1. Call to Order

Dave Brown called the meeting to order at 4:38 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Russ Hug (Linguistics) motioned to approve the agenda.

Shawn Mineer (Social Work) seconded

All were in favor

Motion passed.

3. Approval of the Minutes

Brian Smolik (Atmospheric Sciences) amended to change ‘Focus on the Nation’ to ‘Focus the Nation’.

Yutaka Jono seconded. Motion approved.

Karen Capuder (Native American Students) amended to replace ‘do so’ with ‘make changes after the ad-hoc committee’.
Seconded, motion approved.

Mike Vannatta (Chemistry) made a motion to approve the minutes as amended.
Anna Batie (Sociology) seconded.

Motion passed unanimously

4. Provost Phyllis M. Wise

Phyllis M. Wise said she wanted to congratulate everyone for being active in GPSS. She said money for student safety and child care was being pushed. She said that the government budget was very slim. She said the bill that was put forward was subtle and there was really only money to deal with campus safety issues and the Tacoma campus. She then talked about the creation of a College of the Environment in order to add strength to the environmental studies and then gave a little bit of background information. The education of the college would be based on climate, energy and water, global and environmental ecosystem health, conservation and urbanization, and human dimensions. She said four different working groups had been developed; education, organization and structure, vision and mission statement, and budgeting and planning. Then she said the idea had been presented to the Office of Regents last November and they were interested in it. The plan was to open the doors in July of 2009. She opened the floor for questions.

Andy Morabito (Electrical Engineering) asked, in regards to minimal budget from the government, how academic waivers for RA’s and TA’s would be affected next year.

Phyllis M. Wise answered that so far it has not been agreed to, but has been pushed for in Olympia. She said that the University would take the cost if the state did not.

Brian Smoliak (Atmospheric Science) asked about the structure of the school and what departments were helping to build the structure.

Phyllis M. Wise said that certain groups had been talking amongst themselves to decide if they wanted to be at the core of the new school, but no one had come back with a straight yes or no.

Yutaka Jono asked if buying into this new college would create RA and TA positions.

Phyllis M. Wise said that they had to count on RA’s and TA’s, she said they were counting on using all avenues.

Krislyn McWilliams asked if existing courses would be used or if new curriculum and new courses were intended.

Phyllis M. Wise said they were planning on using existing curriculum but looking for other curriculums that could develop to help enhance the new school.
Anna Batie (Sociology) asked how much social sciences would be included.

Phyllis M Wise said they were talking about how to incorporate social sciences because it would be wanted in the college.

Sarah Reyneveld asked Phyllis to talk about the interdisciplinary strengths and the opportunities that would be created for graduate students.

Phyllis M. Wise said programs would be brought in that were already interdisciplinary. She said the committee knows that if they can get the right group of people to work with each other, a coordinated program could be created.

Alex Berezow (Microbiology) said his concern was that it all seemed like all talk and no action.

Phyllis M. Wise said there were units that they have been growing around. She said the key to everything is finding the right Dean.

Lesley Jantarasami (Forest Resources) asked what kind of degrees would be offered.

Phyllis M. Wise said they were thinking about a fifth year masters. In terms exact programs she said they were thinking about incorporating aspects of preexisting colleges.

Arwen Edsall (Marine Affairs) asked if there was a way for the students to be more involved.

Phyllis M. Wise said that curriculum meetings had not yet started, but was open to take names of people he would be interested.

Andrew Overton (Business Administration-Accounting) asked if other institutions had attempted this and what their results were.

Phyllis M. Wise said six or seven other institutions were successful. She said a lot of benchmarking had been done at the other institutions. She then said the key was to have a dean, and to not have too much to do at one time.

Derya Baykent (Education: Educational Psychology) asked what the role of the college of education was in the project.

Phyllis M. Wise said one track could be teaching in sciences and mathematics, or about the environment.

Dave Brown said if anyone was interested to sign up in the back. And then said Provost asked for an informal vote to get a sense of senates approval or disapproval. He then asked if the body thought it was a good idea.
Beth Curry (Oceanography) said that it is hard to give approval and many questions are left unanswered.

Dave Brown said they were not looking for a yes or no answer, they wanted to know if the idea was supported or not.

