Exec Meeting Minutes

January 31, 2018 | HUB 303

Members Present

GPSS President: Soh Yeun (Elloise) Kim
GPSS Secretary: Giuliana Conti
GPSS Vice President of External Affairs: Matt Munoz (via phone)
GPSS Vice President of External Affairs: Tori Hernandez
GPSS Executive Senator: Elizabeth Oestreich
GPSS Executive Senator: Noelle Symanski
GPSS Executive Senator: Grant Williamson
GPSS Executive Senator: Peder Digre (via phone)
ASUW Director of Internal Policy and the Liaison: Bo Goodrich
Associate Dean for Student & Postdoc Affairs, Grad School: Kelly Edwards
HUB Director & GPSS Advisor: Justin Camputaro
Assistant Director of Student Activities: Rene Singleton

1. Call to Order 5:34 PM

2. Approval of the Agenda 5:34 PM

Giuliana Conti: Approves the agenda
Grant Williamson: Seconds
3. **Huskies on the Hill**  
5:54 PM

**Matt Munoz:** Shares that there were a record-breaking number of students who attended Huskies on the Hill. Higher number of grad students signed up this year compared to last year. Naturally had a higher number of no-shows too. Those figures will be available soon along with the exact number of students who attended the event. There are team leaders for groups who can access the folders that have been created for each group and those will be updated. Kelsey is also working on an email to grad students who couldn’t have all of their questions answered. That will enable Matt and Kelsey to follow up with the corresponding officers and legislators. The questions and answers will be compiled, and the information can be used next year. Received some suggestions on improving the events in the future. The first is the RSVP survey that was sent a week later this year. So advance notice and information needs to be sent from next time for people to plan earlier. Another suggestion is to advertise the event more and orient the team leaders better for the day. Allow people to take pictures after the meetings around The Capital. Have people come dressed professional since there were many students who had come dressed in jeans. Having the training a day before the event so that people know what to do at these events. The training can be in the form of emails, or a one pager or videos on lobbying etc. The final suggestion is to make sure everyone who attends have sufficient access to protect themselves from the rains. Invites questions and suggestions.

**Tori Hernandez:** Shares that the video orientation idea is a good one.

**Rene Singleton:** Shares that everything was fabulous. Recommends that the graduate students go to their appointments by themselves and not go with undergrads because grad students can speak to both issues but it’s better for grad students to talk about graduate issues with legislators. Another suggestion is to work on part of the training. Providing training enables everyone to get rebooted. She and a Resident Advisor drove a van and parked in an area. They had all the bag lunches so that students could walk up to them and pick up the food. Recommends doing it that way in the future for food. Overall commends the work of GPSS for the job well done.

**Matt Munoz:** Thanks Rene. Asks if there’s any more suggestions or feedback.

**Elizabeth Oestreich:** Likes the idea of videos that could be used from year to year but then can be tweaked with either in person or a one pager. There are some things that don't change on a couple different previous ones and there’s somethings like about the attire and expectations that could be nice.

**Bo Goodrich:** Pushes back on the attire from the point of accessibility. Would not want someone to feel like they cannot come to Lobby Day and represent themselves because they don’t have formal attire. It may be more of an undergrads problem and can be dealt with separately. Encouraging people to wear formal wear is great but not imposing it.

**Matt Munoz:** Shares that nobody would be pointed out and held accountable for not being dressed in formal wear. Its more to ensure and demonstrate professionalism. Understands Bo’s point and would like to talk about it and look into in the future.
Kelly Edwards: Shares that if GPSS hosted a clothes exchange drive it would be helpful. She personally carries around six bags of professional clothes to Capitol Hill place for the undergrads who are trying to get back on the job market from the street. It could be interesting if ASUW partners with GPSS to drive the event for grad students.

Asks what the response of the Senators and Congress people was to the attendees? Were there any key issues that they were resonating with or if there’s anything that’s worth sharing.

Matt Munoz: Shares that he received feedback on reception for student loans rates that GPSS has been pushing through. Got a push back on the mental health.

