GPSS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes – 10/26/2011

Members Present:
Aaron Naumann (President)
Adam Sherman (Vice President)
Colin Goldfinch (Treasurer)
Melanie Mayock (Secretary)
Trond Nilsen (Executive Senator)
Amy Winter (Executive Senator)
Megan Gambs (Executive Senator)
Bill Dow (ASUW)
Mateo Banegas (Executive Senator)

Others Present:
Andrew VanWinkle, GPSS Representative on Student Conduct Committee
Rene Singleton, SAO Advisor
Conor McLean, ASUW President
Ellen Taylor, Assistant Vice President for Student Life
Elizabeth Higgins, Director of Community Standards and Student Conduct

1. Call to Order
Aaron calls to order at 6:03pm.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Trond moves to approve the 10/26/2011 agenda. Melanie seconds. Unanimous approval.

3. Approval of the Minutes from 10/12/11
Aaron has one suggestion for revision, regarding Adam’s officer report. Adam invited every single person at the event to the Higher Ed Summit.

New language:
“Adam engaged with legislators and asked them to attend the Higher Education Summit. Rep. Sells said they would be willing to rearrange their schedules in order to participate in student activities. Larry Seaquist said that he thinks legislators should be able to meet students on their campuses.”

Adam moves to approve the minutes, as amended. Trond seconds. No objections, motion passes.

4a. Student Code of Conduct
Guest speakers:
Ellen Taylor, Assistant Vice President for Student Life
Elizabeth Higgins, Director of Community Standards and Student Conduct  
Andrew VanWinkle, GPSS Representative on Student Conduct Committee

**Elizabeth Higgins:**  
Introduction on history of creation of the committee for revision of Student Code of Conduct. In 2007 there was a movement to have UW do something about the conduct of students living north of 45th street and issues with their neighbors in the area.

Medical Leave of Absence has been shelved for now. Will not be part of revised student code, law is being revised. Belongs as separate policy outside of Student Code.

Handout shows where committee is starting from (started in November 2010). Second handout shows a flowchart of the process under the current code. Commitment to revising code so that the process is navigable, making it more user-friendly. Drafting a code that is usable from beginning to end. More thorough revision.

**Adam** stresses that the questions from GPSS are for information gathering purposes and not to pass too much judgment about the pros and cons of each part of the code revisions that might be contested. The areas of questions are on:  
1. Jurisdiction- where does the code apply (geographically)  
2. Burden of Proof (how much evidence does the University have to have)  
3. Concurrent adjudication – what happens when the University wants to pursue a violation of the student conduct code at the same time the Seattle police department is pursing the student for the same criminal conduct?

**Andrew Van Winkle:** Physical authority to extend jurisdiction off-campus. Does UW have authority to extend their jurisdiction (do they have legal authority and how far does it extend? Off-campus, study abroad, at their home, etc.) Threshold issues. Anything that happens in appeals court, can go all the way up to State Supreme Court. UW wants to make sure they are on right legal footing from the beginning. Two questions: Can the University extend jurisdiction? Should the university extend jurisdiction?

**Ellen Taylor:**  
Wants to spend time answering the “should” question.

**Elizabeth Higgins:** What is in place already:  
Under 478-120-025 Off-campus conduct:  
1. Student involved in major crime, university determines that a significant university interest is affected.  
   Looking to criminal courts on decision of guilt on a major crime.  
   Victim can be anyone, and incident can happen anywhere in the world.

2. Off-campus conduct, anywhere in the world, that involves physical harm  
   This has happened in study abroad, around the campus, etc. This code has found students responsible of breaking student code of conduct. Everything is an allegation until student has a hearing. Concurrent adjudication is allowed.
3. Quality of Life: (including but not limited to noise, vandalism) Very specifically geographically limited to area north of 45th.

Adam: When looking at the jurisdiction north of 45th, was the primary concern to deal with frats/sororities? B/C there are other large off-campus student areas.

Elizabeth Higgins: Strong neighborhood association in that area, and a very mixed community in that area. Keep in mind that we have one code for Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses.

Colin Goldfinch: What is a significant university interest 478-120-025 (1b)?

Elizabeth: What do you think a significant university interest is?

