GPSS Meeting Minutes  
February 4, 2009  
Approved March 4, 2009

Quorum Present

1. Call to Order  
Jake Faleschini (President) called the meeting to order at 4:35 PM.

2. Approval of the Agenda  
Anna Batie (Jackson School) motioned to add 5.5 Jackson School Representation pending bylaw approval.  
Shawn Mincer (Social Work) seconded.  
Motion passed with no objections or abstentions.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) moved to add item 4.5 Reimbursement for the Vice President.  
Lindsay Morse (Classics) seconded.  
Motion passed with no objections or abstentions.

Nick Nasrallah (Psychology) moved to approve the agenda.  
Shawn Mincer (Social Work) seconded.  
Motion passed with no objections or abstentions.

3. Approval of the Minutes  
Shawn Mincer (Social Work) motioned to approve the January 14th minutes.  
Marc Jaffrey (Earth and Space Sciences) seconded.  
Motion passed with no objections or abstentions.

4. Lobby Day Announcement  
Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said that in the past GPSS has done one large Lobby Day with charter buses, and this year they want to do targeted individual meetings and use a vanpool to be fiscally responsible. The first Lobby Day was on January 23rd, and the next one will be on February 19th. He encouraged people to come down on lobby day to talk about the important graduate issues on February 19th. We have an hour-long training session to talk about the issues and how to effectively advocate for them. Email Sarah at gpssleg@u.washington.edu if you are interested in coming down.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) also discussed the petition drive to have a star system check box to generate lobbying fees. He wants everyone in the room to get 100 signatures, and asked senators to pass them around to our classes. GPSS has approval from the Faculty Senate to pass these around our classrooms. There is a packet in the back to discuss what to do if there are questions. Dave set the petition deadline as next Friday for getting as many signatures as we can. Petition sheets should be turned back into the GPSS office.
Vedada Sirovica (Germanics) asked if she could pass out the petition while she was teaching the class.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said that it was fine for teaching assistants to distribute the petition.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that if GPSS doesn’t do this, we could bankrupt GPSS within three years, as we don’t have the funds to continue paying the WSL fees.

Natalie Thompson (Statistics) asked if signature-gatherers need to be careful about getting dual signatures.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) mentioned that there are two petitions for the star system, and to make sure to tell people that there are two petitions going on so they are aware of it. One is for WashPIRG – their current star system box for registration. They are in the same reauthorization process as GPSS. And don’t get signatures in the HUB.

4.5 Vice President Reimbursement
Tim Hulet (Treasurer) said that Dave has been down in Olympia, living in an apartment while there. In the past, the budget has allowed for Dave to get reimbursed for that expense, but it was taken out of this year’s budget as nobody had lived in an apartment in Olympia before. GPSS needs to add a little line to the budget allowing Dave to get reimbursed. Tim entertained a motion to amend the budget.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) wanted the line to read and/or three months so he can get reimbursed for travel to and from meetings.

Jason Padvorac (ASUW) moved to amend the budget.
Shawn Mincer (Social Work) seconded.
Motion passed with no oppositions or abstentions.

5. Bryan Pearce, UW Bookstore CEO
Jake Faleschini (President) introduced Bryan Pearce from the bookstore, and mentioned that we have GPSS representatives at the bookstore. The University Book Store is a corporation, but acts as a trust for the student body. The legal arrangement exemplifies the structure that it should be and the way that it is meant to represent the student body. All of their financial decisions are supposed to be representing us. They give a certain percentage back to students to fulfill their message.

