

## **GPSS Executive Committee Meeting - 22 July 2015**

Meeting called to order at 5:18 p.m. by meeting chair Alex Bolton

### **Members Present:**

GPSS President Alex Bolton  
GPSS Vice President Monica Cortes-Viharo  
GPSS Vice President Brian Taubeneck  
GPSS Treasurer Kerstin Hudon  
GPSS Secretary Soh Yeun (Elloise) Kim  
Executive Senator Evan Firth  
Executive Senator Yasmeen Hussain  
Executive Senator Joseph Telegan

### **Approval of Agenda**

Joseph: Move to amend items. For the officer report, I think we should strike A through D. And replace them with Officers who says they currently are. B may be Vice President for Internal Affairs. B is Treasurer. C is Secretary. D is Vice President for External Affairs.

Alex: I will interpret it as changing it to update the current officer position. A will be VP for Internal Affairs, B for External VP, C for Treasurer, D for Secretary, E for ASUW, and F for me. Any other changes to the agenda?

Yasmeen: I move to approve the agenda. | Monica: Second Agenda for the meeting approved with amended item.

### **Introduction:**

Yasmeen: Evan and Elloise, are you on the phone?

Evan: Yes,

Elloise: Yes, I am here too.

Yasmeen: Just checking. I should go get Kerstin for the Travel Grant.

Alex: Any opposition to moving onto next piece of business. (Monica: No) Okay. So Joe, you are on the hot seat. Would you like to explain your idea about creating a consented agenda for Senate meetings?

### **Consent Agenda:**

Joe: Absolutely, Mr. President. Talking quickly about a consented agenda guide - I sent out an email, but don't know how many of you got a chance to look at the attachment in that email.

What it discusses briefly how the consent agenda is to find on Sturgis page 16. Basically a consent agenda is separate from a regular agenda and designed to do a couple of things. Sturgis highlights, it can expedite meetings, specifically taking time away from measures that would be voted on individually, but are not controversial and are not likely to have any discussion. A consent agenda can be changed at any point if any senator wishes to remove anything from the consent agenda. They can simply request to change, and there doesn't need to be a vote. What they are is a unanimous bulk vote. You vote on them as one, and by doing that you cover them all, instead of covering them individually. Now, the main reason why I brought it up was that I thought that there would be a particular potential for a new resolution discussion as a component of GPSS next year. I would like to see the collective of the senate discussing some things that we don't get chance to do, simply because the meetings are timed so rigidly. Did anybody get the chance to read the attachment? (Yasmeen: mm hmm)

Alex: I have a question for you, Joe. Where did you get this idea? Kind of curious.

Joe: from Webster introduction to parliamentary procedures. It looks particularly good for us. (Alex: you have been doing your homework. OK.)

Yasmeen: I also have a question. So, can you think of an example of something that would be discussed if we had things? I am having a hard time thinking of what that might be.

Joe: The Real Food resolution. In my opinion, it was blocked for 15 minutes and as a consequence of it being blocked for 15 minutes, I believed that it diminished the amount we spent talking about it. That's an example of something that was controversial that didn't necessarily get the time treatment that it could have gotten. For example, it is nice to have the veteran affair community resolution to have a speaker to introduce. But if he hadn't been there to introduce it, I am pretty sure the vote would have gone pretty similarly, regardless. Anyway, the idea behind it is simply to block out a certain amount of time that would be done so that controversial measures, new business and etc. can be something that we can talk about. Alex, going back to your question. One thing I have been researching: I read a lot of references about the ideas of new business being spontaneously introduced from the floor of the Senate. I personally think that that would be great if we can do that. Now, whether or not this is the way to achieve is debatable. Anyway, does anyone else have any questions?

Yasmeen: So, basically the way this would work is, a meeting starts and there are something on the agenda that Exec has decided will be on the agenda, but it is undetermined amount of time? Kind of?

