Graduate and Professional Student Senate

Senate Meeting Minutes Session 7

January 25th, 2017 | HUB 332

Call to Order 5:33PM

Approval of Agenda 5:33pm

Allie Sifrit (Marine and Environmental Affairs): Moves to approve the Agenda as presented.

Andrew Prindle (Landscape Architecture): Seconds.

Approval of Minutes 5:34 pm

Allie Sifrit (Marine and Environmental Affairs): Moves to approve the Minutes as presented.

Rose King (Biochemistry): Seconds.

Senator Refresher 5:35 pm

Sarah Loeffler (Vice President of Internal Affairs): Wants to do a quick five-minute exercise to refresh everyone on what your roles are in the Senate. Paired up all old senators (at least 1 year experience) and new senators and wants the groups to talk about prompt.

Elloise Kim (President): We are doing this exercise in response to Senators’ responses to the survey many Senators said they weren’t sure of their role in the Senate. Also, if we need more time to talk we can talk during Good of the Order.

Joanne Harrell Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Advisory Com, Board of Regents 5:43 pm

Elloise Kim (President): She invited Joanne to explain what the Board of Regents is doing to improve diversity on our campus. She is very happy and honored to introduce her.

Joanne Harrell: What she really wants to do is answer Senator’s questions. It might be helpful to let the Senate know that at Washington.edu/diversity there is mission statement about diversity and the overall philosophy on diversity. Currently she chairs the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee but she thought she would give a bit of history first. Personally, she is a graduate from the University of Washington School of Communications and she got an MBA from the School of Business (Foster). She has been a Regent for 7 years in her day jobs she works at Microsoft and leads Citizens and Public Affairs for the United States. She was appointed by Governor Gregoire and Governor Inslee. She thinks diversity and inclusion is so important because it is important that our society benefits form the thinking, and skills of all of us, it applies to all of us. Ideally, in our University we want to be the kind of place where people feel they can show up as
who they are and feel they can contribute and be respected. The conception of their committee, which is a new committee, they are an advisory committee to the Board. The purpose of the committee is very broad across the stakeholders in our community. The committee focuses on students, faculty, staff, and contracting and procurement. That broad outreach is intentional. She is pretty sure that there isn’t another University that is this far down the road where the Regents are supporting this initiative to this extent. Our president is also way ahead on this as well and truly believes this is the kind of place where we can all reach our true potential. The reason this is conceived as it is that having s been on the board for a while, she was board chair for a while, she sees that on an issue like this the opportunity really is to drive change across the entire institution. That’s why they focus on all of those things.

Even before the committee was developed one area of her focus is in the area of contracting and procurement. She graduated with her undergraduate degree in 1976. At the time, there was a man named Eddie Rye who protested because he said that minority contractors did not have a fair chance to get business. In the future about 40 years down the road, she saw him talking about the UW and what they needed to do differently on contracting. Later the same week they had a diversity statement on contracting and procurement at UW based on what Eddie said she wanted to define certain words in diversity statement on contracting and procurement at UW. They worked with a team for about a year to make a dashboard that is part of the boards reporting process for contracting. This shows that external groups pushing can drive change in a way that feels natural, is right, and makes sense.

Their goal with the DEI committee is that across students, faculty, and staff they can get a very clear, committee is in learning phase right now, on where the University is right now. They are a new committee they have 10 members and have had three meetings. Then, they want to focus on the right level about the right things. They want to be really clear on what the metrics are, where are the gaps etc. So that is what they are doing. President Cauce is a member of their committee, there is student and faculty representation as well even community representation. Basically, they are driving a common focus across the community. Questions?

**Micah Buuck (Physics):** From a broad perspective of hiring how is diversity taken into account?

**Joanne Harrell** Do you mean hiring from a faculty standpoint?

**Micah Buuck (Physics):** Sure.

**Joanne Harrell** What feels good is that the Deans have a whole lot of say in this. There is a learning process, or a diversity, equity, an inclusion curriculum. There is a vice president of diversity affairs at UW, OMAD, and they are focused on raising awareness through educational programs. Also, on top of that making sure each of the Deans understands the race and equity initiative which President Cauce is driving. So there is a focus on what we don’t have because we have i200 here. We have the intention and the development of insight. Within each of the schools it’s a focus area, in some schools it is very hard because the available pool of diversity is very small. Driving of common processes is something they are looking into as well.
**Erin Firth (Oceanography):** Have you guys been looking into at some of the limiting factors for Graduate applications?

