilitating a more nuanced, balanced and welcoming conversation on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Chris L: Just to remind you all, we just defeated a motion to extend time for questions. My preference would be that a motion is made, which can be discussed directly. Do you guys see the distinction I'm drawing? A motion be made to direct our representatives to vote a certain way, which can be seconded, then be objected to, which can be discussed. That would be my preference.

Justin: I move to inform our representatives in ASUW to abstain on this issue.

Chris L: Is there a second? Seeing none, the motion dies.

Alma: I move to propose a motion that our representatives vote yes to this resolution.
Haley: I second that.

Chris L: Are there any objections?

Durmus: I do object.

Chris L: You'll get a chance to speak but the way this now works is we now we go back and forth. Proponents can speak to a motion and opponents can speak against eh motion until we exhausted speaking. So would you like to speak to the objection?

Alma: So I come as a representative of the Gender, Women and Sexuality Studies department of both faculty and students. Most of our faculty are also of members for divestment and support it in different ways. So does our student body. I think that we should be taking a decision on this resolution for multiple reasons. This is an issue that has been going on for a very long time and the resolution is actually conservative in what it is proposing. It is proposing that the university divests from six companies, not from the state of Israel as a whole, that other campuses have suggested. This resolution is very conservative in that sense. Additionally, if we say yes to it, it also impacts other universities in Washington that are working on their resolutions of their own. Being a very large campus and student body, Evergreen is dependent on if we pass this resolution and I think it is important for us to concern what it means as people participating in an active life on campus and outside of campus to take a stance on a resolution. This is the only resolution on the table.

Chris L: Would someone like to speak against the motion?

Durmus: I would like to speak against the motion on the grounds that we should leave financial decisions to financial experts because of all the companies that UW invests in, we can surely find a reason to divest. I object to the motion that financial decisions should be left to financial experts and not on the grounds of Israel or something like that.

Chris L: Just to clarify, we are not voting to pass anything. Does someone like to speak in favor of the motion?

Gary: At the University of Washington, there are students that originate from the region we are discussing. Thusly, it involves the University of Washington because students here have family and friends there.

Chris L: Someone speak against the motion?

Derek Sutherland (Aeronautics & Astronautics): Since this document is politically charged, I would feel more comfortable saying yay or nay after consulting my constituents to better knew what they wanted.
Chris L: Someone to speak in favor?

Evan: I just have a point of clarification…

Chris L: If anyone has a point of clarification, you can just shout that out.

Evan: I just want to ask this before we move one. I want to make sure that the motion as a whole and that we weren’t being redundant when having this debate that we can just amend the motion at hand?

Chris L: Alma, did you mean to move to vote?

Alma: Yes.

Evan: I just wanted to clarify that in the minutes so we’re doing it right.

Douglass: Point of clarification, this is due to be passed down to ASUW representatives by when? So if we come to vote today, that will given to our ASUW representatives to be voted on what day?

Chris L: I have no idea.

Joseph: I believe that this is a representation of our own opinions voting in favor or against this particular resolution as GPSS senators. So it’s my understanding that that’s what we are doing with this particular vote. We are people in this room offering our opinion.

Haley: Point of clarification, I think personally it’s more about what my colleagues and constituents want as opposed to what I would want.

Chris L: Okay, so we’re now back to speaking in opposition.

Michael: Can we have one representative vote in favor and one to vote against it?

Chris L: No, we vote as a senate.

Justin: Could each side speak to whether we have investments in those that support Palestinian attacks on Israel?

Chris L: I’m going to rule that out of order because that is not an argument for or against. That is not germane to the motion on the floor.

Gary: Point of clarification, we should as a senator as to what the temperature of my constituents is and I should’ve had the opportunity and that I should’ve taken it back and it’s on
my that I didn’t communicate it but it’s my responsibility as a senator to know how they would vote.

Chris L: We’re now hearing the opposition.

David: Point of clarification, can guests speak at any time?

Chris L: Guests may speak at any time.

Alice: Point of order, senators have the priority and there were senators who wanted to speak.

Chris L: Then I apologize. We are speaking against the motion on the floor at this time.

Ted: This is based on the clause of the Evergreen State College, what they do with their endowment programs is none of our business. If they invest in UW, that shouldn’t pressure us to vote in favor of what they wanted.

Chris L: Now, speaking in favor of the motion.