Joe: That's not clear to me. How much time is supposed to be blocked apart from the consent agenda is unclear to me. But I believe we will decide that as the executive body. They are pretty non-specific about how this works. It was about half a page. It did make it really clear that a consent agenda is separate from a regular agenda. That is to say that it's distinguishable from the rest of the business that you have at the senate meeting.

Alex: So, Joe, I am fairly familiar with it, and it's a fairly common practice on campus outside of the student realm. Board of Regent do it, and the Faculty Senate do it. Actually, Faculty Senate implemented it when I was working there. Part of the idea is a time efficiency move. So, something you don't really need to take time to discuss, you put everything on there, and voted down there as the whole package. If there's anything controversial that we like to talk, we can pull it out and have some separate discussion. I think the tricky part for us is how many things we want to approve without any discussion. I get what you are saying to spend more time on some of the more substantive resolution. But, at the same time, if someone takes the time to write a resolution, I don't really like the idea of not allowing them to go up to present and be able to enjoy the Senate as their back. Because, otherwise, people wouldn't even realize that it happened. So, in general, I like the practice. I am just worry as to how it might make sense for us to use it.

Joe: In response to that last point, Alex, I don't necessary think it's a good idea to be in the habit of putting a resolution in the consent agenda. Or very least, a resolution that has a human face that will come to speak at the student body. This, to me, would be more about covering things that we don't think would be open to any sort of debate or disagreement. The idea behind would be just to cover those kinds of things. Mentioning that examples about the veteran example, the reason why we wouldn't prescribe that for the consent agenda would be that the guy came in and spoke to us. Had he not come in and talk to us, I would have encouraged that to be a consent agenda item. That's where I would draw the distinction. If there isn't really the amount of time that we need to devote to discussion or debate or anything for any reason, then it becomes a consent agenda item. If not, then of course it shouldn't be on there. Because it doesn't fit the purpose of the consent agenda.

Yasmeen: So, Joe, part of the thing about the food resolution was that Exec didn't think that it would be controversial. Because here is where I am going to bring up a counter-proposal. Because the resolution timeline is a bit wonky. Because it doesn't actually give people time to read the resolution more than one meeting in advance. So there's no time allotted for debate or discussion officially before the resolution was sent out. There was no first reading. Because the

people who have talked to the resolution people were like, "Oh, this is not going to be controversial!" So they put it on the agenda as a 15 minute quick thing. But after that resolution, it was more controversial for me than I had seen before. So I think the tricky part about the consent agenda is that we would have assumed that things wouldn't be controversial when in fact they could be. Minimum wage was probably more controversial than we thought it might have been. Even if it's a pretty simple thing. So, I am not sure if this would actually solve the thing that we are trying to solve.

Joe: Ok. Two things. I would be interested in looking into an alternative that is to have more oversight of resolution. For example, ASUW has a database where you can actually look at stuffs that are in progress. There might be something to say about doing that instead of this. I just want to remind you that the part that makes the consent agenda a very non-risky idea is that any senator can just say that I would like this one item taken out of the consent agenda. There isn't a need for vote as far as the removal of item from consent agenda. So even if it is controversial in just one person's mind, it can be taken out.

Alex: Can you think of any other instances of things we did in the last couple of years that would make sense to you on a consent agenda? Any other situation that you can think of where we might want to use that?

Joe: Any time that we are talking about approving the agenda for the meeting or minutes, essentially we do it independent for anyone anyway. Because we say: does anyone has any objection from the minute? Essentially what we are asking is that: is there anything controversial in there? So if we were to put those together in one long vote, it would be unanimously approved. I would say that yes, they are small blocks of time, but certainly any time we consider agenda or minutes, it falls back at the category.

Alex: Agenda would have to be separate, because you have to let people propose an amendment. So I think it would be hard to have approval of the agenda as part of the consent agenda. And also the approval of the agenda would be the time to protest what's on the consent agenda.

Joe: I am not sure that's right based on my limited understanding of consent agenda.

