Call to Order & Approval of Agenda:

Chris Lizotte (President): I will now call this meeting to order at 5:33pm. I will now entertain a motion to approve the agenda for this special meeting of the Graduate & Professional Student Senate.

Seyda Ipek (Physics): I move to approve the agenda.

Eddie Schwieterman (Astronomy): I second.

Approval of the Legislative Agenda:

Chris L: Great. Any objections? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. We will now move on to the approval of the legislative agenda. We have 20 minutes for this item. I will be moderating the time. Chris, you're on.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): So in a second, I will yield this to the GPSS committee members and we will go through this. Hopefully it'll make sense and we'll be able to take comments. I think we want to go through all of this first and if anything comes up, we can go back and look at that and hopefully within our 20 minutes, we will have it approved. I'll yield to members of the committee.

Alex Bolton (Law): The State Legislative Steering Committee worked on this over a few meeting. We started by looking at other various documents. We looked at 3. We looked at last year’s to look how it was set up in the past and see what was done there. Additionally, we looked at the ASUW agenda and the WSA agenda since those are other student groups we’re working with to give us a basis. A lot of committee members also have some background dealing with legislative members so we dealt with what made sense with prioritizing, what we felt was most important and as a group and as individuals, we came together and this is what we have. The first thing we have, which has been traditional, is the importance of state funding even though it’s not a budget year. State funding allows us to do what we do to be a great university and emphasizes that we’re not just looking for money. The reason is that it’s for academic excellence since that is what we care about. There are some different sub-points in there. We can go in more detail later on if you want after we give a broad overview. The second part was transportation.
It’s been a big part in our senate meetings so far this year and it’s been a big deal particularly with how many students rely on the U-Pass, the Metro and Sound Transit to get here. So this is for the legislators to give us the ability to get transportation revenue to support King County Metro so people can still depend on Metro to get to campus. After that reasonably is tuition. It really ties in with the state funding and academic excellence. Kind of broadening ideas of what could be done including some cohort pricing and also looking at the fee-based issues. We tied that together because really, they are linked and we are very concerned about the fee-based issue. Then it’s student voice in governance. This is a recent one. It’s been actively advocated for in the last 3 years or so. So now there’s a budget group consisting of undergrad and graduate students that advise the Provost on the university budget as a whole. Last year, GPSS and ASUW worked to get college councils set up to help advise the deans in their respective school or college in their budgeting process. It’s still a work in progress but the reason we wanted it in here is to make sure that we’re pounding it home and get more headway this year and make sure it stays in the spotlight. After that, we went into some position statements. Student wellness, which dovetails with President Lizotte’s work on mental health and making sure its a priority and making sure that the legislature understands it’s a priority. We hope to get some funding there. We continue to sustainability. It’s been a big part of UW and we like to see it continue to move forward. Voting accessibility. The idea to have a drop box on campus, ideally, a permanent one just to make sure that students have easy access to democracy. Veteran issues. There’s a few different aspects of the whole veteran-friendly campus and we want to make sure that veteran-friendly campuses are actually veteran-friendly as well as looking into some things that could prevent recent veterans from being able to enroll and use the GI Bill, which would basically make it easier to get instate tuition. The idea of the textbook sales tax holiday. Basically, it tries to help that burden with students.

Douglass Tabor (Evans School of Public Affairs): We focused on student wellness to change some of the wording to be clear but not overly broad so that it encompasses many different issues so not just physical and mental health but combining everything to cover as many different issues in the future.

Alex: Anything you’d like to add?

Chris E: For people who were here last year, the funding thing has already been there, the governments thing is already there. What we really did is to refocus the issues to talk about recruitment and retention of faculty and some of those aspects. Then adding some of that language to reinforce that we are worth the money. The bottom issues like student wellness and sustainability have already been around. We just incorporated the language
with the student mental wellness. That was something that the President brought up and it seemed that people were interested in that or that was something important to the group. Veteran's issues really speaks to WSA. That's one of their main pushes this year. We can get into specifics on what all this means, like we can get into cohort pricing and fee-based programs and what administration thinks about that. I actually met with Margaret Shepard. She's the State External Affairs person. She talked about this and she thinks its good. She doesn't see any red flags so I think that we're aligned in this document for what administration wants to work on this year, which is really positive for us since we're not butting head and we can move forward. There are some discrepancies with what is legislative and what is administrative or on campus because administration would like to see if we do cohort pricing things and things with fee-based programs. We would tackle those in places like PACs and college councils but I still think it's an important thing because it does have legislative ramifications. So at this point I think we should just open it up for questions and get some feedback and debate.