Bryan Pearce said that one of the most important things he does is meet with student groups and talk about the bookstore. All University of Washington students are beneficiaries of the University Book Store trust. Bryan admired our Speed Dating event, said that the bookstore has a variation of the Speed Dating event called ‘Read Dating,’ which will work the same way, and people will talk about what they are interested in from a literary standpoint.
Bryan Pearce said that the bookstore is a unique organization, as there are only two college stores that are organized as trusts – the University of Washington and the University of Wisconsin at Madison. He started with student perceptions of the bookstore, that it is a ripoff, a monopoly, that everything is expensive, and that students don’t get much at buyback and that we can get books cheaper online. There is a negative perception of what goes on at the bookstore, and the store has to deal with this all the time. He discussed the mission and the vision of the bookstore. He mentioned that the slides he is using will be available to the senate after this presentation. The mission and vision of the bookstore are tied to the UW, and the bookstore supports of the UW no matter what is happening on campus.

Bryan Pearce said that there are over 4500 stores in the US, but the organizational structures are very different. The University Book Store is a for profit corporate trust/coop. The big difference between the association/foundation, not for profit corporations and for profit corporate trusts/coops and university departments and contract managed or private stores have to do with where the money goes. In the first three categories, earnings and benefits are delivered directly to individuals. Only four stores provide an annual rebate like the UW bookstore’s rebate. Virtually all bookstores charge more for textbooks.

Bryan Pearce said that the bookstore was founded in 1900 by UW students. The student assembly ASUW was founded in the same year. The first store was in Denny Hall in a closet of the president’s office. In 1924, it moved onto the “Ave.” Moving onto The Ave generated a lot of outside business for the bookstore and allowed it to expand. In 1930, the rebate program started, created by students. In 1932, the bookstore became incorporated as a for-profit corporation. This happened because ASUW was bankrupt. In 1964, the bookstore trust was established. The parties to the trust at the time were the Board of Trustees, the ASUW Board of Directors, and the UW Board of Regents.

Bryan Pearce gave an overview of the current UW board of trustees. He mentioned that there are three undergrads and two grads on the board, four faculty members, one administrator, and Bryan as the CEO. This type of board structure means that the bookstore can provide valuable services to campus. Only UW students, faculty and staff are beneficiaries by virtue of their active status.

Bryan Pearce also discussed the UW customer rebate. He said that the rebate amount of ten percent is the highest it has ever been. UW students actually save an additional one percent via the rebate card, as no sales tax is paid on the rebate amount redeemed. The program will be automated as of July 1, and all purchases will be tracked by the Husky Card. Over $1 million in rebate value is estimated for 2008-2009, and since 1930, the bookstore has returned over $28 million in rebates, most of which has gone to students. The bookstore has returned more to students through the rebate program than it has retained in its history.

Bryan Pearce showed a breakdown of sales. Only 37% of sales come from course books, and at most college stores, 70-90% of the sales come from this. So because the bookstore
is diversified, it is not dependent on textbook sales for profit. Course books and tech products are producing the lowest profit margins for the bookstore.

Bryan Pearce discussed the seven store locations throughout Puget Sound. He mentioned the special academic pricing on products at the tech center. He mentioned the free services offered by the book store, including WiFi and gift wrapping.

Bryan Pearce said that the prices students pay are a function of faculty decisions and publisher decisions. Most of the price for coursebooks goes to publishers. Most of what is being paid for used books goes to UW students. Via the rebate program and selling books back, the bookstore can reduce the cost of books to 12.5 cents on the dollar. He listed the things the bookstore does to help students save money on course books. He said that the bookstore is engaged in Open Source textbooks with WashPIRG.

Jake Faleschini (President) asked what the bookstore is doing to inform professors about the books they choose for courses and to bring down the cost, if most of the money we are paying for textbooks goes to publishers.

Bryan Pearce said that bookstore staff actually go and meet with department heads to talk to them about this. The bookstore also deals with individual faculty members, and if they are ordering bundles and there are alternatives, bookstore staff talk with professors about it and also about lowering costs. Used books provide the greatest possible savings, and bookstore staff educate faculty about this. The vast majority of faculty members don’t know about their choices until the bookstore talks to them. Some faculty members dig in and want the new books on the shelf. Typically faculty authors who are getting royalties from the publishing companies insist on having new books on the shelves. Academic publishers are huge public companies, and they have a representative force that descends on faculty and tries to sell them the newest, latest textbook. Often there are kickbacks, and we do not know to what extent this happens.