Alex: that's how I have seen it practiced for the most part.

Joe: Have you always seen the approval of agenda as a separate component than the consent agenda?

Alex: Yes. Because, otherwise, how would someone ask to remove items from the consent agenda? Usually you do that during the approval of agenda.

Joe: I will look into this more to be able to give you more input on that. But, I rooted for the idea for having an open forum for new business. That is something that we can do. I would be interested in talking about any other possible ways to do that. Sometime last year, somebody wrote a proposal for resolution in favor of state income tax, and I stood up and say I would like to have a group that would be dedicated to doing something like that. And Alice understandably replied awkwardly that it just didn't fit what we were doing at that time. Because we were talking about an announcement, but not a resolution. I wonder what you guys think about the general idea. What do you guys feel about the main Senate body being a place where new resolutions can be discussed?

Yasmeen: I think it makes sense occasionally. I think it would be really interesting to see it as an every meeting thing. I could envision a world where meetings are like people would just throw ideas for an hour. That seems unproductive to me. I feel like people usually use the announcement period to gather people together. I felt like that was a good time, but maybe that's just me. Because I haven't tried to start a resolution that way. So maybe your experience is different.

Joe: That's a fair way of putting it. I certainly would not endorse having a sizable percentage of meeting into this. And I certainly think that the informative aspect of the announcement period is great. Monica pointed out that it's definitely one of the great things that the Senate does. I wonder though, if there's some room for the specific task of talking about the legislative function, the resolution function that we can designate ten minutes for. I think if we can open a little bit more time for it, it can go a long way to making the meetings more organic.

Brian: I mean there might be a way to reform resolution business. Like where we do the first read-through, and then proposal of new items, and the next meeting the second read-through, and the voting happens.

Alex: We are over on this. But we can continue the conversation on this the next meeting. Personally, I would not have a problem with you asking a group to come together to discuss a

possible resolution during announcements. I think it's perfectly proper. But we can continue this conversation later, if that's okay for Joe.

Joe: I am going to go ahead and type in my phone number if anyone wants to contact me to talk about this before the next meeting.

Alex: Another thing is that this is a tool that we have at our disposal that we can talk about. I am glad you brought it up. Thanks for bringing this to our attention.

### **Review of Travel Grant - Treasurer**

Kerstin: I just got back from a meeting where we were talking about disability services. I will tell you more in my update. So, with travel grant, we certainly don't have to go through to every application. Since everybody did their grading, and I heard from everybody to get their scores, we can just talk. We have \$2,500 to allocate throughout this summer period. Domestic grants are technically in the amount of \$300, and international grants are typically in the amount of \$500. But we can also change those appropriations as we go. If we run out of the money, then we run out all of the money, and people should apply sooner.

Yasmeen: I have a couple questions: So if someone is not a student yet, but they will be a student in the fall, are they eligible?

Kerstin: They are not. You have to either been enrolled the previous quarter. If they have entered UW, I would say probably not until they have been enrolled a quarter.

Yasmeen: Well, they have been enrolled before, but have graduated for over a year. Yeah, but number seven who has a conference in 3 days. Beryne Odeny.

Kerstin: I am going to allow it because it is a pilot program. (Yasmeen: Alright)

Evan: comment on the number seven. The advisor recommended ... (Inaudible)

Kerstin: I will look that up. (Monica: I can email you my score. Would you like me to do that?) That's okay. We can talk about them. My apology if this is not entirely put together, because I am not quite sure what I am doing yet.

Yasmeen: Do applicants have to prove that they attended? Even if they didn't? And would we send them the money? (Monica: usually there is a registration deadline) But they already...