Colin: When an individual's actions prevent another student from engaging in academic pursuits.

Aaron Naumann: UW has emergency adjudication as well.

Ellen: Standard is pretty high for taking the emergency adjudication.

Colin: Who is responsible for adjudicating? Who decides?

Elizabeth: Unsure. Talking about jurisdiction in a different way. Refer to page 11 478-120-050. Authority is the vice-provost to decide if significant university interest has been compromised.

Melanie: Is there talk about extending jurisdiction further than where it is?

Andrew: there is general discussion of expanding it beyond its current reach.

Ellen: What has been difficult is things in the electronic realm (ie cyber-stalking) may not even be threatening, but unwanted. UW has no authority to intervene.

Elizabeth: Share what other universities are doing. Colleagues around the state are also reviewing. Reasons: 1. Off-campus 2. Procedures compliant with fed guidelines. In regards to jurisdiction, UW is exception to the rule. We have parcelled code in such a way that here is what we have jurisdiction over on and off-campus. What to do about those actions that are not physical harm but are also

Adam: What are the advantages and disadvantages of the UW adjudicating those issues off-campus?

Elizabeth: Purpose of student conduct code so that students understand expectations of being part of the UW community and what to expect if they can’t meet those
expectations. Ought to be around education. Also need to incorporate diverse cultures and backgrounds. Advantages: being responsive of student needs. Dis-advantages: A lot of work. The office is very small.

**Colin:** Defined area north of campus vs. undefined off-campus area. Non-students only get one course of action. Students’ actions are being addressed twice. Why is it that a student has to deal with two different processes?

**Trond:** p6 3b

**Elizabeth:** Double-jeopardy. Worst thing that could happen here is that student is separated from the institution. If their behavior is so egregious that they are severed from the university. The window of opportunity to help student through process. Gives example of intervention role of the student conduct process that helped a student.

Second issue: Burden of Proof  
**Aaron:** certain decisions being made hurt reputation/professional development.

**Elizabeth:** Very low standard. Student has many opportunities to appeal decision. Would take away a number of rights of appeal. Student has opportunity to redress. As that process moves up, student has higher standard, would not be an erroneous conclusion.

**Adam:** There is a concern that due process is afforded to students when the University has the ability to take away life, liberty or property.

**Elizabeth** “We are not taking away any of those.” She explains the appeal process. Keep in mind that the dynamic is changing in the appeal process. Would like to beef up the student committees that evaluate student conduct.

**Andrew:** Cons to appeals: the appeals process only looks at the written record and there is no chance to bring in additional evidence or witnesses.

**Elizabeth:** Yes there is the chance to bring in additional evidence and witnesses.

**Trond:** Agrees with Elizabeth.

**Elizabeth:** Only 2 out of 10 are appeals based on written records. Title 9: Anti-discrimination based on gender in places where federal funding is provided. The Department of Education has issued a Dead Colleague letter confirming that we have to use preponderance of the evidence standard.

**Andrew:** That it is just an advisory letter, but it does not have the force of law and is not binding.

**Elizabeth:** Other schools are using preponderance of evidence.
Ellen: Looking at infusing or making it a more student-involvement appeals process and changing the 1 year limit for students to sit on the appeals committee. The problem is that by the time students finally have the experience to be effective members of the appeals committee they are forced to leave. So we would like to fix that.

Elizabeth: Explains process of students sitting on the committee

Andrew: p20-21 Worst case scenario: potential exists under the code. Need to be aware of how the code of conduct protects students’ rights under what would potentially be a worst case scenario.

Colin: What if a student does not have the means to a lawyer? Is there advocacy on student’s behalf?

Elizabeth: No, there isn’t any access to an advocate. There’s no university provided advocate for the student, and thought it would be good if one could be provided. Thinking about hiring a 2nd or 3rd year law student to act as a student advocate. Want students to have same advantage to present information to a board.

Trond: Pointed out specific limits about severing students from property (both tangible and intangible) as listed in code of conduct

4b. Finance and Budget Committee Appointment

Colin Goldfinch: Colin Morgan Cross, new Senator from Urban Planning, requested to be committee member.

Melanie moves appointment. Adam seconds. All in favor, motion passes.

