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

Others Present:
Rene Singleton, SAO Advisor
June Yi, The Daily
Ashoat Tevosyan, Student Technology Fee Committee
Josh Hanson, Student Technology Fee Committee (call-in)

1. Call to Order
Adam calls the meeting to order at 6:04pm

2. Approval of the Agenda
Evan moves approval.
Megan seconds.
None opposed.

3. Approval of the Minutes from 11/9/11
Evan moves approval.
Amy seconds.
None opposed.

4a) Student Technology Fee Committee Funding
Colin: provides context. A couple of years ago ASUW and GPSS looked at how STF was operating and proposed changes to how it was run. Yearly funding of STF needs approval from ASUW and GPSS.

Josh touches on basics and some figures. Ashoat will go through categories. Small changes, couple of bindings on issues that come up multiple times address policies on charges for consumables and ability of the committee to cut/ignore/not provide budgetary extension, recommended by auditors. Budget this year, no exact figure yet. Operates on estimates until July 1st. Numbers at UW not a huge difference. This year, we have benefit of biennium roll-over. Can be allocated at any time now. $950,000 dollars. Will have about $5.1-5.2 million to spend on proposals. This is a fast track option for proposals that need funding immediately. Money that comes in as revenue can
be spent as of July 1st (2012). Will open proposals after approval from ASUW/GPSS. Will close calling for proposals second week in January. Requiring staff or faculty to be only ones allowed to spearhead proposals.

Questions about proposal process.

Evan: Do you have an estimate of what you would like to see spent this year?

Josh: As much as needed to fund every project that needs funding. It is money to spend, not to hold on to.

Evan: how long have rollover funds been accruing?

Josh: Most/all budgets are on biennium process. Once biennium closes it goes back to budget.

Colin: There is a key change in proposal authors: regarding staff and faculty. Understand logic behind it. Last year there were a couple of proposals ie, Anthropology, that came from students. To what extent would it effects groups like that, or The Daily, which applied for new photo lens last year.

Josh: For student groups, they can make exceptions. It’s more about making sure there is someone responsible. A student who graduates leaves no accountability for what their proposal is. Anthropology example: still requires faculty to spearhead proposal, we don’t care who implements it. The proposal author will be there as opposed to students who are only around for 1-3 years.

Ashoat: iterates the point of making sure there is accountability for project proposals.

Evan: Is the new addition driven out of previous experience or just a safety measure?

Josh: Just a way to tidy up policy. At end of day, department it is the one responsible.

Evan: just trying to think of some student groups that may not be affiliated with faculty or staff.

Josh: We don’t bar student groups but will have to look into it as the proposals need a dean’s signature.

Ashoat: we would like to see someone employed by university as primary contact whenever possible. We would hope that requiring a dean’s signature would not discourage student groups from applying.

Trond: this may discourage groups from applying.
Adam: The issue is helping people find that person if they already do not have someone attached. This may be a good way for groups that are removed from RSO or institution to be brought back in.

Ashoat: Student organizations should be aware of the rule. As for us being responsible for connecting proposal authors to staff or faculty, I think that is outside the scope of STF. Only in context where they can’t find anyone then they should contact us.

Trond: What about including some language that says students are not automatically excluded, but here are some possible areas that you can go explore to find staff or faculty.

Megan: It’s more of a co-sign option if the proposal author is a student.

Colin: We’re not proposing anything substantially different, just adding a bit of language to make it easier for students without a sponsor to not feel left out of the process.

Ashoat: as specifics, referencing Student Activity Office, and rephrasing of co-opting.

Colin: For departmental applications, authors need to have a co-signer.

Josh: Can have concurrent contact, recommend having that as the student.

Adam: Can we just say that “the author needs to identify a faculty or staff member to serve as a primary contact”?

Rene: Student organizations with department sponsors

Evan: raising barriers to access to application for any group that is legitimate within UW.

Ashoat: not barring RSO, but barring RSOs on their own.

Trond: How about wording such as: “Will identify staff, faculty member or other permanent office holder within the university” Current language seems like a student can help write the proposal but they are not the primary author.

Ashoat: changes you want are:
1. reference to Student Activities Office
2. Author will identify university faculty or staff as sponsor
3. Be clear with responsibilities of sponsor

Trond: this is student’s tech fee. If students can’t do it, then it defeats purpose.

Ashoat: most apps are depts. that are submitting on behalf of students.

Trond: wording on the RFP as it is - not meeting the mission of STF.
Discussion of the meaning of the word ‘sponsor’ versus ‘primary contact’

Ashoat: we want to make it clear that the person taking care of the proposal is the faculty or staff member.

Adam: This is a key feature: Information about the responsibilities of the primary contact.

Rene agrees with the importance of placing students first. They can apply but must partner with sponsor/primary contact. The wording as it is now leads with staff.