Kerstin: So if they've said they can't go unless they get the money but it's within 3 days, we'd assume as a committee that there's still planning to go. There is a precedent that if you end up not going and you let us know you'd return the funding to us. The funding does not go directly to the student. It goes through their department. So there's some accountability. We transfer money to their department, and their department transfers the money to them. With all summer travel grant, there's going to be a delay because we just closed the budget book and it's going to take longer until the accounts are set up. So these applicants will likely not receive the money until the conference. They will likely receive a reimbursement from their department. However, in order for us to give them the grant, we have to vote before their conference date due to the GPSS bylaws. So the one on the 16th is still eligible. What was the other odd thing that you saw in the application? (Yasmeen: number 7)

Evan: Global Health Department will not fund them unless ... (Inaudible)

Kerstin: So she has no funding, but it's unlikely that the department will fund her if she doesn't get this grant. That's complicated. I think I would interpret that as they understand that the funds come through from the department. They are saying that Global Health does not have any money for her, but if she gets the GPSS grant, the department can give her the fund from GPSS. That's my positive interpretation. What was your average score for application number 7 anyway? Those who graded it. (38, 39, 32) (Yasmeen: this is highest one of mine) (Evan: Mine too) (Elloise: 34)

Yasmeen: Elloise, did you see the instruction on the grading for travel grant that the list of the ones that you are supposed to grade. So did you grade number 7?

Elloise: Yes. I misunderstood the instruction at first and ended up reviewing a few more than what I had been asked to do. Number 7 was one of those.

Kerstin: That gives this girl a 35.7 average. So number 7 would be a candidate. Did anyone have thought why this person would be a good candidate for funding?

Yasmeen: I thought the faculty letter was particularly strong and persuasive.

Kerstin: Is it a domestic or international?

Yasmeen: Well, that's tricky! It's in Seattle, but she is from Kenya. She is starting in the fall, but she is based in Kenya now. That's why I am confused about this student and whether \$300 would be useful. I think we will just hold off on number seven. (Sounds great.) Were there anyone that stuck out or do we just want to go in order. (In order) Candidate number 1 was graded by Alex, Monica and Brian. What were your thought on candidate number 1?

Monica: I gave this person a 34. I thought it was a strong application. It was one of my lower scores, mostly because I think this person has been to two conferences in the last two months. For the most part it's strong.

Alex: I gave this person a 35. Very strong on the faculty letter.

Brian: This is my lowest numerically, but my favorite. She got a 28 on mine. I thought it was a strong application, but going by the rubric, it was weaker. Just because the multiple conferences, and also there's some indication that she will still get the money somehow.

Kerstin: So a stellar application but not as much financial need. (Others: Exactly) Domestic conference? (Yes) What about number 2 which was graded by Elloise, Myself, and Brian.

Brian: 31. She will be able to go without the funding, but her application was fine.

Kerstin: I gave her a really high score because she didn't have the highest need, but she has a great application and that's typically very important in Finance and Budget. She mentioned that she had applied previously and tried to find ways to cut her cost, so her application would seem more competitive. She also requested the specific amount of \$250.

Yasmeen: She also used to be a Senator, she didn't say that in application.

Brian: Why is that important?

Kerstin: It shows involvement with GPSS. And we typically favor those who are interactive with GPSS. Which is why we give a point if we know she is a Senator, and another point if they have contacted their Senator for any issues. I score her out of 40 31. Elloise, what was your score?

Elloise: My score was 36. Her application was well narrated and strong. It was not obvious, though, that she really needed the funding from us than other applicants for having other sources, possibly.

Kerstin: Application number 3, which was graded by Yasmeen, Joe, Me, and Colin.

Yasmeen: I put a 28.

Joe: 38.5. The faculty recommendation was very good. I think I gave every possible faculty endorsement for the highest possible score.

Yasmeen: The thing that stood out most is, the person has gotten multiple funding sources for this, and they have exactly \$360 left. Compared to other applicants, it was less needed.

Kerstin: How about number 4, Liliana. Evan?

Evan: Her advisor mentioned internship of some sort. That means that that money was to help them travel. (Inaudible)

Monica: I thought it was particularly strong. I did see the internship thing, but I didn't know that we were not supposed to consider those. Their faculty members seem to really understand what they were doing and seem to say that this person was particularly thoughtful in choosing this conference. Being that she is a Southeast Asian to go there to visit these scholars.