Giuliana Conti: Shares that one of the things that was most effective that could become part of the training better is the use of personal stories and as Grant has talked about Leaders within groups. So, part of what sells becoming the importance of being a graduate student is being able to say, “we effect this” and especially in regards to like K-12 education. That was a point that was encouraged to bring up and felt like a sufficient reason to support graduate students even as just a small reason. But having a facilitator to be able to point to different people in knowing what their story was ahead of time so that comes up to being 15 minutes ahead to the appointments so that one can converse with the people they’re going to be in the appointment with, decide who a facilitator can be so that the facilitator during dead silence can say “well this person can really speak to that”. That’s something that Grant did really well and that's something that she tried to do but did not know how to do it. So, how to bring graduate students stories into these conversations to drive home these overall points that GPSS and everyone is trying to make and have them advocate for on their behalf. With issues of mental health one could relate to issues of finance, having several graduate students in the room who can speak to that as well and say “well you know if you don't have graduate students who finish because either they can't afford it and or mental health becomes an obstacle then you don't have people in these fields who will contribute back to our society which are your constituents.”

Grant Williamson: Adds that one of the significant problems this year was making sure there was enough space between meetings and that people got to meetings ahead of time. People were getting to meetings late whereas it should have been 15 minutes ahead of time, so they get enough time with the Legislators to discuss beforehand or if people are walking in late, they should have a clear sense of what they are going to discuss. Not sure if it was emphasized as much this year as past years and some of that was the way meetings were scheduled.

Giuliana Conti: Asks what was the likelihood or the possibility of having groups that move together as opposed to people that just kind of run chaotically around to different buildings and rooms. The benefit of that would be great and that the cohesion would build throughout the day and could have a more unified stance and fluidity of the meeting. Don't know what the possibility for that is but that might be something to consider if that's feasible.

Matt Munoz: Shares that last year had fewer meetings that people could attend. Would bring up the issue with OGR on how to improve the meetings in the future. As per Rene’s point on having separate meetings for grad students would help to discuss issues in the agendas.
Tori Hernandez: Shares that she liked Giuliana's point about having groups that move together, something that GPSS really tries to do is create a community and a cohesion and a bond between graduate students from different disciplines and that would be a great aspect to do that. Witnessed a lot of grad students who were just by themselves and they didn't have somebody to talk with throughout the day when they didn't have a meeting for an hour. So, the idea of having groups of students together throughout the whole day is great. Secondly, having 30 people in a room for meetings is very difficult. The most rewarding part for students is being able to talk and share a story and being able to represent themselves while also representing the university. When there are 30 people in the room, only 5 or 6 end up talking. So, students don't necessarily get those opportunities and a lot of other students feel comfortable talking in small groups rather than in front of a large room. Third point going back to attire is, career center partners with J.C Penny a few weeks before this event happens where one can get business clothes for 60% discount. It's a certain J.C Penny store at Northgate at a certain time. That's something they do every year and GPSS can look at promoting that better from next year along with promoting Lobby Day.

Elloise Kim: Acknowledges Matt’s and Kelsey’s work towards the event. This year’s events were a way better version than the last year’s is you until Susan colony. There are some room to grow in terms of organization and grouping but overall it was very successful. Likes to make 2 points. Not knowing who would show up to her meeting was a challenge for her personally because she was on time but there were people who had to arrive late coming from the previous meeting in the neighboring building. So sometimes it happened to be individual meeting and then two people showed up late and it was a little bit disorganized. So just knowing who will be in the same meeting with her in the same group will be helpful. The other point is on encouraging people to wear more purple if they have a purple theme on Lobby Day might be looked at as great enthusiasm and spirit.

Matt Munoz: Thanks Elloise and continues to report that this year’s creative process was difficult due to the communication between OGR and External affairs. The transition documents of GPSS and OGR will have all the details so that the incoming new teams are aware of all the challenges in the previous year and how to address those.

4. OSFA Student Budget

Elloise Kim: Shares that she included this in the agenda because last week there was a meeting of Financial Advisory Board organized by Office of Student Financial Aid (OSFA). Learned last year that this board met only once a year and fortunately this year the meeting schedule was sent to the members a little earlier than last year, yet the handout given contained old information besides what she could find on the OSFA website. This is the information that the university will publish for prospective students who are entertaining the idea to come to UW. The information this year was pretty similar to what was presented last year, but the problem is the language that is very vague and confusing. There are many incorrect and ambiguous information. Had a good conversation with Naved, the University Affairs Director regarding that. It was agreed that the
same book doesn’t make sense in case for grad and undergrad students. In case of professional students, they spend much more money on textbooks. So there has to be additional communication and information given to students for better understanding and it was very unclear why there was no differentiation earlier. OSFA was receptive and is hoping to see some changes in the information published. Wanted to have it as a way to build institutional memory for the Officers of next year because this is once a year and it’s really hard to be ready to carry meaningful conversation.