4c. Bylaw Amendment Proposal

Aaron: Will be resigning from President position December 6th. Because of this, we looked in to the bylaws about what would happen in this scenario. What is the guidance for president for resigning. All officers are entrenched in the jobs they were elected for. If following current bylaws, there would be a lot of shifting around in the office. Ideally, process to fill presidency should be transparent and inclusive of greater Senate and legitimate process. There were complaints last year about transparency and inclusiveness. So, rather than have vice-president assume presidency, we should hold elections for specific officer position. Would like to open it to discussion.

Melanie: The officers proposing to amend bylaws. (See Article V Section D Clause 2 and Section G- Clause 5.)
Aaron: also allow for some overlap so as not to have a temporary appointment.


Aaron: No precedence for this.

Melanie: Be aware of timeline. If Executive Committee agrees, email notification to Senators will go out tonight.

Rene: Are you sure that there are any other things that need to be amended.

Megan: Section B Clause 2: What if there is another situation where the vice-president needs to take over the president’s role?

Trond: Concerns about time gap of temporary replacement.

Adam: Should we consider other bylaws that say that if you want to go for the presidency or other officer position you need to resign from your position first? Concerns about waterfall effect of losing/replacing officers.

Mateo: How does this affect GPSS presence in other key committees and decisions?


Colin: The executive will still be meeting on a weekly basis, so they can delegate representatives to serve on various committees and can mandate those representatives to take positions on behalf of the Senate.

Trond: Are there any committees the President sits on where we can’t delegate a representative?

Aaron: None that is known but can also ask again. To Colin’s point to collaborative decision-making: Make sure Exec committee knows all the decisions GPSS is getting into, moving away from 1-2 people who have been decision makers in past.

Megan: Note to bring up Exec Committee group decision making at Senate meeting.

Bill: Idea of another executive committee member running for the office may have to be re-visited.

Melanie: How do we want people to submit statements?
Trond: Judicial committee should be involved in writing better rules for a special replacement election.

Rene: Need judicial committee to help out. Regular election procedure with accelerated timeline.

Adam suggests a word changing to section - a replacement election shall take place.

Amy: most important thing is to communicate clearly to the people who want to run.

Trond: Suggested we run election similarly to last year’s election and then write special elections rules when time is available.

Megan: Line “we will receive nominations from floor” - does this conflict?

Colin: The by-laws stipulate that, in a general election, the Elections Committee develops elections rules and an election packet. The amendment to the by-laws for replacement elections should include a provision for the Executive Senators to prepare replacement election rules and a replacement election packet.”

Renee: Considering something for fairness

Trond: Suggested adding language to the effect that ‘In order to be an eligible candidate, they must recuse themselves from discussions & decisions governing the election’.

Trond: Include - Distribute election materials at least 7 days before the election.

Trond moves that Executive Committee states its support for these bylaw amendments and recommends its passage by the Senate. Megan seconds. Passed unanimously.

4d. Senate Agenda, 11/2/11
Aaron and Melanie go over the draft agenda for the next Senate Meeting agenda. Dean Baldasty of the Graduate School will give an informational. David Parsons of UAW will also give an informational. Based on survey last year, GPSS wanted to strengthen relationship with UAW.

Aaron: Revisiting the open forum.

Trond: Regarding our efforts to include and involve Senators, can we document our work and results so that next year the officers will have some sort of report?

Proposed Senate Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Info/Action</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>Aaron Naumann</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>5:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the Agenda</td>
<td>Aaron Naumann</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>5:31pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the Minutes</td>
<td>Aaron Naumann</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>5:32pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guest Speaker: Graduate School Dean Gerald Baldasty  Aaron Naumann  Information  5:35pm

Guest Speaker: UAW President David Parsons  Aaron Naumann  Information  5:55pm

Bylaw Amendment Proposal  Aaron Naumann  Action  6:05pm

Higher Education Summit and Legislative Update  Aaron Naumann/Adam Sherman  Information  6:35pm

Science and Policy Summit  Colin Goldfinch  Information  6:45pm

GPSS Funding Options  Colin Goldfinch  Information  6:50pm

PhD Movie  Colin Goldfinch  Information  6:55pm

Announcements  All  Information  7:00pm

Adjourn  Aaron Naumann  Action  7:03pm

Adam moves approval of the Senate agenda. Colin seconds. Agenda passed unanimously.