Alex: Strong overall. Strong faculty .Strong Application.

Kerstin: Evan, would you consider disqualifying her because of the internship part despite of two really high scores?

Evan: She was the second highest on mine by one point. I just want to bring the internship to your attention. But that being said, I think we should go for it.

Monica: Also the internship thing didn't seem like a sure thing. It seems like it's still a bit up in the air.

Kerstin: Number 5. Brian, Elloise, and myself. Elloise, what do you think about Number 5?

Elloise: That was one of my favorites. An appealing application that highlights the need to attend the conference. Weak rec, but I gave 41.

Kerstin: Brian, what do you think of number 5?

Brian: I gave him a 30. He was third on my list out of all four. The main note was that the faculty recommendation wasn't very strong.

Kerstin: I score number 5 as a 28 because they messed up the conferences. They keep saying it bi-annual, but he kept saying that it was a 2014 and 2015 conferences. So I thought that is confusing. Also he didn't give particularly thorough answers. OK. Number 6. Brian.

Brian: 39. On top of my head I don't remember any note. She is going international. Pretty significant need. Strong GPA. She has some funding but she still needs a lot more.

Joe: 41. I thought it was a strong application overall. One thing I would note is that the faculty recommendation was again very good. In this case, it was underscored how bad departments were when it comes to funding. Made that point particularly clear.

Kerstin: Colin scored it a 37. Number 7. (We already did 7) Alright. Number 8. Monica, what do you think?

Monica: I gave him a 32. I thought it was a good application. I think he had the least strong faculty recommendation that I remember. The faculty put 2-3 lines down for each answer. And I felt bad on that, but it is what it is. That was the main thing.

Brian: Another 28. This was the weakest out of the 4 I read. (Monica: Mine, too)

Elloise: I gave a 32. (Inaudible)

Kerstin: Number 9. I will go first, and then Brian and Joe. Number 9 was my highest score with a 42. Because they have extremely high need and have a lot of confidence from the faculty recommendation. My one concern was that they didn't specifically address what their experience would bring to UW.

Joe: This is a general note for me. I thought that to be a fairly regular absence in these applications is to bring back to the UW thing. Generally I score them down one point. Do people agree that that's the general problem for this?

Brian: She is an RA. She can bring insight back in strategic implementation.

Kerstin: One of the persons I read was a premier person in environment education. She learned more about environmental education and shared it with her classmates. What was the score you have for it? (Joe: 43) This applicants by far has the highest score. Is it a domestic or international? (Yasmeen: San Antonio) I will motion to fund applicant number 9 at \$300.

Joe: Seconded

Kerstin: \$300 for applicant number 9 without opposition. Let's do number 10. Colin, Yasmeen, Evan.

Evan: I didn't have too much comment on number 10. Her advisor mentioned they were not going to get funding for this.

Yasmeen: We should only focus on funding things that the students are working on. I have been in a lot of situations where stuffs aren't funded in my grant because it's something that's not my project. I think that makes sense. I don't think that is a detractor. I score it as 33, which was second highest for me. I thought the need was higher because it was international conference. I thought it was generally elaborated application.

Evan: 26.

Kerstin: Colin scored in at 34. Number 11. Brian?

Brian: This was my favorite. 45. Really well written application. The need was there and the faculty recommendation is strong. The conference sounds really great and it sounds like a great opportunity for her career.

Monica: I also gave her a 45. It was my highest score. Really strong. Probably the best faculty endorsement.

Alex: Highest. 45. Strong across the board.

Kerstin: So she is going on the international conference. And with her score I will motion to fund her \$500. | Monica: Seconded (No opposition)

Kerstin: Number 12 was Elloise, myself, and Brian.

Elloise: My least favorite. (Inaudible) She already got \$500 from her department and it was with just an okay recommendation for me. I gave her a 29.