Yasmeen: So one of the points of the opposition that was brought up was that there are more pertinent issues to students. I would argue that since ASUW has voted and has made a statement that we want to focus on investment activity that is socially responsible, the question of student relevance has already been discussed, rehashed and covered by the entire student body and they’ve already voted to make a committee on advising the UW Treasury Office to advise on investment opportunities. The question whether its relevant to students is more of a personal one and not a procedural or administrative one. It is relevant to students.

David: I’m a student at UW. I’m very involved in my community. I volunteer at the Youth and Children’s Justice Center and I’ve definitely worked in this conflict. I want to make sure that it’s clear to everyone that we’re not reading into this. This is undeniably intertwined with the global BDS movement. Most of the things in this packet and most of the letters addressed to ASUW are the same that are used in other schools and campuses. The language of this bill to be conservative is a tactic so we feel it’s okay to pass this bill, not as a part of the BDS movement but as divestment. Boycott is something that our school has come against. The reality is this is just the B in BDS. First off, we don’t have more money in Caterpillar, which is the main target of this bill. The reality of this is that this is meant to increase the isolation of Israel, where I have family and friends and who have been the victims of same sorts of attacks that the people of Palestine are a victim of. It’s a country that I’ve been to and I have friends in Palestine as well in the Israeli army. There have been judges who have served as the presiding judge over former Israeli prime ministers. There’s is virtually no area in Israel where you can relate to apartheid because they are two separate states. The supporters of BDS support one state, which would mean one state and an end to Israel as a state and as a Jewish homeland. History has taught us that we do need a state to call our own, a state where, by the way, the only democracy where the laws of equality are enshrined in the constitution. It’s an area where the Jews, Arabs and
Israelis are all represented in our government and there are tons of organizations that bring people to together and the reality is this time of divestment and BDS movement isn’t seen the same way as it is there. The leader of the Palestinian national authority hasn’t even actually endorsed this type of movement because it take them further away from negotiation. It doesn't bring together. If anyone has any clarification, they can find me after the debate.

Alma: I thought that you could shout out the point of clarification. I’m sorry. You had a last sentence which I did not hear.

Chris L: We are now speaking in favor.

Christine: How much time do we have for this?

Chris L: We gave ourselves 25 minutes and we’re at 17 and a half. It’s extendable.

Christine: My point is, I've been watching people leaving the whole time. I'm going to have to leave in 20 minutes and I would like to vote on it.

Chris L: Thank you. I will recognize the gentleman in the back.

Craig Corrie (Rachel Corrie Foundation Representative): My name is Craig Corrie and I'm not a student at UW. I represent the Rachel Corrie Foundation and am the father of Rachel Corrie. I thank you both for your views. I've lived in Israel both off and on for 9 months and certainly have several friends who have children killed by Palestinians as well as many Palestinian friends that have been killed in Israel. I'm in favor of this and I just want to say that it's asking for very minor things. It asks for divestment, which may send a message to people about whether it's acceptable to ask in the world to ask corporations to be responsible and it also means that the university will not profit from what I view to be irresponsible behavior. I think that just as the boycotts in the southern part of the United States was meant to bring the southern part of the United States into the realm as we all see as socially acceptable, to get rid of the Jim Crow laws. Just as the apartheid in South Africa, it was linelife. Both whites and blacks have a better life now than before and I see just the whole movement here not as to ruin Israel but as a lifeline to Israel.

Chris L: We are speaking against now.

Evan: Point of information, just to mention that we’re running out of time so we have the parli pro option to call to question. I’m still in favor of continuing this debate but if someone else wants to, they can all to question. That requires a vote in it of itself to call into question and force a vote on this.

Chris L: Thank you. Any senators speaking against the current motion?
Christine: I’m a scientist and I’m really bothered by the language in this because I do feel that it’s strongly one sided and not impartial that I ascribe to be when I write. I would support divestment if it wasn’t attached to the inflammatory and biased language. That’s why I’m opposing this because there are points where certain sides are being called out more than others. I don’t feel like it’s not an impartial, legal bill. It’s not the type of language you see in a bill.

Chris L: Speaking in favor?