Grant Williamson: What does the personal category cover?

Elloise Kim: It includes food but not for everyday but for the food that students will have to pay to attend schools. It counts only nine months expenditure and not a full year. And personal means anything else. Books can include the supplies that students need to get to study such as laptops. That was a recommendation from Elloise along with books because laptops are becoming a must-have other than optional these days. This information was sorted out based on the survey that was conducted last spring and there were 561 grad students who responded and about 700 undergraduate respondents. But who they were and why they responded as they did is unclear.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Points that between traditional and nontraditional children, it costs about $3000 extra for 9 months. Highlights that the total in the second column is wrong. It should be 8433. Asks why the transportation costs are more for grad students but everything else is the same.

Elloise Kim: Clarifies that there are more commuters by car amongst grad students. It is true that more undergrad students live on campus. Yet, the language used in the document is unclear. Requests everyone to study the OSFA website and if something needs to be fixed, will be communicated with OSFA in a meeting later this month.

Kelly Edwards: Asks how the response was for Elloise’s feedback?

Elloise Kim: Shares that she has had previous conversations with the lead of the committee and there were others too who were raising points.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Comments that non-traditional includes all graduate and students with children in the same rent on board.

Elloise Kim: Shares that last year, Randy focused on changing the language from traditional and non-traditional to something better that would make more sense. But the OSFA was resistant to that change. The reason was that the language was a shared and established terminology across schools. Lots of students are living on campus and off campus housing, living with parents and relatives. Those categories are making more sense to people. Recommendations have been made but need to wait to watch if they will be implemented in the next year’s information.

5. Next Senate Meeting Agenda - Feb 7th ‘18

7:05 PM
**Elloise Kim:** Shares the draft of agenda for the next Senate meeting.

**Tori Hernandez:** States Transportation services will be present as a Guest at the next Senate. Recently learned that U-PASS Advisory is presenting as Transportation services as whole. Asks if everyone is okay with that?

**Grant Williamson:** Asks if they are going to talk about the survey.

**Tori Hernandez:** Doesn’t really know because wasn’t at the U-PASS meeting. But when scheduling this, the intention was to talk about everything they do including U-PASS. But apparently, they changed that in the Friday’s meeting. A clarifying email has been sent. So, in the agenda, it can be written either Transportation services or U-PASS.

**Grant Williamson:** Suggests leaving it as Transportation services because U-PASS falls under Transportation services. Asks if it should be 10 minutes and if it cannot be 5 minutes?

**Tori Hernandez:** Says 5 minutes for presentation and 5 minutes for Q&A.

**Elloise Kim:** Shares regarding the next item, Huskies on the Hill, Matt will be meeting the OGR this Friday and he will have some plan for the next year based on the feedback he has collected. OGR is doing online survey of the participants as well. Asks Matt if 10 minutes is enough for that.

**Matt Munoz:** Says 10 minutes should be good.

**Elloise Kim:** Hopes to have some photos received from OGR to show as well. Talks about the next item - Elections Committee Recruitment would need 5 minutes.

**Giuliana Conti:** Shares that Grant and she wrote a resolution.

**Grant Williamson:** Says it’s the Resolution in support of UAW 4121 Bargaining Demands 2018.

**Elizabeth Oestreich:** Asks if they are going to present what they are or have someone else do it?

**Grant Williamson:** Says he will be presenting and 10 minutes would be fine since he is just presenting the first reading.

**Giuliana Conti:** Asks if they are going to go through the first reading with the Body because they are going to go online.

**Grant Williamson:** States it will go online ahead of time

**Elloise Kim:** Suggests sharing it online by Friday with the Senate which will give them the opportunity to have a look at it before presenting it on Wednesday at the Senate meeting.

**Giuliana Conti:** Agrees and comments that the Senators can also make edits online. So, they won’t need 10 minutes for that. 5 minutes should do.
Grant Williamson: Says yes, unless there are questions.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Points that Shares that it's not just about reading the resolution. It’s actually telling what the UAW Bargaining is and they've got a quite a list. So that'll take a little longer than a normal resolution.

Kelly Edwards: Says if it’s a new one, it would require detail presentation.