Shawn Mincer (Social Work) added that we should talk about the role of GPSS and TAs for getting the message out and creating opportunities for Bryan and others to come to departments and discuss how to make cheaper textbooks.

Bryan Pearce said that students are the most powerful voice on campus, and that he has created student ambassadors.

Jake VanderPlas (Astronomy) asked about the rationale for delaying the rebate rather than implementing it at the time of purchase.

Bryan Pearce said that the bookstore cannot give out the rebate at the time of purchase because it doesn’t know who the eligible recipients of the rebate are until later. It has been difficult to differentiate who is who with regards to the rebate. The bookstore has to establish the rebate before the year begins. It is not allowed to deliver the rebate to a non-UW faculty, staff or student.
Scott MacKenzie (Neurobiology and Behavior) asked for a justification of the bookstore’s products and areas of sales.

Bryan Pearce said that the bookstore is not Barnes and Noble, and that the seven merchandise areas are based on what students want. He mentioned that the Clinique counter arose after the Nordstrom store that had been across the street closed. The product has to be in demand from UW students, the bookstore has to produce a profit, and all the money we make from the Clinique counter allows the UW to keep it rebate high to reduce prices of textbooks, fund scholarships and provide benefits throughout the year. People from the community who come to the bookstore for gifts are high-profit customers, whose profits are pushed back to UW students.

Adrien Renaud (Urban Design and Training – Masters) asked if there was a need for the bookstore to be a corporate trust, and asked why it was not set up as a nonprofit.

Bryan Pearce said that nonprofits would not have to pay federal taxes, but only on income. Payroll taxes would still have to be paid. The portion that would not have to be paid would be between $2-300,000. The reason that they are a corporate trust has to do with the Bellevue and Mill Creek stores, which do not sell textbooks. The bookstore would not be a 501c3 store because of Bellevue and Mill Creek. The bookstore gains more by being a corporation and providing the benefits to students.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) made a motion to suspend the rules to add item 6.5 Local Control to the agenda. He said that GPSS needed to do it at this meeting. Dave moved to suspend the rules in order to do this.

Dana Little (Law) seconded.
Motion passed without any abstentions or objections.

5.5 Bylaws / Jackson School
Nick Nasrallah (Psychology) said that the Judicial Committee met to review amendments to the bylaws to suspend the bylaws, and Sturgis requires that the bylaws reference themselves to do this. He entertained a motion not to read the proposed bylaws.

Shawn Mincer (Social Work) moved to not read the bylaws.
Noah Benson (GLBTQ) seconded.
Motion passed with no abstentions or objections.

Nick Nasrallah (Psychology) said that the new bylaws would require a 2/3 vote of the senate or a unanimous vote from the Executive Committee in order to suspend the bylaws. He explained the bylaws.

Trond Nilsen (Industrial Engineering) moved to adopt the bylaws.
Noah Benson (GLBTQ) seconded.
Trond Nilsen (Industrial Engineering) offered a friendly amendment to correct the spelling in the bylaws. The motion passed with no abstentions or objections.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) spoke about the reason for suspending the bylaws, which had to do with Jackson School. In the previous year, GPSS created a structure allowing for changes to departmental representation. However, the current process stated that the restructured seats can only be approved in the fall. She asked to suspend the bylaws to split the Jackson School representation. She reviewed the criteria for splitting: 1. To provide evidence of unique degree-granting programs. 2. A unique application process. 3 A uniquely defined curriculum. 4. That there is no dual representation. 5. Indications of student support.

Rich Nobles (Psychology) asked for the first criterion to be repeated.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) responded that unique applications were the first criteria.

Trond Nilsen (Industrial Engineering) asked how large the programs are.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) replied that some programs have 50 students, and some are as small as 20.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) entertained a motion for the Jackson School to split its representation from the school-wide level to the program level.