Leah Knopf (SUPER Representative): My name is Leah and I’m a graduate student in the School of Social Work. I am a constituent of yours and I urge you to support this resolution and stand on the right side of history. Students have the power to make change as you have seen. UW has divested from fossil fuels and they have divested from Darfur and Sudan. To me, to be impartial, that’s not a place here. To me, to work for change is to take a stand and we can do that here. So in Social Work classes, we’re constantly grappling with how to work with social and economic justice in the classroom and beyond its walls. I see this resolution to do that. I see it as a way to support responsible investing for our university and support equal rights. To clarify, BDS is not a solution. It is a strategy. It doesn’t say one state/two state. It is a strategy to work for equal rights and maintaining profits from human rights abuses doesn’t move toward any solution in this conflict. So this resolution is a strategy to work for equal rights and it’s also a non-violent strategy that has opened up conversation. We’re talking about it right now. I’ve had one on one dialogue with people and we’ve been talking about it and I believe conversation and connection to dialogue cannot happen in an unequal power imbalance and that is what’s happening with Israeli and Palestinians. In South Africa, the truth and reconciliation came after the oppressive power was dismantled. So after that system of oppression was dismantled, that was when reconciliation and conversation happened. We can act in solidarity and to me, solidarity is responding to the call for change from those who are asking for it. Solidarity is the connection with struggles and sometimes it is speaking up and to not be complacent in that space of oppression for others and solidarity is responsive to us all. As I benefit from white privilege in the United States, I benefit from Jewish privilege in Israel. I can move to Israel tomorrow and have rights while Palestinians who’s lived there for generations and I would not be subjected to discriminatory laws, racial profiling or unequal resources or occupation. We have to change the system of inequality here and there. To me, Jewish tradition compels me to work for Palestinian equal rights and that’s tradition of liberation, freedom and questioning. I urge you to question the status quo and these system of oppression and how we can work for liberation and equal rights of all people.

Chris L: We’re now speaking against.

Evan: If a senator wants to ask a clarifying statement of a senator that wasn’t directly pro or con, what’s the process for doing that?

Chris L: Before you do that, we are at time. I will entertain a motion to extend time. If no vote is taken to extend time, I will still exercise my prerogative to give a final opportunity to the side
opposing the motion since the one proposing the motion spoke first but I will entertain a motion to extend time.

Alice: Can I call to question at this time?

Chris L: You may, but I will give the opposition one more chance to speak.

Evan: Point of clarification, so for the senator that mentioned non-impartial language in there. I was wondering if that senator could point out a specific clause?

Christine: I thought the section where it highlighted the number of Palestinians killed but not the number of Israelis killed was one sided. There also some more colorful language to provoke an emotional response against these practices that isn’t necessary to convey.

Gary: Point of clarification, regardless it’s going to be voted on by ASUW right?

Chris L: Yes.

Gary: We have to inform our representatives on how to vote.

Zach: Point of clarification, when is there a vote?

Evelina Vaisvilaite (ASUW Representative): We went through the first reading and it was referred to the committee so I don’t have a date of when it will be voted on. It may or may not come back by our next meeting, which is next Tuesday but I can’t tell you when exactly the vote is. It depends on how our debate goes. It can be soon as next Tuesday.

Douglass: Motion to extend time by six minutes.

Edward: Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections? Seeing none, time is extended by 6 minutes. I will now hear from the opposition.

Tal Gottstein (Guest): Hi, I’m not a senator here. My name is Tal Gottstein. First of all, I’m happy to have this conversation. I don’t know who of you are aware of how the political spectrum works in Israel but I’m totally in the left perspective. I am against occupation. I go to demonstrate against occupation. I’m part of groups like Peace Now and that means that there are a lot of things that aren’t right and I’m still against backing this resolution. I want to explain why. Me and a lot of my friends from Israel support a two state solution. I’m Jewish, my family is Jewish and I think it’s important for us to have a Jewish land and I think it’s important for the Palestinians to have a land too, without any doubt. My problem with this resolution is it calls to the right of the UN law. That means that all the countries from 1938 and Palestine under the sentence would
leave to Israel. In practice, it means that there’s not going to be a Jewish state. It doesn’t call for a one state solution but it does in practice. The BDS solution and what they’re calling for is a one state solution in the ground. That means that there will be a majority of Palestinians in the land of Israel than Jewish people. The Jewish homeland is not going to be Jewish anymore and that is what I’m against. I want to get the Palestinians to get a land and for us to have a country and what the BDS movement is calling for is for the Jewish people to not have a country.