Giuliana Conti: Shares they discussed about whether or not to go over those specific things during the first reading because there will be a link in the resolution so that they can go to the website because GPSS is also supporting the negotiation process rather than these specific items or what we support. Trying to say GPSS supports the graduate students and union members that are bargaining on our behalf and their decisions are what we support.

Grant Williamson: Shares that they have passed around a copy of the resolution if everyone wants to see it.

Elloise Kim: Says 10 minutes would be safe for the resolution. Requests Giuliana to share her idea on Good of the Order.

Giuliana Conti: Says yes, the length of Senate meetings and whether or not Officer report should be at the beginning, the end, or simply within the e-mails as part of general notifications.

Elloise Kim: This came up after witnessing some people leave before Officer Reports. Replacing Officer Reports with emails might not be very effective because Officer Reports is an important part of the meeting. It’s towards the end of the meeting because it’s not an action but shared as an update. There are usually resolutions and elections and therefore having action items first and guests first makes more sense. If someone believes this is not the best way, can suggest or comment.

Tori Hernandez: Shares that just from sitting at the front of the room and being able see everyone, the people who do leave early as soon Officer Reports come on the screen that's when they get up and leave. It seems to be tied and there seems to be some sort of correlation there. So, it would be a good topic just to ask the Senate Body what they think about it.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Feels that the officer reports are a nice way for people who don’t interact with the Officers. It's a good point. There are sometimes when it seems like the officers are reporting to them but can be concise. Sometimes there can be the better use of that time so that it's a little bit shorter but bringing it up in the Good of the Order might encourage people to talk about ways to try and change, it might encourage people to stay for what the new way looks like it looks like doing just that sometimes.

Elloise Kim: Adds that given that it’s the session time, Matt will have more than the other Officers to report. Recommends other Officers at such times to be more succinct. Suggests not going over 2 minutes unless there’s something more important.
Grant Williamson: States, this is a good discussion to have with the Senate but maybe a bit broader discussion now that they've all had enough meetings to see how Senate works. There hasn’t been a resolution yet, but that will be there this week. Asking them for feedback on the time aspects of how something works maybe it would be is important.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Adds that the point about having the Senate on other days and not just Wednesdays can be discussed too.

Kelly Edwards: Shares that it’s nice to see people use Slido. So many great questions have come in. Suggests running a poll which could be an easy way to express opinions more than show of hands. Online poll like in a Slido can help people see real-time responses too.

Giuliana Conti: Shares that they have been consistently gaining new senators every session they've had. So, sharing info with new Senators in a way by saying “oh by the way for those of you who are new, this is what Slido is, this is how it works etc. would be really helpful for the Senators.

Rene Singleton: States that people might be leaving at a particular time probably because they have to catch a bus or have a class to attend. Asks why exactly are the Officers bothered about it? Would like to know the reasons.

Tori Hernandez: Shares that she is not particularly bothered why they are leaving but wonders if the meetings are too long (1.5 to 2 hours).

Grant Williamson: Adds to Tori’s point and says he sees it as a symptom of a potential problem and not sure if the problem actually exists. Thinks for a lot of students, they do like have a very planned schedule and GPSS is not the best to sticking to the times as mentioned in the agenda. That maybe more where he has concerns is that they don't actually stick to the time. Some of this is that the Senate wants to talk longer about something or something else. So, sticking to the time for telling people so they can plan so when they see the agenda would help.

Giuliana Conti: Agrees and adds that GPSS’s time efficiency as a sign of respect to the constituents. So, if Senators are leaving it may reflect on their investment on what GPSS does, their interest in the very last pieces which means that the Officers are not communicating maybe some important things about what they do. Shares that if they leave, she personally is not offended because she leaves meetings often when she can. The meetings are long and has seen most of them on their phones. GPSS can't be invested the whole time, all the time but if it does mean that GPSS need to be more respectful of their time dial it back and stick to a time length that is read upon and then that would be helpful and if they are missing information because maybe it's not so much that they have something else they have to do after but they just got tired. It’s midway through the week and it's late at night, then maybe there’s something that GPSS can be more efficient about. Also suggests adding a line at the end of the agenda moving forward with the total time on the right-hand side.
Elloise Kim: Agrees and adds that in the future meetings, there will be resolutions and other things and the meeting tend to get longer. It’s important to communicate with Senators that they have to carve out two hours on Wednesdays.