Chris L: Maybe for the first question, are there any terms that are unclear to anyone, like what cohort pricing is?

Karen Michael (Environmental Educational Health): What's cohort pricing?

Chris E: So cohort pricing is actually this idea that when you sign up to go to school or your program, you would actually pay that the entire year or years that you're in the program. So up until this last year for 12 straight years, tuition was raised every year. So it would be the idea that when you sign on the dotted line, you had an idea of what you would be paying and that changed. There's opportunity for that since the Business School already uses a model that works on that. Administration isn't as happy about it for undergrads since 4 years is a long time but there's a move right now for biannual budgeting within the programs so they can more easily gauge what their shortfalls will be and can adjust that to the next incoming class. It's one of those things that will be hard to prescribe a broad policy on this since even within the graduate program, there's 14 differential tuition sets. But as an option through college councils and through PACs is, say the Public Health school wants to do this or the Evans School is interested in this as well, to have those conversations and to be able to do it so students can enjoy or feel good about.

Chris L: One of the terms I want to explain is veteran friendly. It's actually an official term that universities can apply to the state to be designated so what this means is that they are doing the things that they need to do to comply with having this official status bestowed on them.

Alma Khasawnih (Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies): I'm wondering about what it
means for example, student wellness. I don’t have a problem with the physical and mental part but for safety, what policies are these because what if the university decides to have more police on-campus? This is too general and I support certain thing but I'm not sure if such general statements work when we’re talking about policies. Are they the ones that are already set? Future ones? What are they talking about?

Chris E: So this is a good idea. We should be doing what we call a book of standing opinion or this Wiki idea that people talk about. That’s where we really hone down on what this means because I think when we talk about safety in this aspect, I think it falls with the SARVA.

Chris L: The point is very well taken that it's an ambiguous term. I think what it refers to here is personal safety however that is defined. I guess what I would say is that this document is not meant to be the final word. It’s meant to be a set of guiding principles so if then for example, there needs to be further discussion on refining what exactly that means, that is definitely possible. These last few ones are additional GPSS priorities and not the legislative priorities. The question is a good one and the point is well taken but this is to a large extent, a working document and not any kind of final document.

Chris E: This is a road map. I think I was just trying to get an example of the sexual assault response program that Chris has been working on. When we talk about safety, that's what we're talking about rather than having a militant police force on campus. Again, it's the idea that we will promote safety and we further define, when the issues come forward, our stances on what those become.

Seyda: My question was along the same line. These are just for what we're going to think about this year? Are we going to support what the state wants to do and then we look at that more deeply?

Chris E: Sure, these are just broad issues that we say we're in support of. This is our internal document. Maybe I should talk about specific things. So for the transportation thing, we already have on our record with the resolution that talks about that and it also is involved with Move King County Now. If campaign items come up and we need to mobilize voters to vote on a package that might come up in April or November to help move that funding, that will be part of that. I think what this just says is that its what we're looking at. It's broad and it gives us the flexibility to decide what those become. So for the veteran's number, the bill numbers out there for a bill that would make it so that veterans that have been honorable discharged from the military in the past two year that move to Washington can forego the 1 year waiting period for residency. It's one of those things that people say, "Well is this really an issue because the GI Bill is paid by the feds?" It actually is because the GI Bill
only covers instate tuition so what you’re seeing right now is veterans that aren’t seen as instate and they get their state tuition paid but have to pay the difference. All this does is to correct that. There actually is a cost that the university incurs because of that but they are very knowledgeable and willing to take it in support of that bill. There are specific bills that will come up and we can focus down on those and you’ll be well informed on that. This is a broad sweeping feel-good thing to let everybody know what the road map is.

Dawn Roscoe (Communication): Just to clarify, this is the general guidelines with these initiative but with the transportation thing with a more defined document of something that is happening, it’ll be brought before us and we vote on that specific one in case there is a safety one where it says we should have more police on campus, we can vote that one down specifically even though we said we support safety as a body?

Chris E: Correct.

Chris L: Chris is going to spend most of winter quarter in Olympia. This document will be him. This is the senate saying that we authorize you in broad terms to advocate for issues along these lines because things move very fast. Bills come up and die but he needs to be some flexibility to respond to things that happen without having to come back every single time. Until there's actually a specific bill that is being put through or when something looks like it'll become an actual legislation, that's when it comes back here.

Chris E: I also think that if it's controversial, I want to be very sensitive to things that come up. This is broad and gives me flexibility to work on campaign on behalf of you guys. That’s something I’ve been entrusted with through vote and I think that's a good thing to be able to do things. At the same time, there are parameters here to keep me focused on what is important to GPSS.