**Joanne Harrell** The limiters are not that different from undergraduates, a lot of the limiters are cost. A lot of programs are fee-based. The best we can do is make sure that the cost is reasonable. There are also waivers that we make sure are amiable and the programs are equitable. There are many factors for that, one is quality of programs but so much of it comes down to the costs and the capacity. For better or worse a lot of those levers are financial. They make sure to work with legislators on funding, and work with foundation to raise funds and try to make people aware of the funds and ensure they are equitable and accessible.

**Dan Herb (Education - Leadership in Higher Education):** Is an advisor with undergraduate research program, thinks the big disconnect is how we are communicating the actions and things that are happening to students in a broad way. We are doing all this great work but students don’t know. Ex. Diversity blueprint.

**Joanne Harrell** The diversity blueprint has just been updated, the previous one was done about 5 years ago and it was a great plan they made traction on it and we need to do a better job of telling the story one big change that they had in time between previous plan and now is we have a president who understand the importance of doing great work and telling the story. Also, on their committee there is student representation and a student regent that does great work as well, and helps get the message out as well. Not only will the volume continue to increase, but the traction and support will increase as well. That is a good question, and we will make sure to pay attention to and continue to improve listening.

**Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama):** Everyone know what i200 is? (No)

**Joanne Harrell** Many years ago there was a law passed that you can’t use race in government contract procurement and that includes acceptance into university. As a University we have been able to shift our acceptance rates to focus on income. Programs such as Husky Promise can still tackle other issues.

**Erin Firth (Oceanography):** For the sciences at least, federal funding is getting drastically cut so how will that affect diversity? Do you have guidelines to address that issues?

**Joanne Harrell** Thinks their committee is new so they haven’t been able to tackle that yet. However, since the president really does see this as important we will keep it in high importance. Today, we have done very well in securing contracts and we hope to continue to do that and whatever we do we do it in an equitable and inclusive way.

**Elloise Kim (President):** We are really lucky to have a Board of Regent member who is very willing to genuinely listen to student feedback. Thank you, Joanne, for improving diversity, inclusion, and equity for the UW and the entire community.

---

**Divestment Guidelines (Margaret Shepherd and Austin Wright-Pettibone)**

6:03 pm
Elloise Kim (President): Wants to get student feedback before these guidelines go to the Board of Regents to get approved. Marghret Shepard is the chief strategy officer in the office of the president and she served in the State relations office for many years. She knows everything that is going on, on campus.

Austin Wright-Pettibone (Student Regent): What we want to do is get student feedback on what they are looking to propose for Divestment Guidelines. Students have been coming up with Divestment proposals for years. So, wanted to put together a divestment guideline so that we could have guidelines for accepting divestment policies for the future. Students in the past have brought forward divestments for fossil fuels, private prisons etc. The guidelines have outlined criteria for consideration for any divestment proposals the highlight to draw from this is they wanted to make sure that there was an inclusive process put in place so that students were brought into the advisory committee with a known broad consensus for their proposal. There needs to be a broad acceptance for the divestment to be put in place so it can move on.

Margaret Shepard: Divestment proposals to the Board used to be very rare, and they used to be judged on a case to case basis. Recently, the amount of divestment proposals has increased. Thus, the Board has heard from students that they are unclear on guidelines for proposals and what they need to do. There was conversation in Board to put structured process in place for transparency on the board level for the process and criteria for proposals. There was an initial proposal that came in September and there was student feedback that there wasn’t enough engagement in that process so Regents made so changes. They are now presenting a new proposal with some additions and changes to ASUW, GPSS, PACs, Student Budget committee, so student feedback can be funneled through Austin and reported in the February meeting when the Board will consider the proposal, it will be an informational meeting for this proposal. We are also on the forefront of this in Universities.

Most Boards don’t entertain divestment proposals or it’s on an ad hoc basis. There is no set way to do this, we think this is a nice balance of things we think will work. Structure of how things are considered, ethics is more important than financial criteria. There are a list of criteria upon which the board could evaluate a proposal. So, the process goes that a student or interested party would make a proposal, matched to divestment criteria, and it will be sent to a committee that would consider proposals on a quarterly basis. If the committee accepted the proposal, will go to Board based on 2/3 vote. The Board would take it as normal course of business. She is happy to go into as much detail as needed.