5a. Higher Education Summit Update
Aaron: Derek Kilmer will give for closing remarks. And last week we got Rep. Reuven Carlyle to be on the first panel. These are very strong additions. Doug Wadden was very flexible and will be a panelist with Elson Floyd and Kelley Testy. These speakers will give a broad range of perspectives.

We also the TVW out of Tacoma will be there as well as perhaps Seattle times but we need to firm that up. Still working on getting KUOW.

We need to get the word out to grad students and get faculty buy-in.

Rene: Raise concern about room capacity and how to arrange or prepare if this were to happen.

Aaron: Once the Higher Ed Summit is concluded we should seriously consider revising our strategies associated with this event. 1) the work load is too much for just the President, Chief of Staff and Vice-President. 2) should be incorporated into a wider legislative strategy, 3) planning for this event should start earlier.

Also, mentioned we will be continuing to get the word out and trying to reach out further to media. We are planning a post-event column for the Times.

Trond asks about available staff and how early to start for next year. If present officers are exceeding their hours, do we need to hire additional staff.

5b. Universal U-PASS Update
Melanie: Gives Universal U-PASS summary, how it was decided last year, and the creation of the U-PASS Advisory Board. Give an update as what has been happening in the past couple of months. This could have been the biggest thing that GPSS did last year, enacting a mandatory fee on students. This needs to continue to be an item and GPSS senators need to own it. Some complaints have come in, specifically from online students from the iSchool and extended MSW students who only come to campus once per month. If it’s a policy issue, the student reps on the Advisory Board create templates for Transportation Services staff about how to answer emails. There is also a public comment period at the advisory board meeting. Still working out details about how to handle public comment period. Other types of complaints: those that get a discount through work.

Advisory board has drafted a values statement about the Universal U-PASS. The universal fee benefits all students and strengthens the university as a whole. Wants to engage more with Senators from departments that seem to have a high volume of complaints (ie the iSchool and Masters Social Work). Melanie is going to reach out to these senators to hear their perspective and present the Advisory Board/ GPSS position.

Trond: Branding issues- comprehensive transportation policy, not just a bus pass. Seems like a framing issue.

Aaron: Faculty is facing same issue.

Adam: Can we amend to change the name to Community Transportation Fee, and frames it in the light of what it actually is?

Rene says that GPSS does have the ability to rename their own.

Melanie: Need to do more outreach to students, websites and media. We also need to give an update to the Senate, but maybe not until January.

Aaron: Would be good to have some ridership data before we update Senate.

Trond: Should also have information on the negatives if the UPASS was not in place, what would it do.

Melanie: Advisory is looking into information about online students.

6. Officer Updates
   a. Vice President
       Adam appointed a lot of people to various University committees.
   b. Treasurer
       a. PHD comics movie on November 17th
       c. Staff orientation
a. A new staff Orientation packet was created to help new hires get acclimated to their positions
d. Secretary
e. ASUW
f. President:
a. Board of Regents meeting last week – relayed information from the 1st full Senate meeting that loss of faculty is affecting time to completion, mentorship and funding streams for graduate and professional students. This raises the issue as to whether or not our training and education is eroding, meaning are students getting the quality education for the tuition price. As a result we are strengthening our student-faculty relationship.
b. Sending out an email to the Senate about the resignation to provide context for why bylaw changes are coming up.
   i. Trond: Point is to get change going as fast as possible.

7. Announcements

Trond: UAW and TA/RA pay rates. Discusses UW rules at present on TA/RA pay rates. Work with UAW to get clear and same policy across the board. The union would like to pursue this further and would like to work with GPSS on this in some way. Longstanding issue - the union wants the university to be clear in treating ASEs as employees. If ASEs are thought of only as students, university tends to ignore employment rules and contract in some areas (eg, workers comp).
Rene: How many people do you think this affects?

Trond: Not sure how many caught up in getting paid the lower rate. Know that some hundreds are working across departments, and that treatment is inconsistent.

8. Adjourn
Melanie moves to adjourn. Amy seconds. Unanimous agreement
Meeting adjourned at 8:55pm.