Brian: She was 40. I really enjoy her application. The faculty endorsement basically said that this is what she needs to do.

Kerstin: I scored her a 30 because I thought her application was the only few that talks about how she will bring it back to UW. So number 13, Yasmeen.

Yasmeen: I gave it a 28. That was tied for the lowest. I think this person has exhausted their funding, and they have attended 4 conferences in the last 12 months.

Joe: I also have the lowest for the, at 33. For the same major reasons that Yasmeen mentioned. I think this person goes to conferences pretty often.

Brian: 29, Colin's lowest as well.

Kerstin: Number 14. Elloise.

Elloise: 38. (Inaudible)

Evan: Nothing to remarkably great or bad about it. 31.

Kerstin: 41 for this one because I made a mistake for number 12. That leave us with \$1700. Other application that scored very high was number 4, 6, 7, and 14. At this point I will open our meeting up to discussion and if you have an applicant that you really think deserve funding, I would like you to give us that applicant's name, and we can discuss it. It's a rolling application, so we are still receiving applications now. And if we have funding left over, we will hold another meeting where we can give out more funding.

Monica: Advocate for candidate number 4 Liliana. I like the fact that she knows her Senator, and she spoke to her Senator about this. She is going to an international conference and internship. I think that it is an exciting. Her faculty seem really positive about her being in the particular right place.

Evan: I agree. (Alex: yes)

Kerstin: I motion to fund applicant number 4 in the amount of \$500. (Brian: Seconded.) Another really high one was number 6 read by Colin, Brian, and Joe.

Joe: I think a letter of recommendation puts this one in the strong category. There's also evidence for lack of departmental support.

Kerstin: What do you guys think about the potential overestimation of funding? We are talking about 7 now. The conference is in Seattle, but this person is currently international. So if we were to fund this, we will be funding it in the amount of \$300 because the conference is domestic. The date is today. They will get reimbursed after the 15th.

Monica: Even if she overestimated, it's not changing the amount we give her.

Kerstin: Entertain the motion to fund.

Brian: I motion to fund \$300. | Joe: Second.

Kerstin: So, we have \$900 remaining. I personally would speak for application number 14, specifically because they talk about environmental education that is not part of UW's curriculum, but they have been working with people who teach science at UW to improve the overall science curriculum.

Monica: Is this person one of the highest?

Kerstin: This person has an average score of 37. I gave this person a high score. Evan gave them a low score, and Elloise was middle. I would motion to fund this person at \$300.

Monica: Second.

Yasmeen: Can you tell me how many applications are left?

Kerstin: We have approved 9.

Monica: What about number 1? Where is she in that standing?

Kerstin: Her average was only a 32.

Yasmeen: We fund number 4, 6, 9, 11, 14. Are there any other that people would like to advocate for funding?

Joe: I would like to discuss [. . .] applicants. I think the faculty recommendations expand the content in the application and strongly support the attendant.

Yasmeen: I like some other application better but not strong enough to object it. This is so hard. (Kerstin: Go with your gut.) My gut feeling is that this person has gone to multiple conferences and will be spending a lot of money on conferences soon, so I would like to fund one of them. If that's possible.

Kerstin: Number 3 has the higher score. 35 is our next. This is a domestic conference.

Joe: Based on this conversation, I am going to move to fund this person the amount of \$300.

Yasmeen: Second. (No objection)

Kerstin: There is three 35s. We have \$300 left for one domestic conference.

Brian: Number 1 will still be able to pay for it, but I think it would be great if we can fund her. It connects her with scientist in the industry. Plus, she has a really strong faculty recommendations.

Monica: This is the one where I feel like the conference was tailor made for her. It's an application for biofuel.

Yasmeen: But number 2 talks about bringing it back. And they applied already.

Kerstin: Number 2 applied in the Spring, and talked about bringing it back to UW, and the cost of re-applying. That would be an argument for number 2.

Monica: I like the idea for funding someone who is reapplying.