Austin Wright-Pettibone (Student Regent): One thing that has come from advisory committee structure, is that it is less ambiguous about how the divestment will look like going forward from the committee. Before, this draft of the proposal the structure of the committee was not confirmed. With an advisory board, there will be an opportunity to engage with a broad set of individuals. He is really supportive of this. He is really looking forward to student feedback on how it can be strengthened further.

Joanne Harrell: She was one of the two Regents that worked on this. One of the biggest concerns about the first proposal is to make sure it didn’t overly burden students. What she likes
about this proposal is that it sets students up to have a conversation with the Regents in a way where everyone can see where the other is coming from.

Michelle Brault (Molecular Cellular and Developmental Biology): Two questions. For the process of divestment in number 2 it says that all proposals need at minimum endorsements from ASUW, GPSS, and faculty senate. Was wondering why endorsement from one wasn’t enough? Thinks it might be an unnecessary burden. Also, would the three students in the committee be undergraduate and graduate students? Would it change?

Austin Wright-Pettibone (Student Regent): Typically the government leaders on tri-campus would submit names for who should be represented on the Board.

Michelle Brault (Molecular Cellular and Developmental Biology): So, it isn’t for sure that Graduate student would be on the board?

Elloise Kim (President): We would put up good fight to have Graduate students on the board.

Margaret Shepherd: Have tried to leave some flexibility so students could factor that into decision making. However, it is a point of feedback to bring back to the Board.

Elloise Kim (President): If there are more qualified Graduate students than Undergraduate students then we can get more Graduate student representation.

Austin Wright-Pettibone (Student Regent): Having all three endorse a proposal shows broad support. When he worked on open access textbooks they started with GPSS, and when they went to the libraries to propose the idea they were asked [by the libraries] to get an endorsement from ASUW. Then they went to the Faculty senate, the Faculty senate were not sure if they should support the idea. When dealing with something as big as divestment we need to show that everyone on campus supports it.

Margaret Shepherd: History shows us that typically students that bring divestment to the Board come with all three’s supports. Typically, we have seen that students have used that as a mechanism for lobbying the Board into interest. The initial draft said that there needed to be campus wide consensus and there was frustration that there needs to be more detail for what that meant. There was concern that nothing would pass with such vague guidelines. Ana Mari Cauce would also say that the governing structures of the campus are the right place to go to get voice for a particular student body through a democratic process. The assumption with the Faculty Senate is it would be through some class C process, rather than a Class A process.

Michelle Brault (Molecular Cellular and Developmental Biology): Moves to extend time by 7 minutes.

Erin Firth (Oceanography): Seconds.

Erin Firth (Oceanography): Overall likes this. Had a question from criteria number 1. Was wondering where the term morally reprehensible came from? Was wondering where language came from/
Margaret Shepherd: Did a scour to figure out how to make this work best. The language here is what Cornell’s definitions are, and the one that they [Board] thought was most balanced because it provides a few options for how things may go.

Erin Firth (Oceanography): Ever thought about putting a definition of morally reprehensible?

Austin Wright-Pettibone (Student Regent): They purposefully relaxed some of the language to make it more likely that some things could come through and not get shut down immediately. It was done to allow some room for conversation at the committee level.

Margaret Shepherd: One of the first goals of the committee would probably be to define what morally reprehensible is. Also, moral reprehensibility does change over time.

Will Gochberg (Political Science): On number three is says that an action that would cause deep division in the UW community may not be approved, below there is some evidence of what might constitute non-support wants to get some clarification on this.

Margaret Shepherd: The criteria here come back to first draft that said there should be no opposition to the divestment proposal which they decided was too strict of a guideline. However, from other Universities it was seen that certain proposals to the Universities had caused some pretty significant concern on campus. If a proposal came through from the three government bodies, then it will probably not be very disruptive but this allows the committee to exercise its rights on those grounds if something does come up to the committee.

Dan Herb (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): In terms of the endorsements he thinks it’s a smart move. However, he would like to know how the endorsements affect tri-campus faculty and students? For the composition of the committee, his concern with having a 2/3 vote is that there will be 6 students and faculty members that would not meet the 2/3 vote which may be to the detriment of student voice in the divestment process.

Austin Wright-Pettibone (Student Regent): Tri-campus faculty are represented through the Faculty Senate; however, a Resolution process is different for Tacoma and Bothell so he will follow up with both of them.