Shawn Mincer (Social Work) moved. James Meabon (Physiology and Biophysics) seconded.

Kyun Chung (Pharmacy) objected. He asked if there was a minimum enrollment size for splitting, as his department was larger than twenty students.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) responded that there is no minimum.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) pointed out that there are departments on campus whose programs have fewer than 20 students who have representation in the senate.

Kyun Chung (Pharmacy) asked if representation should be proportional to department size.

Jake Faleschini (President) responded that we are a senate, not a congress. GPSS decided last year, after much debate, to follow the departmental model.

Nick Nasrallah (Psychology) said that any of these could come before the Internal Review committee as suggestions.
Adrein Renaud (Urban Design and Planning – Masters) pointed out that GPSS is already disproportionate.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) said that the Bylaws create a process for more representation.

Marc Jaffrey (Earth and Space Sciences) asked how it would affect department allocations.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) responded that this is a matter for the Finance & Budget committee.

Jake Faleschini (President) called for the vote. Shawn Mincer (Social Work) moved to close debate. Noah Benson (GLBTQ) seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to allow the Jackson School to split its representation.
33 yays
0 nays
9 abstentions
Motion passed.

Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) entertained the motion to create these as voting or non-voting seats. Shawn Mincer (Social Work) moved to create these as voting seats for the Jackson School. Kris Anderson (Art History) seconded.

James Meabon (Physiology and Biophysics) asked about the process to approve a Senator, and pointed out that at this point, these seats were not approved by the Secretary.

Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) said that she had spoken with Paula Milligan, the Jackson School Graduate Program Administrator, who had approved these seats. She also said that the webmaster has yet to create these seats on the website.

Scott Mackenzie (Neurobiology and Behavior) said that people should have had more notice about these seats.

Kyun Chung (Pharmacy) asked if the people voting tonight were emailed their materials.

Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) responded that yes, they had.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) moved to close debate. Shawn Mincer (Social Work) seconded.
The motion passed unanimously with the majority in support.

The main motion passed with 9 nays and 11 abstentions.

6 The Daily Discussion

Jake Faleschini (President) said that this has been an ongoing discussion since November. He said that the issue before us is that at the end of last meeting, Jake had the task to write an opposition to Sarah’s non-apology apology that she had printed in The Daily in early January. It was printed the following Friday. GPSS didn’t feel that her non-apology apology was sufficient, and requested a real apology or else we would come back to them with a decision regarding what to do after the next meeting. We have still not heard anything from The Daily, except that they refuse to apologize. Sarah spoke at the ASUW meeting and refused to apologize, that she felt that it was a poor decision, but that she felt that GPSS had backed her into a place where she couldn’t apologize. We are in a spot where we can let it go, we can write another resolution that responds to the fact that they haven’t apologized yet, and we can call on them to do a number of things – task our Student Publications Board member to call for a vote of censure saying that she screwed up and to put this on the permanent record, ask our SPB member to call a vote of no confidence on the editorial staff, ask our member to fire the editor in chief, or ask our member to suspend any of the employees. Jake doesn’t feel comfortable saying which one is the right thing to do. We prepared a resolution unique for us as it leaves the end blank. We are asking the senate to fill it in. If we do decide to resolve something, then we can put forward a position. He pointed out the options at the bottom of the resolution for what we could do, which are not exhaustive.

Shawn Mincer (Social Work) asked about the decisions being made by ASUW, and what the other governing bodies want to do.

Jason Padvorac (ASUW) said that Yutaka submitted a mirror of the earlier resolution in ASUW a few weeks ago. It was discussed in committee a week ago and the statement calling for Sarah Jeglum’s resignation was deleted. The resolution to go before senate only requests an apology, but someone could put the call for resignation back in, not specifically call for an apology and ask for steps forward. The strongest act they might take is calling for censure. It is likely they will call for an apology and to talk about steps moving forward.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that he and Lindsay Morse (Classics) did a presentation of that legislation in ASUW, and the second reading will be next week. He strongly encouraged all senators to come to that meeting.