Kerstin: We also have the option for funding them \$150. Number one's financial need is really low. See that "My adviser funds conference."

Monica: She didn't get a good job at explaining for funding.

Yasmeen: She wrote the conference in Seattle, but it's in Philadelphia.

Kerstin: That would technically count as an incomplete application. So, we can either fund number 2 or leave money with the account.

Brian: Let's go with one. I like the fact that she is reapplying and reducing the cost of conference and travel. The reason she got a low numeric score from me is because she will go anyway.

Kerstin: I will entertain the motion to fund applicant number 2 at the amount \$250. And we will leave \$50 unfunded for seed funding.

Monica: Second.

Kerstin: Today we allocated \$2450 to 7 applicants who will be traveling over the country for conferences. That concludes the travel grant, and I will take care of notifying the applicants.

Alex: Thanks, Kerstin.

### **Succession Planning in Response to Colin's Email**

Alex: I like the idea of recruiting Eddie. (Yasmeen: He said he will think about it.) Should Eddie is not interested, we should wait until fall, because we are a bit upper man heavy. I can act as the Senate to elect during the summer. If people are more comfortable waiting till then, we can do that too.

Brian: I think we should wait until the fall to give it some fresh blood.

Kerstin: I was hoping to send out an email in the august to give some details on the committees to try to recruit people for SAF and Travel Grants. So I think that email would be a great way to advertise that exec position. (Yasmeen: that sounds good)

Alex: Colin would be ineligible in the fall. So we will hold off until fall for everyone who wants to run.

### **Potential Date for Retreat**

Alex: Try to pin down a window. Usually we have a retreat for the summer. Last year we went through a color coded type thing and met with the office of public record and went over some PMA things and public record issues. My idea was to do a bit more hybrid mixing something fun and taking care of some business. I would like to do more team building. Did it on the ASUW board and it did help strengthen the relationships. It was fun. And we can get back to meeting mode in the afternoon. Maybe from September 7 - 23? Does anyone have anything that's significant? Another thing is that we have Husky Sunrise on the 28th.

Kerstin: My parents are visiting me from Rhode Island on the week of the 17th through 20th. I would prefer not to do it during that time.

Yasmeen: The 7th is Labor Day.

Alex: Let's do 10<sup>th</sup>. 10<sup>th</sup> through 17<sup>th</sup>. Try to put a hold on that and we will try to get all these workout by the next meeting.

Yasmeen: Are you in town then, Joe?

Joe: I will be back.

Evan: I should be back then.

### **Exec Senator Report**

Joe: In addition to parliamentary procedure research that I am doing like for the consent agenda thing we talked about earlier, the major thing I have been thinking about over the summer is how to serve my department better. Most work has been primarily geared to my department. I don't have any other GPSS specific function to report.

Brian: People found out about two new departments through the news instead of internal communication and I thought that is an issue. One of the things I kept hearing is that "we didn't know", so how do we change that? (Alex: What do you think would be an appropriate thing? Like an all- student-email thing?) Yes. I know beforehand because I know someone from the inside. That new department that opens up is a resources that people would like to learn about. My issue is just a lack of transparency.

Alex: I will let the administration know. I think sometime they are worrying about overdoing it, but I will let them know about it. I did receive one email from the internal channel, but I think both how we handle it and how they handle it can be improved.

Yasmeen: The GPSS senator email, is that moderated? (Alex: That was a mistake, postcode was not completely understood and has been taken care of.)

Monica: I have been doing office hour Wednesday and Tuesday morning. (Yasmeen: Can you put that on the website?) I am usually here from 1 to 5.

Kerstin: We will be overlapping. We can talk about this later.