Margaret Shepherd: The reasoning behind the equal balance of types of people on the committee is the fund source. No public funds or tuition money are allowed to go into private investments. Only investments that are made are donor related funds. There was some sense that there needed to be some conversation about donor-related funds. The tri-campus representation is something for the Board to consider when considering the committee balance at the meeting.

Dan Herb (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): Maybe a counter argument to what he said is the possibility that there should be more donor representation on the committee because it is their money.

Micah Buuck (Physics): On the bottom paragraph after page 5. Seem like there needs to be some kind of higher bar to meet?
Margaret Shepherd: Shareholder engagement is sometimes a better option than divestment. Sometimes we hold such small portions of certain things that shareholder engagement would have a bigger impact. The idea here is to acknowledge there are other forms of advocacy other than divestment.

Micah Buuck (Physics): Seems interesting that if point one isn’t met other avenues can be seen, if point 2 isn’t met then other avenues won’t be looked into.

Margaret Shepherd: That’s fair.

Elloise Kim (President): Please communicate information to your constituents and get feedback to Austin.

Margaret Shepherd: The governance committee meeting will discuss these on February 8th.

A Resolution in Solidarity with Standing Rock Sioux Tribe 6:33pm

Elloise Kim (President): The first reading is to explain what the Resolution is about and to ask questions. Authors will take feedback into consideration when revising for the second reading.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): Randy, Jessica (NOISE), and Monica have worked on this for a while.

Jessica Ullrich (NOIS): NOIS (Native Organization of Indigenous Scholars) are a Graduate student group and they did a teach in on December 1st in support of Standing Rock. They are gearing up to do another one due to Trump signing an Executive Order to move forward with the pipeline in North Dakota they are now regrouping and trying to figure out what they can continue to do to support Standing Rock at this time.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): After the teach in she contacted Jessica to make the Resolution. They highlighted treaties it violated, and the impact of violence from government officials on Native Americans. They have a revised version that takes out President Elect Donald Trump and just says President Donald trump. Also, line 69 they mentioned that in financial disclosures the Trump administration received a large donation form energy partners, who is trying to build the pipeline. She personally put language in there thanking the Sioux tribe for being water protectors for all of us. Also, for being a good example of non-violent protests. Basically, saying we are in solidarity with them, she is asking President Cauce, the Provost, and the Board or Regents to speak out in solidarity with us and UAW 4121.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Definitely in support of this, but some of the language of the Resolution may have a deeper meaning he isn’t aware of so wanted to get some explanations. Lines, 15-17, 14-16, 88-89, 94-95. Could you give us some background or details?

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): A lot of this language came from Resolution of UAW 4121 made along with NOIS. They wanted to mention that it is not just the Sioux tribe that is standing up for this but rather it is many tribes that are coming in solidarity. Also, they are trying to say they are not just protesting a pipeline through the land but also that science has shown that fracking often does make water polluted and makes man made earthquakes.
Erin Firth (Oceanography): Fairly recently there was a news article that shows a spill near where DAPL was, would be less dated proof that could be added to the Resolution.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): There has been proof that chemicals leech into the water through hydraulic fracking.

Jake Busche (Chemistry): Has read the article of the oil spill near DAPL and thinks it’s very damning. Has there been any studies about frequency/chance of oil spill of damaging things around standing rock? (No idea.)

Laura Taylor (Molecular and Cellular Biology): Might be good to put in a whereas clause that tells us that science also backs up the arguments.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): Believes this is more about treaties not just science but given some of the conversations lately about fact and evidence based decision making that might be helpful.

Erin Firth (Oceanography): There are a few science driven government publications through the national academy of sciences that publish the estimated economic costs of recent oil spills.

Margaret Hughes (Environmental & Occupational Health Sciences): At least two high quality articles about contamination of water near hydraulic fracking sites. She can send those.

Dan Herb (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): Sources would be great for this.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): There are a few sources, in particular for the contentious parts of the Resolution. She didn’t source out all the treaties.

Siddharth Rath (Material Science and Engineering PhD): He remembers reading that the company is going ahead with DAPL, has said their DAPL pipeline design is suited for high pressures under the earth and goes deeper than many lakes, he is not sure if there are scientific reports backing up their claims but that might be something to look into.

Elloise Kim (President): Erin then Grant then please contact Monica with other information.

Erin Dunnington (Nursing - Psychosocial & Community Health): This Resolution will be up online for comment, and that is a great place to put in links for the articles etc.