Scott Mackenzie (Neurobiology and Behavior) said that the problem with this issue is that people have different priorities. Sarah Jeglum wanted to allow people to speak their minds, and not censor their opinions. If she apologizes now, we are going to censure her.

Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) said that Sarah does not seem to understand the job of the editor. The Daily can publish any pro / con article but they need to be careful.
about how they approach it. There’s a difference between pro / con pieces and printing offensive content belittling gays which is how many of us took it. We have yet to invite Sarah here. She said she wanted Q center training. Why is editing a piece the same as censorship? We should invite her here.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that Sarah’s job is to censor the paper and that is part of her title. The issue that most people are taking is that she is not doing her job.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) said that he would entertain a motion that we adopt a vote of no confidence or at least move to censure. The reason for this is that none of this is a satisfactory answer. The Daily is supposed to provide a safe environment for students, and if she is saying she can’t apologize because we’re threatening her, she’s violating the last part about The Daily being an independent organization. Our job is to represent the graduate student voice and if we are angry, we should state that. This is consistent with the resolution we passed earlier. He is open to the idea of censure as well.

Shawn Mincer (Social Work) said that as one of the original co-sponsors, he agrees that we as a body made a decision a couple of months ago to pass the initial resolution. We made a decision to call for the apology or ask for some type of sanction. He would support a spirited debate for censure or one of the other options. There should be some level of responsibility called for on this decision, and we should follow through on the initial resolution or make a change in language that calls for action on the part of The Daily or something should happen. He said that the freedom of speech issue is a powerful issue, and he has never seen this as a speech issue. If it was, he wouldn’t have co-sponsored it. He sees the issue as a person who has not fulfilled her obligations with regards to the paper’s mission. Decisions about the images were editorial decisions. Putting a picture of a man and a sheep with an article about LGBT folks is offensive. It would be like caricaturing African Americans with an African American piece. It’s a decision that went against their mission to create a safe learning environment for students on campus. When you demean people, you create an unsafe environment with these types of issues. This is not the job of a university newspaper.

Dana Little (Law) wanted the chair to elaborate on the options – sanction, censure, and the vote of no confidence.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that this was not greatly elaborated in the Student Publications Board bylaws. A censure is an official mark on the record of whomever you decide to censure. It doesn’t do anything as far as removing them or taking away their rights and responsibilities for editing the paper. For most other things, Sarah is an effective editor. In other circumstances she has done her job well, in this instance she messed up. This would be a mark on her record if she were to apply for a job and an editorial position. It is a powerful mark on her record. The other options are to suspend, which takes her out of her position for an amount of time, or to get rid of her entirely. We could do this for anyone within The Daily. That said, we have one voting member on a panel of nine. Whether or not this goes anywhere is something to think about.
Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) spoke for having Sarah Jeglum talk to the Senate, and if we don’t like what she says, discuss the option of censure. Censure is a big deal. She would have a very hard time getting a job after censure.

Kris Anderson (Art History) said that this process has gone on for a long time, and that we are losing traction. He agreed with Anna’s comment. He made a motion that we invite Sarah Jeglum to come to the next meeting to talk to us.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) moved that GPSS ask Sarah Jeglum to speak with us at our next meeting.

Noah Benson (GLBTQ) seconded.

Two objections.

Tom White (Molecular and Cellular Biology) was concerned about the delay. He wondered what would happen if Sarah declined the invitation or couldn’t make it.

Shawn Mincer (Social Work) said that Sarah Jeglum has had multiple conversations with Jake and personally doesn’t feel as though she needs the opportunity to talk to us. He agrees that the traction component becomes problematic. How many months go by before we make a decision on the issue? Why are we trying to get her to come to us? Why hasn’t she come here?