Haley: Point of clarification, I think there is really excellent representation on both sides but the resolution itself is just to be voted on in the senate. It’s not voted on whether there’s a one state or a two state.

Tal: Exactly.

Robbie: What she referenced about the law of return is in the whereas clause in the resolution.

Chris L: I’ll now hear in support of the resolution.

Lubna Alzaroo (SUPER Representative): Hi, my name is Lubna. I’m a Palestinian student. This is my first year here in the English graduate program. I’m with this resolution. First of all, there is no place in this resolution where it states a one solution or two state solution. Also, in the BDS call, there is no one state or two state solution. The BDS call was called by 170 Palestinian civil society organizations and the 170 civil society organizations are trade unions and political parties and they are also representative of a huge spectrum of Palestinian society. Some of them might be very radical left that believe in the one state solution but the majority of the people who called the BDS call are with the two state solution. That’s not the really big question because this resolution does not specifically ask for us to discuss whether it’s a one state solution or not. This resolution is asking us to target specific companies who are investing their money in the illegal application of the West Bank and helping with the siege of Gaza that has resulted in the death of thousands of people and it is also asking us to stop investing in occupation in the West Bank that has been there since the ‘40s. I’m a person from the West Bank and my family lives there. I’ve witnessed within the past 20 years the fall of the Oslo Accord. I’ve been in dialogue programs with Israelis. I’ve come to the conclusion that the way that Palestinian and Israelis can negotiate with each other is when we are in equal grounds and I believe at this point, we are not in equal grounds. The state of Israel has no reason whatsoever to give Palestinians a state and therefore Palestinian cannot deny a state.

Chris L: We are at time, so unless we extend time, I’m going to give the last speaking opportunity to the opposition. I would ask that any comments are not duplicative of something that has been said before. I don’t think it’s been a problem yes particularly. Unless there is a vote to extend time, I will exercise my prerogative to give one last speaking opportunity to the opposition.

Griff: This is a contentious issue and I don’t know how my constituents feel about this and I don’t feel comfortable voting affirmatively to this without polling them. So I vote in the abstain side. I would request more time to go back.
Chris L: Since that is not germane to the motion at hand.

Griff: Which motion was that?

Chris L: There was no motion to extend time. I'm exercising my prerogative to give the last speaking opportunity to the opposition.

Evan: Point of clarification, were you speaking as the opposition?

Griff: I thought I was.

Chris L: I'm going to rule that as not germane to the motion and allow one more comment.

Hal Muzik: Hello, my name is Hal Muzik and I'm a queer Israeli human rights activist. I lived in Israel all my life. I was 12 years old and an ice cream shop two blocks from my house was blown up by a suicide bomber where a grandmother and her year old granddaughter were killed and I was 2 minutes away from getting there. This resolution is targeting me and my family and Israelis. We need to be honest. We need to talk about what this resolution really is. The BDS oppose the Jewish and that does mean the end of the Jewish state. The BDS wants to bring down the Jewish state of Israel. This is the leading BDS activist. BDS represents to bring about the defeat of Israel and victory for Palestine. This is one BDS leader and compares Israel to South Africa. I have a letter here from South Africa that as a black South African who lived under South African apartheid, I'm disturbed and offended when people compared South Africa apartheid regime to Israel. It has nothing to do with that. If you want to read it, I can pass this out. My hope is that both Palestinians and Israelis can sit together and discuss find out a solution that benefits both sides. We can do that but we have to be honest and we have to say what exactly this resolution is. I came from Iraq. My family came from Iraq. My great-grandfather was executed in Iraq in 1951. I have no place else to live as a queer Jewish Israeli. I'm going to be deported from the state. Israel is 66 years old and they've made mistakes but maybe one day we'll be as perfect as America who has been here for 200 years. Hopefully we'll get there but we're trying our best and passing this resolution will push us down and push me and my family down and I'm inviting you to take the vote no.

Chris L: So there has been no motion to extend time. There is a motion on the floor. I would remind everyone that we, the GPSS, is not voting on this resolution. We are not voting on this. We are voting, on the motion on the floor, to instruct our representative in the ASUW senate to when this come up for a vote to vote yes. Is that correct?

Alma: Yes.