Noelle Symanski: Shares that the only concern that she would have about people leaving early is that they miss the announcements because that's one of the more important things to report back on to their constituents and departments. Suggests switching Announcements and Officer Reports.

Elloise Kim: Shares that in case of Faculty Senate Meeting, Officer Reports falls in the first part of the agenda. GPSS does it later because of the meeting time and it matters for people to know what the Officers do.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Shares that they have talked a little a few times about being more aware of the time and having something like a run clock on the screen like that could be preset for each agenda item would be helpful and also to know when to extend time. It is an idea of one way to keep the presenters on track but that would make people uncomfortable.

Giuliana Conti: Points that part of the challenge for her being the time keeper is that it's rude to interrupt but she has to say when they have a minute left etc.

Grant Williamson: Likes the idea of around the clock because putting it up there makes the collective responsibility. So, one person saying they are over time, it's obvious to everyone that they're over time instead of it being one person's responsibility.

Justin Camputaro: Says that needs to be communicated to the Speaker well in advance.

Tori Hernandez: Suggests having signs similar to the ones they had for the elections.

Elloise Kim: Shares that it’s important to discuss why they are having the meeting, what is the prescribed time and why they would have to extend.

Grant Williamson: Agrees with that but thinks their struggle isn't so much in meeting the time but in identifying areas where they're providing information that the Senators don't value. So that is perceived as it's wasting their time and they're less receptive to Officers spending the extra time on other issues that are important and they're less receptive for staying for meetings that run long because GPSS is discussing the issues of importance that take a long time and so that's where the real constraint is.

Justin Camputaro: Asks if the stuff is something that they all know for sure or are just talking about it.

Grant Williamson: Says he knows that for sure from talking to other Senators and knowing Senators who leave and why they leave.

Justin Camputaro: Asks if he talked to the ones who left? Asks what about the ones who stay.
**Grant Williamson:** Says they both have problems with what's presented.

**Justin Camputaro:** Highlights that GPSS don’t make changes due to some/few people leaving before the end of the meeting.

**Kelly Edwards:** Says this is why she is curious about doing a poll. Having closer to comprehensive data about preferred use of timer of when people would leave. The best thing about Officer Reports is the transition of getting the information on the slide. The trade-off of that is that you can read that information later and becomes less important when its orally presented. Who reads the minutes is another polling question.

**Tori Hernandez:** Shares, it is a good topic of discussion for Good of the Order.

**Elloise Kim:** Asks Grant to share some of the feedback he has heard from Senators on what they like to hear at the Senate meetings.

**Grant Williamson:** States it's that issue areas they've discussed extensively. The Guests and the officer reports are the areas where he gets consistent feedback on them being too long. Since the changes with Slido the complaint has gone down substantially for Guests. With the officer reports, it's not that they're not presenting important information, but a lot of the information doesn't require timely actions by anyone and so there's no sense of urgency when that's the information being presented. At least from what he has heard that's why there's this perception that it's not necessarily the best use of people's time, is because there's no action for them associated with it. So, with things like lobby day there's a very clear action and that needs a lot of explanation and that means lead up to it for them to be successful there. So, the items associate just as a timely example. But there needs to be a lead up on what's going on in session to prepare people for that, there needs to be the announcement about what it is they need so that all fits together is a timely point of action for people but when there's no action for Senator associated with that, that's where the problem comes in. If the Officer reports could be structured so they're either significantly shorter so it's only the very most important things or so bring in more actions from Senators, so Good of the Order is the right way to do this.

**Elloise Kim:** Highlights that the general feedback requires Officers to be concise with their reports and presentation.

**Elizabeth Oestreich:** Asks if they are going to do a poll of the Good of the Order?

**Elloise Kim:** Shares her concern that GPSS has been successful in moderating and facilitating session and questions through Slido, it can be seen that only specific people are participating. So, she is unsure how many people will be ready with their devices and participate in the poll.

**Elizabeth Oestreich:** Suggests using a catalyst and do it with the email beforehand and use that as a starting point for discussion.
Giuliana Conti: Shares that it could also be the way that GPSS presents it because there could be Senators that don't know that Slido is used. So, orienting them would make sense. Even if that means that for a while the Officers have to repeat themselves numerous times, it's a good resource and people are engaging in it. It would be great to be consistent with the platforms used to get more reactions.

Tori Hernandez: Points that a poll would get more reactions from people than questions.

Giuliana Conti: Suggests a mixed method – while they talk about it, they are also polling the Senators.