James Wiker (Jackson School – South Asian Studies) said that she has had ample opportunity to express her point on all sorts of mediums. We would not add anything new to this issue if she addresses us.

Jacob Nelson (Computer Science and Engineering) said that perhaps the issue we are trying to resolve isn’t as important as we think it is. Sarah will stop being the editor in a short period of time. If we want to do something targeting the newspaper or urging safe space training, this would be better.

Sarah Reyneveld said that the one thing that is coming across is that Sarah Jeglum doesn’t understand the magnitude of her editorial decision. But there are other people involved. There is a supervisor who is a full-time supervisor to the staff, and that person is much more of an institution on the paper. Sarah mentioned that this person should come before the body. She is also supervising the pieces that are coming out. There needs to be institutional changes made to the paper, and there are institutional issues with the paper.

Trond Nilsen (Industrial Engineering) suggested that we add to any other motion that she has a chance to talk to us before we take any other action, or censure her if she refuses to come.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said that since there isn’t anything specific, there needs to be a formal amendment with a specific disciplinary action.
Vedada Sirovica (Germanics) mentioned that this issue is not really about Sarah. It is a matter of letting the larger community know that she is accountable for things she does with the paper.

Adrien Renaud (Urban Design and Planning – Masters) said that he would like to point out that there is a way that their office is flowing, and he is not sure that the conversation we are having – there is no forward momentum regarding what it is we are trying to do.

Noah Benson (GLBTQ) moved to offer an amendment. We invite Sarah Jeglum to speak at the next meeting, that we move for censure if she does not show, and that we revisit it if she does show.

Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) seconded.

Eric Gleave (Sociology) clarified what it is that we are voting on.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that what GPSS needs to do is get her to come in here and explain herself or make a decision. We can’t make any more vague threats.

Rene Singleton said that we could invite her to speak, and reminded us that we don’t know the outcome of this. We may change our minds after hearing her speak. She suggested including either action or speech in the resolution.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that the motion on the floor as it stands is to invite her to come and speak at a meeting. He called the question.

Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) asked for a point of information, and asked if we could have an emergency senate meeting.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that we could to invite Sarah to come and speak to us. Otherwise, as the motion stands, it is to invite her to come and speak at the next senate meeting to make a decision as to what we want to do.

Lindsay Morse (Classics) said that she is for letting Sarah speak, but having gone to the ASUW meeting, it would be pointless to have her come here as she would sidestep all the questions. Lindsay said that Sarah wasn’t answering the questions. She was asked what the writer would have to have said for her not to print it. Sarah replied that it would be on a case by case basis, and that she would not censor her authors. She has had multiple opportunities. There are 650 comments on The Daily’s website. She has had opportunities to answer our issues, and she refuses. It’s valid that it is taking too long, and we should vote to censure her.

Christine Lloyd (Microbiology) said that in the general view of students, we have lost momentum on this. It seems silly to debate something that happened in November. Emotions are running high with this. She would love to invite Sarah to face her accusers,
but she is not certain if we can be civil entirely. This may be part of the reason why she wouldn’t want to show up. If we invite her, we have to pledge to remain halfway civil.

**Rich Nobles** (Psychology) called for a point of information. He said that given that we are a senate body ruled by Sturgis, we would have to remain civil anyway. He said that this would not be an issue as we have rules by which we are governed.

**Mark Frymoyer** (Civil and Environmental Engineering) asked about the ASUW resolution.

**Lindsay Morse** (Classics) said that ASUW would vote on this on Tuesday. She also said that if we call Sarah Jeglum to come speak we should have the editorial supervisor come too.

**Scott Mackenzie** (Neurobiology and Behavior) said that he was opposed to taking any action in November on this issue. He said that Shawn made an argument to take action, and that he would be moved to take action on this now.

**Gary Brattin** (Music) said that to know to what extent to seek punishment, we should ask how many times she has stirred up a hornet’s nest before.