Chris L: So everyone understand what is being voted on. That is the motion on the floor. We have a second and we have run out of time. We have no motion to extend time so therefore the
speaker’s list is exhausted and it’s time for a vote. I’m going to do a count vote. Senators may vote on this. Evelina, I think you can vote as an ASUW liaison. You may vote yay, nay or abstain.

Edward: Abstain from the motion to vote yes. So that means the yeses and the nos will be judged against each other leaving out the abstentions. I just want to clarify if you abstain, you are not voting for the ASUW representatives to abstain.

Chris L: Yes. Abstentions are subtracted from the total so just yays and nays. So Elisa, if you can help me count and we can compare the number. So all those in favor of directing our representative to vote yes in this resolution, please raise your hand. All those voting against the motion to vote yes on this resolution, please raise your hands. Abstaining? Thank you. The motion fails. The floor is open for motions.

Douglass: I motion to table this vote so I can go back to my constituents and conduct a random sample for my own personal reasons.

Chris L: Can I modify?

Douglass: Yes.

Chris L: To go back to your constituents and use whatever method you deem appropriate. Not everyone might not want to do a random sample.

Alice: Could we have the result of the vote?

Chris L: Yes. 13 yay, 14 nay, 15 abstentions.

Edward: Are the abstentions count against the yeses?

Chris L: No, they are simply erased from existence.

Jess: What happens if this comes to a vote before we meet again?

Chris L: They have not been directed to vote anything because defeating this resolution that we’re recommending them to vote now. It simply means that we’re not voting yes. Having said that, Doug has made a motion. Is there a second?

Alice: Is it possible to record who voted yay or nay? Is there an option for that?

Chris L: Roll call.

Rene: If you want to call roll call, you have to do it before you vote.
Chris L: Getting back to the motion, is there a second?

Gary: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Cindi: I think we should discuss whether to table it or whether to move again to possibly instruct them to a no.

Chris L: That means the floor is open for discussion on Doug's motion.

Ted: If we do table it, that means there are two ASUW meetings before we have our next meeting?

Chris L: Correct.

Haley: Can that motion be repeated, the one that was defeated?

Chris L: Yes, of course.

Alice: I also object to that because I believe we've been given such extensive information from both sides of this contentious issue, that we as representatives of our constituents are the best informed to make a decision on how to instruct our ASUW representative on this issue. It would only muddle the issue for our constituents that may have emotional and personal issue for or against it so as our elected representatives, we have a prerogative and have an informed decision on this issue.

Gabe: I'm going to object as well. As senators, you should be able to judge the temperature of the water for you body.

Alma: Point of clarification, did the majority abstain so they can go ask their constituents for more information?

Yasmeen: I support the objection because we had this resolution for a grand total of a day and I think more information is needed.

Douglass: To answer your question, yes. I abstain because I wanted more information from my constituents.

Chris L: The motion on the floor is to table this discussion. Are there anymore discussions?
Cindi: I’m wondering if we table and this comes to a vote at ASUW, it’s my understanding that our representatives can’t abstain so it will just be up them to decide.

Chris L: No, we can instruct them to not show up.

Carolyn Shores (Environmental & Forestry Sciences): Can we make a motion to have our senators to abstain since that was the winning number of tallies?

Chris L: Yes, but not before we act on this motion.

Griff: I would like to amend this motion. I would not like to rehash this whole discussion if we do decide to table this. If it’s possible to take a vote at another time, I’d prefer to do that than take more of the senate’s time.

Chris L: What is your amendment?

Griff: To not have discussion again.

Evan: Point of information, you can always call to question.

Chris L: Is there any other discussion on the motion that is on the floor?

Cindi: Would I be correct in saying that the motion to table does not instruct to abstain?

Chris L: It simply tables it.

Douglass: Point of information, I would like to ask the ASUW liaison, do you think it’s pretty likely that they’ll come up with a vote or is it totally unknown?

Eveline: I don’t want to make an opinion on that because I don’t know how to gauge how the discussion will go.

Leah: Point of information, I was under the impression that student elections are happening so they were not addressing any bills.

Evelina: That was two senate meetings ago. At the last senate meeting, the bill did come up and went through first readings and got sent to committee. So next week, it’ll be discussed and has the potential to come back for second readings and from there, it’s hard to say how long discussions will take.

Chris L: Is this speaking to or for the motion?
Haley: I’m asking if we can call to question.
Michael: Second.