Grant Williamson: Highlights that his sample is by no means representative so shouldn’t be embracing decisions based on it.

Elloise Kim: States the total time for the meeting is 70 minutes. Good of the order would be for 15 minutes. Highlights that on the agenda. Makes a motion to approve the agenda.

Giuliana Conti: Approves

Tori Hernandez: Seconds

6. Executive Senator Reports

Grant Williamson: Reports that on Feb 13th there’s a policy event at Kane Hall co-sponsored by the Science & Policy Committee. GPSS will be posting about it shortly.

Noelle Symanski: Reports that a lot of people were interested in Good of the Order. Lot of people stayed back to talk about it. Got their email addresses. Will put together a work group and will meet next Tuesday and discuss drafting a resolution. One of the ideas that people mentioned was that they want to kind of a peer support group or a way to connect outside for the purpose of talking about grad student issues or mental health with people that have similar backgrounds or interests. Shares that they are trying this platform in the Law School that essentially like the Match.com of the professional networking where you put in your interests into this form and it matches you like a professional mentor. Asked her Deans if she can test it out of like People who need peer support groups who might have similar interests or want to talk about similar things and they said they didn’t know how it would work if they used outside of Law School. She could take a look at what the program would cost. It will be a lot less than the cost of a Counsellor. That's one of the things they're going to talk about. It would promote community.

Grant Williamson: Asks if she expects it to be ongoing other than the resolution?

Noelle Symanski: Says she is unsure since they haven’t met yet. She is unaware if there’s interest yet.
Grant Williamson: Suggests making it an Ad-hoc Committee if it keeps going beyond the resolution.

Noelle Symanski: Says they could do kind of a pilot program and see how it works and see how many students are interested in this type of a program that would connect them to people who have similar backgrounds. Would update further after the meeting. It might just be a resolution.

Grant Williamson: States that is an option and that the Senate Body supports of them.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Asks if she is familiar with how reach out to some peer health educators?

Elloise Kim: Shares that she and Tori attending the meeting once. They bring students together for a conversation. Invites her to join the next meeting.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Shares that she is aware that they're interested in reaching out to grad students and they kind of talked about how they do similar stuff to what you're saying without the count.

Noelle Symanski: Agrees.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Reports that she had a couple of grad students approach her about student fees, why they pay student fees and they should not have to pay those and talk about the public good and the pushback was like “when I'm writing my thesis or when I'm stuck in the lab. I'm not using any of those services or benefits.” Thought it was interesting and maybe something to think about in terms of re-framing the purpose.

Justin Camputaro: Says it has been discussed for decades.

Elizabeth Oestreich: States it’s a really difficult topic to handle in a way it's like “I understand what you're saying but this is also how this program works.” Yet to figure out how to talk about it. People get angry about it.

Rene Singleton: Says that she has been seeing a trend this year. It’s very self-focused. It about “my money and me”. U-PASS, SAF, tech fee, any fee right now needs to have a new language to explain this to everyone.

Tori Hernandez: Shares that she is working on new language for U-PASS right now but not for student fees in general.

Justin Camputaro: States it’s also an educational opportunity to talk about several things – 1) becoming familiar with court cases because this argument has been going on for 2 decades and the courts have given very clear/good language for justification. 2)The high level is the educational reality check like people who don’t have kids, still pay taxes into schools because it’s a public good and especially at public institutions. It's the reason why there's many programs that have their own fees is because of the direct benefit versus indirect benefit. Especially from a SAF perspective,
the stuff that SAF is funding, U-PASS is funding is a universal opportunity cost essentially. Students have access to it at any given moment that they want to. The standard practice is that's the best mechanism to do versus students who are in fee-based programs are going to pay for their programs because someone else isn’t going to pay into it because they're obviously not going to use it. Those are those pieces to talk about. 20% of that funds THE HUB. If a student walks into the Husky den, they have used the fees. The don’t realize they have used the fees.

**Grant Williamson:** Adds to Justin’s point that anyone in STEM, use shared use equipment that Student Technology Fees funds and that's that shared use equipment is substantially more expensive than all of the fees one will ever pay at UW. The struggle could be because of the narrow approach on these. Saying “yeah maybe you don't use U-PASS, but you use these ten other fees that you haven't even thought of”. Showing rather than rather than telling them they should these are for the common good.