Elloise Kim (President): Please provide feedback for Resolutions, online.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): The last line?

Jessica Ullrich (NOIS): It’s a common thought in Native American culture that you think of your ancestors and look towards the next 7 generations to try and do the best you can for them.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): Even if the pipeline is better, it’s still goes through native land which is unlawful. Also, was originally supposed to go through Bismarck and was moved because of probability of something bad happening to the large urban white town.

Jake Busche (Chemistry): Where are the documents online?
Elloise Kim (President): Drafts are sent through email and catalyst.

Randy Siebert (Secretary): They are in the emails I send out.

Elloise Kim (President): The Resolution process can be intimidating for new senators, email one of the officers with questions if you need help.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): Appreciates everyone’s interest in this. Wants to thank Jessica for coming. Will send information about other things we can do for this Resolution.

Elloise Kim (President): Resolutions are one of the most important things that happen in the Senate when they are approved they become the official opinion of all Graduate and Professional students represented by you so make sure you are fine in supporting it if you will vote for it.

Good of the Order 6:48 pm

Elloise Kim (President): Wants to have some time to relax and acknowledge that since last week things on campus and off campus has not been normal. All of us might know about the gun shot, the person who got shot is recovering but is in critical condition. There was a women’s march and more. It’s been an interesting time, she wants to propose that we meet in small groups and communicate how we are feeling. For maybe three minutes we will do this.

Michaella Rogers (Treasurer): Wants to open up the floor to concerns and conversations over last week.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Was on campus during the shooting, working in a building near red square. The notification from UW police said to clear and stay out the area. The notification wasn’t helpful. A group of people in the building went to the second floor and sheltered. They were there for hours waiting for an update on the situation. UW alerts should have regular updates and define clear areas. There wasn’t enough information to know what the right action was. He doesn’t want to have to make assumptions in an active shooter situation.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): She was in red square when it happened and she didn’t know what was happening until she got the alert. She agrees that it was very unclear about what was happening and what someone should do.

Elloise Kim (President): Laura Taylor who serves on the student advisory board for UW PD just left but she can voice our concern to the committee. Due to [Elloise] position she got notified earlier, but she agrees there needs to be more notifications.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): He thinks this an unacceptable way to alert the community, if that had been an active shooter hunting people no one would know until after it is over.

Sarah Loeffler (Vice President of Internal Affairs): Actionable items that come up can be addressed through Resolutions. Given the fact that we do have a GPSS member on the UW police committee this would be a good time for us to do something. Such as write a resolution.
Kelly Edwards (Graduate School Liaison): On another note, the Graduate school was talking about getting funding from the Federal government on the Graduate level. She has been in contact with office of research and another office which deals with our funding and they have been monitoring everything on a national level. As soon as we know anything we want to tell Graduate students and Post Doctorates. It will be a while until we understand everything that may happen, so she wants to give updates on the process.

Siddharth Rath (Material Science and Engineering PhD): It’s his first year, so he has rotated in many groups. One of the groups works in clean energy and was funded by the EPA but funding has been frozen for now. His advisor told him to have a backup plan. However, he doesn’t know what that would look like, his entire PhD career is based on clean energy sciences. There is a real probability that in the summer he would be unemployed with nothing to do. It is a great concern.

Kelly Edwards (Graduate School Liaison): We are lucky in Seattle for having private industries that will fund that kind of work especially with clean energies. With Core programs we can coordinate with GPSS about having targeted workshops about how to diversify funding resources.

Scott Spencer (Bioethics): Use the resources that Kelly has mentioned and try to brainstorm other opportunities for funding. It may be a good avenue to connect with other Graduate students on what is available.

Erin Firth (Oceanography): For postgraduate professions, he thinks it would be very useful for students in departments that are in danger to have mentors for Post Graduate work outside of academia.

Sarah Loeffler (Vice President of Internal Affairs): James is our External Vice President in Olympia. We spent the last quarter working on the State Legislative agenda. Our Federal Legislative advisory board will be put together soon. Some of us will lobby in DC in March. These things are great input to put for the legislative agenda. Reach out to Scott spencer, matt, or James.

Scott Spencer (Bioethics): Specifically regarding research funding He [Scott] is on the SAGE board and they are actively trying to recraft what that white paper looks like because the climate at the federal level has changed so drastically. Michelle Brault is also a part of that work group as well. For people who want a better picture of the Federal conversation he is happy connect at another time.