Ted Chen (Bioengineering): Could you clarify the last statement? What are public partnerships?

Chris E: This is a new idea and is tied to a specific program or idea of what is a social impact bond. A government entity would put out a bond specifically for a social issue. For example, New York City issued a social impact bond for an inmate program. JP Morgan bought bonds in the amount of 9.4 million from the City of New York for the specific social program of inmate re-incentiveism. In the future, those will be analyzed and if they are seen to have improved or work, the outcome will show the recintivism is less, then the city can issue a return on that bond to JP Morgan on those savings. It just opens up the private public partnership and for private money to make it into programs. I think this is good for UW in the aspect that we run a lot of programs specifically for after-school college prep or
teacher training. We can have these fund our program, which will free up university money. On the other end, if the programs are now getting their money from private businesses, the state can help subsidize their programs with private money, which frees up other money that can go towards the university.

Alma: I will have to disagree with your argument with the way that public-private partnerships will actually spend on social programs. They come with their own constraints and also make the university a neo-liberal university, which makes it more capitalist thus more conservative. It's contested whether it's a good thing or not. I think its one that is a little bit more complicated than that. I'm uncertain that we should be comfortable with any of these public partnerships. We should be much more selective with all these partnerships rather than being very open to it. Actually, the military does a lot of those things and these are not institutions that make our campus a good campus, education wise.

Chris E: Agreed. The main point on this is that it opens up the door. There are going to be people that will be working on this this year. I think it's something that should be explored and we can decide for ourselves if it's something we're into or not. A lot of these things are double-edged swords. The DoD funds a lot of our sciences but those same DoD grants are helping to subsidize research that our programs can't get money from otherwise. Those debates are out there to be had. All this is saying is that we think is important to look at.

Alma: Actually it says we support it, not that we're looking into it. Those are very different terminologies.

Chris L: One option would be to strike it from this document and anything that comes up would have to come directly to the senate for consideration.

Chris E: I will make it clear which says at the bottom that when other things come up, I can bring that to a vote.

Steve Carlin (Chemistry): Just a suggestion on things that might be more contentious, just insert the words 'the exploration of'. The issue that people are having is that it seems to support 100% of the issues that seems to come up because the language that is currently written says that the GPSS supports this regardless of context. So if the language can be structured to say exploration that might be better.

Chris E: I'll take that as a friendly amendment.

Chris L: I will need a motion to extend time before we go any further.
Eddie: I move to extend time by 5 minutes.

Dawn: Second.

Chris L: Any objections for the extension of time? Back to the proposed language change. Could you repeat the language you wish to change it to?

Steve: 'Exploration of private partnership'?

Chris L: Is there a second for that?


Chris L: Are there any objections to amending the document?

Gary Hothi (Social Work): Is this just for that one for all of them?

Alma: I had the same question.

Steve: For ones that seem contentious.

Alma: I understand this is a working document and that Chris is not going to go and do things right and left. In general, I think it's important for us to understand that all of these are explorations and I think that's the idea of this document so I don't think that all of them need that language but some of these change our social world. It affects us everyday on campus with the public-private relationship so I think that one needs more specific language.

Chris L: Is there any objections to that amendment?

Eddie: Point of order, do we need to vote on friendly amendments?

Seyda: You took that as friendly.

Alex: Maybe it was just to see if there were any objections to that.

Chris E: Are any points you guys want to bring up?

Chris L: Alma, I think it's a legitimate point particularly for that item so thank you for bringing it up. If there is no more discussion, I'll entertain a motion to endorse this document as the working legislative agenda for the GPSS 2014.
Seyda: So moved.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Great, we have approved our state legislative agenda. Thank you all. So as soon as we adjourn, please join us at our holiday mixer. It's down on the bottom of the HUB. There'll be some alumni hopefully. Before we adjourn, Elisa has an announcement. Keep your nametags when you go down there so we know who you our. That was a request from our events coordinator.

Elisa Law (Secretary): We will be having a diversity forum for international students to open up a conversation about their experiences. It’s tomorrow from 12-1:30pm, across the hall from this room in the HUB. So if you haven't reached out to your international constituents, please do so. You're also welcome to come as well. If you have any questions, please ask me during the holiday mixer.

Gary: I was made aware that there'll be a kwanzaa celebration in Kane Hall that will be starting at 6:30pm.

Rene Singleton (SAO Officer): We are having a snowflake-making contest down in our office.

Elisa: When is it?

Rene: It ends January 2nd.

Chris L: Other announcements? I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Eddie: Moved.

Douglass: Second.