**Elizabeth Oestreich:** States it could be a future Good of the Order topic.

**Elloise Kim:** Asks everyone to share topics that could go beyond a 2-minute discussion.

---

7. **Officer Reports**  

**Bo Goodrich:** Apologizes for missing the past meetings. Reports that the GPSS and ASUW relationship is going great. Collaborating with Giuliana on couple of fronts mainly relating to ASUW engaged in department reviews. Also talking about some new resolution opportunities and ideas that could be powerful for two bodies to pursue together. Regarding elections, graduate students are also eligible to run for ASUW elections. Invites questions. Looks forward to discussing in the future about actively encouraging graduate students to run on ASUW elections and if they want them to run for GPSS elections and what it looks like.

**Peder Digre:** Reports that he was at Olympia yesterday and he was at the Washington Students Council meeting. Intends to promote more about SAF to graduate students about how they benefit from it. Lastly, will be in Mississippi next two weeks and so won’t be able to attend meetings in person. But will join on call.
Kelly Edwards: Reports that the graduate school has two pieces of updates. There’s a new Dean for the graduate school. This is an interim position. Had a Graduate Student Experience meeting. There’s a 5-year strategic plan and one of the main pillars is Graduate Student Experience. There are about 25 people in the committee. The theme for this meeting was data sharing; collect different data on programs as well as surveys of different campus climate or different dimensions of student experiences. Looking into what’s working well and what needs work. Different working groups are coming out of it. Kelly is particularly interested in Exit Survey data of masters and Ph. D students. Similarly, there are other groups. Invites more grad students to join the groups. The Green Dot program is creating a video to ensure more reach. The aim of Green Dot is to prevent and reduce sexual assault & relationship violence at UW by engaging students as leaders and active bystanders who step in, speak up, and interrupt potential acts of violence. The filming is to happen for the next two days. It’s an effective program.

Tori Hernandez: Reports that she attended the GSE meeting with Kelly and her plan after that is to bring that back to graduate students. Next Friday is the other GSE meeting and hopes to see some of the GPSS officers there. Everyone has an early access to Winter Social poster. It’s on Feb 22nd, Thursday. Food, drinks, fun and bowling permit is available. Can register early and create teams ahead of time. Children are more than welcome to come, but there won’t be childcare. The Chair of U-PASS Board, Bucoda Warren will be a guest at the next Senate meeting. They will be talking about the U-PASS services and seeking constituent’s feedback from the Senate body.

Matt Munoz: Reports that he is working on the document on immigration with Sarah Castro and the Leadership of the immigration. SAGE – working on delegation process. To update that as he makes progress. Bills are being pushed.

Grant Williamson: Asks if he can talk about the bills that are in trouble and the bills that are successful.

Matt Munoz: Inaudible

Giuliana Conti: Reports that attendance went up a little bit more last Senate than it had been before that which was low. Earlier was at 40% and now at 46%. It's definitely in the 40s. Average last quarter was 53% so working on that. Emailed Senators who did not show up at all last quarter to verify whether or not they are still active Senators and have targeted a list of departments that have not been represented in the past five to seven years and are emailing them this week to let them know that and to inquire how GPSS can assist in helping them get representation from their graduate students. The Diversity Committee is planning several events. Brownbag lunches with Go map to make sure that the committee aligns with them and don't just repeat what they're doing. That would be for spring quarter as well as an organization symposium where diversity related campus organizations will have the opportunity to share their impact on campus, their efforts, create panels to discuss things for example the biology letter from graduate students to their administration with certain demands and then that ripple effect in other departments that was and was not successful depending on the department. So, it would be a networking opportunity as well as work shopping and paneling. There are still some details that they're working on, but the committee is working hard on it.
**Elloise Kim:** Reports that she already talked about OSFA. She had a chance to talk with OGR about what went well and what could have been better. Student Life contacted after the GPSS newsletter was published. In communication with them to develop a program for grad student. There’s high chance that they will include grad students in the current program as a pilot program to see what programs will be better for grad students in the future. She and Osman were interviewed to talk about the importance of being a bystander for the Green Dot video.

PACS has appointed Sarah as one of the members. There is a great discussion happening about GPSS President seat at the Board of Regent. Doing her best to protect and insist the seat at Board of Regent because without having GPSS President sit there, it’s very difficult to present their voice.

---

8. **Adjournment**  

**Giuliana Conti:** Approves to adjourn

**Grant Williamson:** Seconds