Call for Executive Senator Elections:

Chris L: All those in favor of moving immediately to a vote on this discussion. All opposed. Then we will move immediately to table this discussion until the next senate meeting and in the interim senators will be directed to poll their constituents on how they would like us to vote. All those in favor, raise your hand. All those opposed. Motion carries. This is tabled until next senate meeting. We will move on. We lost two executive senators at our most recent election so we need to replace them. We will do that next week and at this point, I’m speaking to about 25% of the senate. If any of you 25% or any of you have colleagues that would like to run for executive senator position, please talk to one of the officers or remaining executive senators. That would be Alan-michael or Evan Firth. I would encourage you to come to the next executive meeting.

Karen Michael (Public Health - Environmental and Occupational): Point of information, to be executive senators do you have to be a senator to start with?

Announcements:

Chris L: Yes. Moving on to announcements, before everyone runs away, please return these.

Alma: Next senate meeting, I’m doing the spotlight on Gender, Women and Sexuality studies so I know all of you desperately want to know and you guys might already know but I’ll still talk to you about it.

Adam: I really appreciate you guys having this discussion. Next Thursday, Ali Abuminah, this really great activist who’s going to speak. It’s going to be May 15th at 6:30 in Kane Hall in room 110. If you want flyers, I have some.

Ted: The Taiwanese Student Association is hosting the UW Night Market this Saturday at 10:30pm in Red Square. It’s partly funded by the GPSS Diversity funding.

Edward: I’m promoting this thing that’s advertised up here. The UW Astrobiology program is hosting a talk by Dr. Steve Benner, who is a world reknown astrobiologist. He works on creating life in the lab. This helps to inform our ability to look for life elsewhere in the solar system and exoplanets. This is a really great interdisciplinary public talk that is accessible to all people and levels of science knowledge. A lot of people are coming to this. We really encourage anyone to come see this talk.

Robbie: I just want to thank you for inviting me to come talk and I really appreciate it. I think this is a really important conversation to be had. If any of you guys have more question, I’m going to leave my contact info with Chris and can you pass it on?
Chris L: Yes.

Robbie: Awesome. Thank you.

Genesis: Next week, we’re having our Science & Policy Summit. It’s called Quality of Life. We’re having 3 panels throughout the day and it’s at the Burke Museum. We are looking for speakers for our mental wellness and neuroscience panel.

Alice: We have some in the works but if you happen to know someone in the expertise of neuroscience, specifically in regards to depression or anxiety and or someone with mental health policy, that will be great. We also have two other panels and happy hour at 5 so please come.

Jess: When is that?

Genesis: Next Thursday.

Elisa: So diversity forums. We had 3 this month. We just had Allyship and it was awesome. The next one coming up is on the 13th. It’s how to start a diversity committee. If your program does not have a diversity committee, we’re going to be having lots of people who are representing great programs and we’ll have all the answers on how to start your own and following up with that, we’re having a forum on veterans on the 29th.

Chris L: I have two announcements. The first is that we’ve have launched our peer graduate student mentoring initiative and it’s off the ground. Applications to be a mentor are open until May 20th. There’s a link on the website and you will receive this as an email. We’ll also be sending this out to the graduate program advisor listserv. We’ve already had a couple. Also, information went out in the Graduate School listserv a couple weeks ago. I wrote a guest blog post. The post is probably not that good but the information was in there so that’s what’s important. Tina made this kickass logo for us. The name of the program is Grads Guiding Grads. It’s a partnership between us, the Graduate School and the Counseling Center and the application is live. You can click down here and apply to be a mentor. It brings you to a Google form and it spits that out into a Google Doc excel file for us and that gets you into the system. If you’re wondering who’s looking at this, we have students and faculty from the Graduate School. Please check it out. This will be sent out and please forward this to your constituents. My final announcement is that I thank you all for who stuck it out until the end. We had a really tough but extremely respectful and extremely productive conversation today. I want to highlight the respectful part. This is a charged issue. I don’t think it was possible to approach this issue without bias of some kind. I really applaud everyone here and for the immense amount of respect and compassion you showed. I’m really proud of everyone for that even if we did see an exodus of people. I won’t throw a hissy fit that we don’t have quorum.

Adjourn:
Yasmeen: I move to adjourn.

Michael: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?