**Jake Faleschini** (President) said that we have researched this.

**Gary Brattin** (Music) said that it would be a bad choice on our part to ask her to apologize again. We asked her and she didn’t do it. He thought that whether she gets fired or not, we need to document some sort of grievance about that.

**Yutaka Jono** (Secretary) moved to amend the motion to read that GPSS directs its SPB rep to censure Sarah Jeglum.

**Rich Nobles** (Psychology) called a point of order and asked if we have to exhaust the speakers’ list.

**Lindsay Morse** (Classics) seconded.

**Noah Benson** (GLBTQ) moved to close debate.

**Trond Nilsen** (Industrial Engineering) seconded.

Motion passed with three abstentions and one opposed, and debate is closed.

**Yutaka Jono** (Secretary) called to a vote on the amendment.

Motion passed with four oppositions and seven abstentions.

**Jason Padvorac** (ASUW) discussed how ASUW responded. After she met with them, it was at that point that the committee removed the clause regarding resignation, and a move to censure didn’t have a second.
Kyun Chung (Pharmacy) said that censure seemed like a harsh action to take. It was a viewpoint, it was flawed, and she thought it was representative of that side. She chose to let it go up, and looking back on it there was a lot of discussion about it. He doesn’t see it as a flaw in her editorship. Her decision to let it go in the paper may not have been an act of negligence.

Sanjay Hari (Biomolecular Structure and Design) agreed with the last speaker. We should think hard before legislating against someone’s potential future.

Kylee Peterson (Biology) is concerned that censure won’t get us what we want. Will a censure go into The Daily? A suspension might be more obvious. If they choose not to report on a censure, nobody would know.

Rich Nobles (Psychology) moved to purge the speakers list and close debate. Charles Plummer (Earth and Space Sciences) seconded. Two oppositions. Four abstentions. Motion passes.

James Wiker (Jackson School – South Asian Studies) said that the editorship of The Daily is a point of trust and an important position. We can’t let one bad decision go if it had such an affect on the community. We need to make sure that there is a society of responsibility to cultivate. This isn’t a singular action, it is repeated actions. She made poor editorial decisions when she published it and she has continued to defend those decisions repeatedly. There’s no responsibility without censure or calling for her resignation that shows that we as the grad student body cannot support this type of behavior. She has continued to make the same mistake repeatedly by failing to acknowledge that she made a bad choice.

Tom White (Molecular and Cellular Biology) said that nobody on the Student Publications Board is taking the lead in holding her responsible. It would be negligent of us to not make the effort on the board. The board would not pass it, but we owe it to the people we represent to have the board vote on censure.

Shawn Mincer (Social Work) agreed with the prior two speakers. Any sense of responsibility has to come with some type of action. It would be the carrot without the stick. If The Daily doesn’t meet the standards, there should be some type of penalty. He thinks we do need to do something now. His constituents are not happy with this process, especially with us not doing anything. His constituents get the sense that we are not doing anything. That nine-person board may or may not vote for censure.

Adrien Renaud (Urban Design and Planning – Masters) mentioned the ideas that had been kicked around. He said that timing is crucial, otherwise there is no point. But he is not convinced that we are going after the right person. We have to keep in mind that this is safety for her too. She is a student. In an educational setting, is it appropriate to go after her? Maybe we should go after the system – maybe there is some sort of safety net.
Jake Faleschini (President) suggested that going after her supervisor could happen in the future. By taking action against Sarah now, we could still take action against her supervisor in the future.

Adrien Renaud (Urban Design and Planning – Masters) said that this doesn’t make sense now. We are one of nine, so we don’t have the power to really threaten her. There is no point in doing something like this. The university is supposed to be safe for everyone, including her.

Trond Nilsen (Industrial Engineering) said that we have a representative on the body that is designed to advise Sarah. The point about creating safe spaces is a good thing, but we should treat it as a separate issue.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) moved to amend the motion to create the document into a resolution, “8.08-09,” to censure Sarah Jeglum.
Majority support,
Four opposed. Seven abstentions. The motion passed.