Amy Underkofler (Jackson School) asked how much the new school would affect other departments’ budget and faculty.

Beth Curry (Oceanography) said that her department brings in a lot of money because of large scale projects, so her department was worried about how they would grow if they join with another college. She said it is hard to give approval and many questions are left unanswered.

Dave Brown suggested discussing the issue.

Richard Nobles (Psychology) said that departments use adjunct appointments. He said that adjunct faculty will join so the department could get more full time employment (FTE). And with these adjunct faculties they would be able to bring in new faculty without draining other departments.

Brian Smoliak (Atmospheric Science) said people want details where there is none, he said he felt comfortable taking a vote saying that they liked the idea, but only the idea nothing more.

Dave Brown said it was very much just the principle.

Yutaka Jono suggested that a statement be made saying that they would support the idea as long as certain criteria were met.

Amir Rahmani (Aeronautics and Astronautics) asked how big the college was going to be and how many students. He made a point about the structure of the college not expanding as fast as the new college would be.

Karen Capuder (Native American Students) asked whether social science would be incorporated. She said one anthropology professor was seeking to make an endowed chair with an addition to one graduate student.

Dave Brown asked who felt comfortable taking a vote. Majority were in favor of supporting the principle

Two objections

Two abstentions
5. Bylaws

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said he was going to break the election bylaws into four areas. He said he would give the background for each and then answer questions. He wanted to go over article VI because the election process is planned to start in March so he thought it needed to be looked over in case things needed to be fixed.

Denise Rodriguez (Jackson School) said it can be difficult to secure volunteers to be on a committee, and she said Executive Committee members already established they were involved. She thought that that could be why the overlap was there. She asked if the rule was made that members could not be on both committees, whether they would be able to fill the committees.

Richard Nobles (Psychology) said that finding people to fill the committee was not the issue.

Denise Rodriguez (Jackson School) asked how many of them were Executive Committee members, too.

Richard Nobles (Psychology) said he only remembered one.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) moved on to the next section; who is eligible to run for office.

Section F: Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said there was no preset way to determine eligibility to run for office. He said he took out from another section that you do not have to be a current student and also that a one year program student could run.

Amir Rahmani (Aeronautics and Astronautics) said there was a resolution passed last year for these kinds of applications to be accepted.

Kara Main (Microbiology) asked if a person had to attend GPSS meetings before they could run.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said it could be any committee meeting.

Aaron Naumann (Anthropology) said they had to be recognized on the minutes.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) moved on to the process for counting votes. He said that a lot of people did not understand the process so he decided to make it clearer in the bylaws. He said he only changed minor things. He said section K talked about when the votes were counted. He said section L was a problem last year because your name has to be signed at the bottom of the ballot and if there was no name the vote would not count.
Andy Morabito (Electrical Engineering) asked about being more specific in Section K regarding who the random witnesses would be. He asked whether the candidate pool should be defined.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) he said that it was put in the clause that the random witnesses would be put up front, but a person was allowed to challenge who they were.

Andy Morabito (Electrical Engineering) asked how far in advance.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said 48 hours.

Anna Batie (Sociology) asked in regards to section L, why someone couldn’t hand out ballots to Senators present and then Senators not present could vote online. She said that was a proposal for getting around the ballot-name problem because that way no one would have to sign their ballot.

Amir Rahmani (Aeronautics and Astronautics) said they had the same issue last year, and then said there was no other choice, names had to be printed on them.

Denise Rodriguez (Jackson School) said she thought it would work if people checked in at the door and then handed a ballot.

Yutaka Jono said in response that it is possible for someone to take another person’s ballot after it has been given to them.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said there was a motion on the floor.

Anna Batie (Sociology) asked for a point of clarification, she said the names had been left on the ballots and according to the bylaw the names were going to be ripped off.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said as soon as the names were torn off the ballots had to be given to a SAF advisor.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said there was a motion to move forward. He then explained that IRV voting was a way to take all votes into account if a majority was not reached. He then gave an example of how it worked for clarification. Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said streamline voting had been used for past elections. Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) then said if someone wanted to complain the appeal process was unclear, but that they would go to Elections Committee first because the problem could be addressed there. If the plaintiff does not agree then he said they would have 48 hours to go to the judicial committee for them to decide. He added to that the secretary sits on both committees.