Colin recaps on two issues being discussed with Ashoat. Two Objectives:
1. Placing students first through a bit of language tweaking.
2. Faculty/staff as de facto who comes to present to the committee

Ashoat: There is space for student involvement, but for the primary contact, we want to see someone in the primary role of driving this proposal forward and played a part in committing to this.

Melanie: The role of the primary contact is to keep consistency, whereas students are always changing.

**Summary of Changes:**
1. Include a reference to the Student Activities Office (SAO)

2. On page 8 under IV. Eligibility: Remove the first two sentences. (The primary and concurrent contact…”) Language change to “The author will identify permanent staff or faculty as primary contact.”

3. Make reference to section with the responsibilities of the primary contact.

Responsibilities of primary contact include:
- Proposal executed as described for at least 3 years
- File annual report
- Dealing with non-compliance

Trond raises the issue of a deeper philosophical problem with the direction that STF Committee is taking to the application approach.

Colin: Moving forward, we need to have the STF Committee look at the “S” (Students) in STF.

Colin moved to approve the STF funding proposal, with the three changes. Mateo seconded.
Voting yes: Mateo, Evan, Melanie, Colin, Amy, Adam.
Abstentions: Trond, Megan
Motion carries, 6-0-2.
4b) Senate Meeting Agenda: 11/30

Adam and the Executive Committee discuss agenda items for Senate meeting on Nov. 30.

Melanie: Student Engagement: How to break up students?

Adam: putting professional schools together as their issues are different from grad school students.

The agenda for the November 30th Senate meeting is:
• Call to Order (1)
• Approval of the Agenda (1)
• Approval of the Minutes (5)
• Special Election (45)
• Legislative Agenda (20)
• Student Engagement (30)
• Financial Update (10)
• Announcements/Election Results (5)
• Adjourn (1)

Evan moves approval of the Senate agenda.
Trond seconds.
None opposed.

4c) Legislative Agenda

Adam gives an update on the legislative agenda. Met with federal and state legislative steering committees. Will be adjusting last year’s agenda based upon current environment. Last year the idea of revenue was third rail of politics, now it might be pushed through as a referendum. Still going off things that were priorities in the past such as immigration, student indebtedness and taxation, and federal research funding for graduate education.

Trond: in past years when we’ve talked about federal issues, do we have a position on publishing?

Adam: balance between consistency in message, and also updating message to reflect current ideas/situations.

Trond: NAGPS has a great position statement on this. Would like federal committee to look at adopted language of NAGPS. Issue on public domain and public publishing.

Melanie: adding something about revenue into state legislative agenda.
Trond: Legislative Steering Committee - idea was to be a lot more tactical on the agenda as opposed to what we believe in. What does the committee believe in?

Adam: Balance between values and tactics. For example, in talking about immigration as it pertains to graduate students, we want members of congress to come to see us as experts in this topic in a couple years’ time so when comprehensive immigration reform is finally discussed SAGE will be consulted.

Adam: Legislative agenda is a guiding document consistent with values of grad students.

4d) Financial Statements
Colin: Talks over financial statement with Executive Committee. Bringing to Executive Committee to let Committee know where GPSS is financially. Would like to bring this to the Senate so senators have this information as well.

Highlights:
1. Fundraising
2. Under budget for fall social
3. Under budget for Higher Ed Summit
4. Under budget for Personnel budget

4d) Officer Reports

a) Vice President (Adam)
- Slow but steady stream of students volunteering for committees.
- Connor Lieb (Legislative Assistant) is setting up appointments with legislators before the special session starts. First chance to go around and talk about what our priorities are
- Talking to a lot of departments to meet with students.
  - Melanie talks about event at College of Built Environments happy hour
  - Adam wants to find ways to engage with students in multiple formats from happy hours to socials, to town halls. Thinks that if we can engage students in a more light-hearted way, more students will want to become involved
- Developing the legislative agenda

b) Treasurer (Colin)
- PhD comics tomorrow night
- Planning for trivia night and speed dating events
- Yesterday was planning meeting for Science and Policy Summit and discussed new format to be more engaging to have audience engage with speakers. Hoping to put on same amount of programming for less cost
c) Secretary (Melanie)
   - Diversity working group will have first meeting this Friday
   - UPASS- potentially adopt bylaws this Friday
   - Communications Plan
     - How we send out our emails- coordination, template consistency

d) ASUW (Evan)
   - Big controversy: ASUW passed support for Occupy Wall Street. Goes to ASUW Board tomorrow for approval.
   - First reading of Diversity resolution in ASUW Senate.
   - “Huskies On The Hill” (HOTH) will be the name of Lobby Day this year.
   - Entire week dedicated to higher education.
   - First tri-campus meeting this Friday.
   - WSA general assembly this Saturday at UW.

5) Adjourn
   Colin moves to adjourn.
   Mateo seconds.
   All approve.