Monica: At the end of the year, Alex, Alice, and I have a meeting with the Assistant Dean about the program reviews. The survey we conducted wasn't being included. But, I think we did a good job conveying to her that that wouldn't be a good idea. And a lot of people would be really upset if they feel like student voices aren't being heard. And she gave me a calendar of when all those reviews are happening. We all agreed that we will be turning in our survey results three weeks prior to when she needs them. That gives her a week to review that and send it back. (Brian: What are the surveys for?) Basically periodically programs need to be reviewed by an outside entity, so we helped coordinate getting grad student feedback. What I am hoping that we can do is identifying the senators whose programs are getting reviewed this year to make sure that they are highly involved. So that's one thing. I am working with Corp program, and they are interested in doing a communication skill workshop for international students. That's one of their big programs. They want me to do something on public speaking and communication around international students and for international students. We are moving forward with that. And I met with someone who is a bit GPSS related. The undergraduate research program that's happening this summer. This program is supposed to pipeline people to grad student, so I gave a presentation today. And I went to the Q centers, and she said she is interested in doing some brown bag. Because I was telling her that GOMAP has done brown bags and has been really successful, and one of them was on being faculty of color. And I am working with her to identify time to do that.

Brian: I found out that my internship is a lot more flexible than anticipated. The program is that they are not set in stone.

Kerstin: Open office hours are Wednesday and Tuesday and other appointment is by schedule.

Brian: The budget passed with the tuition cut backfilled by closing tax loopholes. That's what both Republican and Democrats can take credit for. That amounts to 5% resident undergrad cut this year, and 10% cut the following year. For public universities, state grant is reduced addendum with the tuition cut. The legislature also wanted to make sure the maximum college bond is still there. So they are working with universities to give college bond priority in the state. WAMEY was funded for \$9 million. WSU got only \$2.5. Services and Activity Fee is allowed to grow beyond the growth factor. The only thing that didn't get funded for the capital budget was the Life Science building. Computer and Burke were small too, so they need to get private funding. As far as what I am working on, I have been trying to set up a meeting with state relation, but they just got out of session. Congress is focusing on No Child Left Behind. We have a WSA board meeting that went fairly well. Alex and I sat down with WSU graduate student body and legislative representative and got on the same page. Most of my office work then has been working on this - kind of a legislative office guide. Because I am from out of here and I am trying to play catch up and try to educate myself and try to get as close to Alex as I can.

Monica: Committee coming together to do Husky 100%. They are doing 100 student on campus. 100 student on this campus. They are looking for a proportion of that to be grad students.

Kerstin: Most time is spent on curating job post, and all of you are going through that experimental procedure with me, and I got a lot of application in. Rene will be sitting in as well. So Renee and I are working on that. Then I also went to a 3 hour training. We are definitely going to have more procedure this year for spending because last year a lot of receipt got lost. I would really like to know where everything is going. I am working on detail description for my committee as well as the SAF committee. I just sat in on the SAF committee. We are currently in dispute with the D center going over whether a position can be created. Any question or financial stuffs?

Brian: Last year, during the budget process, things got a bit frantic. Is there any need for a financial desktop training or any other staff?

Kerstin: I would talk to Jane who manages our account instead of trying to navigating my financial desktop.

Rene: My financial desktop is just a tool.

Monica: Perhaps three of us should get together for a hiring procedure. Navigate your I-9 three days in advance, otherwise that person doesn't get paid.

Alex: WSA meeting went really well. Regent meeting was financially able to approve the budget. In general, our grad and professional students are doing okay. Public Health and Dentistry are the ones that went up the most. Public Health was the one that had the most issue. Provost Cauce promises that that will never happen under her watch. I am on the presidential search committee. I was on a few conference call. We did get an additional student on the committee. The regent ended up picking Hayley Beck. She is great, so we feel great having her on the board. The state level, we did a big push on WAMEY and made sure Spokane people won't let go. We now have strong ties with students there. We also worked on loan forgiveness program. They also increase the number of residency. Those are all pretty good wins for us. Undergrad tuition cut was also a good thing for us. It was a strong year for us.

### **Adjourn**

Bryan: Move to Adjourn

Monica: Second.

Alex: Hearing none, meeting adjourned.