Elloise Kim (President): As a president, she is sorry that she cannot promise research funding but with SAGE they will do their best to bring student concerns into our lobbying. Let’s try to be hopeful.

Dan Herb (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): Went to the Women’s march on Saturday and there has been some critical feedback but overall it was an incredible event. It is motivating that there are 2.9 million people that are willing to work on this. It just is good, this is a time for us to regroup and work on what is happening.
**Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama):** There is a talk about another one on April 15. She loved the march but she hopes that people in that march come out for other things and vote etc. Encourages all of us to be vigilant.

**Dan Herb (Education - Leadership in Higher Education):** There is a Black Lives Matter (BLM) march in Seattle central college on March 4th. April 15th is the BLM march in Westlake park.

**Elloise Kim (President):** February 7th is Husky on the Hills day if you really care about raising your voice please join us on that day.

---

**Officer Reports 7:10 pm**

**Vice President of Internal Affairs (MATT)**

Olympia update on fee based programs there has been progress. Now working with the administration for some of these changes, there is a pretty good level of dedication on this issue. Representative Paulette who is also professor of public health at UW is sponsoring a bill to further support fee based programs HB1651. If you would like to weigh in on that give us some feedback. They expect changes to come through and are really excited the conversation is going beyond Graduate students.

On mental health, there is an incremental push, there is a suicide prevention mental health bill they are supporting and also supporting mental health for veteran’s bill that will be introduced in the legislator as a whole in the next week if not tomorrow. Due to financial constraints, it has been hard to push overwhelming change in the legislature on this bill there has been a strong support from the right. Senate bill has dropped today and has support from 4/5 members of Higher Education. The House bill will be dropped tomorrow. Please call legislators to boost this bill, the veteran’s mental health bill that was dropped today and will be introduced by next week.

Not much change for Sexual assault, ASUW is leading the way on that. Bills are being held up due to a need for a change in the student code conduct. If you have any ideas for proposals or suggestions let us know. Finally, Capital budget has been slow waiting for budget update. Need students to testify on t wing renovations and seismic improvements, as well as Parrington hall. Help with population health that would be great but they have a lot of support on that front. On all of this it is best to hear from students. Contact him if interested.

This is our last Senate meeting before lobby day, sign up on the catalyst link, also it has been shared on twitter, and the link is on the website, also on the Facebook event going around. It’s on Feb. 7th there have only been 20 Graduate students signed up so far. SAGE (Student Advocates for Graduate Education) has a DC trip planned for March 26-29. The SLAB committee will merge to the FLAB committee. Currently working on a student loan white paper.

**Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama):** She signed up for lobby day but hoped it would be easier to get back to Seattle in the middle of the day.

**Elloise Kim (President):** There are many options, including bussing etc.
**Vice President of External Affairs**

The Survey is still up, please fill it out it is very helpful to hear from Senators. Program reviews are coming up in January are for Scandinavian studies and school of medicine Medx. The Science and policy steering committee are working on the white paper project that is coming up, it’s a good way to learn how to do white papers. Also, the GPSS winter social is coming up it’s in the HUB game room there will be bowling, drinks and refreshments. If people can help Feb. 16\textsuperscript{th} let Tori know.

**Secretary**

She is sponsoring the Indigenous Feminism series at the Intellectual House. On Feb. 4\textsuperscript{th} they will do the polar plunge, the community outreach event for GPSS. They have almost raised 500 dollars out of 750 last time she checked, so that’s awesome. She is updating the website and getting organized. Diversity committee has funded four different events on campus so far and they have some more applications. We have consistently throughout last quarter had 57\% attendance at Senate meetings even with a few of you not signing in.

**Treasurer**

Finance and Budget committee has been really busy this quarter a lot of application on the books, people are really prepared, they are awarding a lot of money. Travel grants are open. The primary goal for her is working on the fiscal year 2018 budget.

**President**

The academic conference is happening and the application is on the GPSS website. It is a time to reflect on our role as Graduate students. It is a pretty general theme there are lots of sessions to apply for. Please spread the word. It is only for the UW tri-campus. She hopes to get many applications.

---

**Announcements 7:20pm**

**Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama):** Tim Wise talking about white privilege and she thinks it’s great. People think that people of color have to talk about discrimination but it is White people’s problems too.

---

**Adjournment 7:20pm**

**Maxine Savage (Scandinavian Studies):** Moves to adjourn the meeting.

**Jake Busche (Chemistry):** Seconds.