Jake Faleschini (President) called a vote on the resolution 8.08-09. He read the last clause on the resolution.
Resolution passed by a vote of 24-12-5.

6.5 Legislative/Local Control

Rich Nobles (Psychology) asked to see the agenda.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) entertained a motion to limit discussion and debate on 6.5 to six minutes and then exhaust and table the rest of agenda except for announcements.

Noah Benson (GLBTQ) moved.
Nick Nasrallah (Psychology) seconded.

Lindsay Morse (Classics) objected because committee formation can’t be tabled.

Jake Faleschini (President) explained that the committees could still meet as unofficial working groups.

Lindsay Morse (Classics) withdrew her objection.
Motion passed with one abstention.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said that this was really important, as there are hearings on this on Friday. We have not taken a position on local control so we can say that our issue is reasonable, affordable tuition. Dave said that the survey results were confusing, as the comments were unclear. He is going to entertain a motion and explain why this should be our position. He read the motion.
Dana Little (Law) moved, and Jason Padvorac (ASUW) seconded.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said that the reason why this was so important is that there are a lot of different views on this. We can talk about it from a lot of different ways. There is a large debate going on in the legislature whether or not we should be a high tuition high aid state or low tuition low aid state. It seems like there is a push for high tuition high aid, and that the UW administration is leaning towards that route. We do not want to have the body that is heavily influenced by the administration to have that authority. While it is scary to give it to the Legislature, giving the Board of Regents unfettered local control is a scarier thing.

Nick Nasrallah (Psychology) asked that based on his argument, do we know if the legislature will adopt the high aid high tuition model?

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said that this won’t be decided this year. If we want to have more influence on this debate, the proper venue is the legislature.

Jason Padvorac (ASUW) said that from the ASUW perspective this is awesome. Undergrads will be lobbying for legislative control.

Noah Benson (GLBTQ) said that he is personally against legislative control because it has worked out poorly in other states. The Board of Regents fundamentally has the best interest of the university in mind. It is a mistake to believe that raising tuition is always bad for students. It is true that the Board will be interested in what is best for the university.

Adrien Renaud (Urban Design and Planning—Masters) asked if this was for future classes or our class? Will this affect us? He wanted to know Dave’s motivation.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said there is a bill going through the legislature determining who has that power and why. The bill mandates unfettered local control forever. He has suspicions that it will not say this at the end. It might make it through one of the chambers in complete unfettered local control forever. No comment hurts his credibility at this point.

Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) said that she went to Olympia to present to the legislature. They were receptive to listening to students. Even those for high tuition stayed after the meeting to talk to students. Grads are caught in the middle between high tuition increase and job losses.

Dana Little (Law) asked about how high the tuition increases would be. Is 16% the actual amount, or is it up to 16?
Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said that if we are talking about tuition rates for 09-10, the Board of Regents has said that this is what we want it to be. The Legislature will set it. The bill would allow the Board of Regents to set it.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) said that we are getting close to quorum.

Dana Little (Law) called the question.
Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) seconded.
Motion passed to close debate with no objections.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) called the question. 25 in favor. Three oppositions.
Eight abstentions.

7. Announcements
Yutaka Jono (Secretary) announced the guitar ensemble concert this Friday. It costs $5.

Jason Padvorac (ASUW) said that he is leading the textbooks campaign with WashPIRG and to talk to him about it.

Shawn Mincer (Social Work) said that to tell constituents to work through us about questions, comments, feedback about what the bookstore should be doing for students.

Jake Faleschini (President) has been doing the distinguished mentor award that the grad school awards to one professor the entire year. He is supposed to do the distinguished teaching award over the next three weeks. He asked for one senator to do it. Lindsay Morse (Classics) volunteered.

Rich Nobles (Psychology) moved to adjourn.
Anna Batie (Jackson School – REECAS) seconded.
Meeting adjourned at 6:35 PM.