Denise Rodriguez (Jackson School) said that Section O should read ‘within 48 hours’ and not just ‘with’.
Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) motioned for all changes to be passed.

Anna Batie (Sociology) seconded

Krislyn McWilliams asked if another chair needed to be put together. She asked if it needed to be put in the bylaws that a chair needed to be elected by a certain date.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said the real question would be when the commission would select a chair.

Alex Berezow (Microbiology) asked what was going to be done for the distribution of ballots.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said it was open for interpretation. He said distribution of how voting could be done would be done by the election committee.

Alex Berezow (Microbiology) asked why both names and ballots were needed.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) said it was to ensure the legitimacy within the election.

Dave Iseminger (Public Health Genetics) asked all in favor of adopting the amendments.

Passed unanimously

6. Lobbying/Legislative Update

Sarah Reyneveld said it was the second week into the legislative session. She said GPSS focused on three big priorities: Expansion of access to child care, restoring non-resident graduate tuition subsidy, and preventative investment for campus safety. She encouraged Senators to write letters to their district representatives, as well as to attend Lobby Day.

Elizabeth Scarbrough (Philosophy) asked if the University would do what they did this year.

Sarah Reyneveld said that was what they were saying, but that was a problem because it may come out of somewhere else. She said they were looking to restoring this by first restoring state funding.

Kirk Rappe (Urban Design and Planning) asked if this did not pass what would happen to out of state graduates.
Sarah Reyneveld said she was not sure what the legislature was going to do in order to balance out the budget, but she would look into it.

Yutaka Jono asked if there was a policy bill or any other bill that would support this.

Sarah Reyneveld said there was no policy bill.

Sarah Reyneveld said that GPSS was spearheading a budget request for three additional PhD mental health counselors. She said the university supports the request in addition to a campus safety proposal. She said because it was just a budget request they were trying to push for it that week.

Arwen Edsall (Marine Affairs) asked if the counselors would be in Schmitz Hall or Hall Health.

Dave Brown said it was not specified where they would go.

Sarah Reyneveld said that she and Kelly had drafted a letter for the Senators to sign and email to their legislator on behalf of their departments in order to really drive home the issues at hand. She asked them to look up the legislator in their district and email them the letter.

Jake VanderPlas (Astronomy) asked if better health care was dropped.

Sarah Reyneveld said that mental health care is the health care improvement they were focusing on now because they think it will get more traction.

Amir Rahmani (Aeronautics and Astronautics) asked if it was available online.

Yutaka Jono said he would send it out tonight.

Kelly Merrick said the letter was a generic draft so any changes that needed to be made, she said people were more than welcome to do so.

Rob Muilenburg talked about lobby day:
He said it was a free trip to Olympia on February 12th. He said GPSS and ASUW arranged for people to meet with legislators and discuss issues they think are important. He said they were looking for group captains who would volunteer themselves to find three to four other students all interested in the same thing to commit themselves to going to Lobby Day and discussing these issues with legislators. He said information would be sent out later with who to contact and how to sign up.

7. Committee Appointments

Elections committee:
Dave Brown said at least four members were needed.
Mike Willard
Emily Spahn
Andy Morabito
Noah Benson
Richard Nobles

Regent Selection Committee:

Dave Brown said that this was a position that really impacted the character of University but also impacted the quality of life in the University. There are two graduate/pro students on committee.

Amir Rahmin (Aeronautics and Astronautics) asked if a judicial member could sit on the committee.

Dave Brown said anyone could.

Richard Nobles
Amir Rahmin

Dave Brown said they would both be on the committee.

Resolution 4.07-08, in support of student involvement in Lobby Day

Kara Main (Microbiology) motioned to approve the resolution.

Mike Vannatta (Chemistry) seconded. Majority support.
1 abstention.
Resolution 4.07-08 passed.

8. Announcements

Krislyn McWilliams reminded the Senate that Jorge Cham is coming and that the speed dating event was going to take place on February 4th.

9. Adjournment

Dave Brown adjourned the meeting at 6:07pm.