

Graduate and Professional Student Senate

Senate Meeting Minutes Session 9

January 11, 2017 | HUB 332

Call to Order 5:34 PM

Approval of Agenda

5:34 pm

Julius Doyle (Anthropology): Moves to approve the agenda as presented.

Michael Diamond (Atmospheric Sciences): Seconds.

Approval of Minutes

5:35 pm

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): Moves to approve the minutes as presented.

Shuhang He (FIUTS): Seconds.

Program Reviews: Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning, Graduate School

5:35 pm

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): It is very important that we have students involved in program reviews, students are important ambassadors. Program reviews are mandated by state of Washington every 10 years. Is a two-year process. The first part of program reviews is knowing that it will happen. Program reviews are scheduled out until 2023 right now. There is a committee set up with two faculty members from UW, and two faculty (from outside) that work in specific areas and they make up the review committee. The review committee works closely with Rebecca to make agendas of who they want to speak to.

The program itself is asked to write a self-study that includes information on teaching, learning, and research, it is also an opportunity for programs to ask specific questions about struggles they have. A big struggle for most departments is student financial aid. Overall, the self-study is an opportunity to understand what the academic unit is struggling with. They ask academic units to involved as many people as possible in the self-study, its the perfect opportunity for graduate students to participate.

Furthermore, a key part of program reviews is the site visit. The review committee comes to campus, has a working dinner, all day meetings, and half a day of meetings. All day meetings are on the agenda. They are another good opportunity for graduate students to get involved. We want to make sure the review committee is working with graduate students, it's important to be ambassadors for others students in letting them know when a program review is happening. The agenda is pretty tight. If there are times when a graduate student is not able to attend a meeting

they can ask to and meet with the chair of the review committee, who can provide information that the student may miss. Program Reviews have been working with GPSS for number of years on program reviews. They are trying to figure out best way to create more collaboration. In the past, they had surveys that were given out by GPSS and were included in the program reviews process, they have been inconsistent on that for a while.

They are reviewing what the best way is to have student voice in the process. Typically, Graduate students worry about career outlook, funding etc. However, there could be other issues. After the site visits this is another opportunity to meet with the committee. The committee then writes up what they heard, then get sent to academic unit department to review, then goes to academic counsel and they hear outcome of review and what their recommendation is.

Usually there are 10-year reviews, unless something really bad is happening. However, five year reviews are becoming more common. At the very end of the process there is a document that is available on line on the graduate school website, under academic affairs, In program reviews, there is an archive. There are also other ways to see program reviews. A lot of time students don't really hear about program reviews. The reason she is here is to let everyone know that graduate students are important part of program reviews, and their voice matters. A lot of issues they see now, are based on modern opportunities. There are a lot of ways that the data collected from program reviews can be used.

Elizabeth Oestreich (Public Health Genetics): You say program review and then refer to academic unit, what does that mean?

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): Depends, sometimes we do a whole school, sometimes only a department. Every single degree or certificate offered in a program is eventually reviewed.

Shuhang He (FIUTS): Why ten years?

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): We have a lot of degrees, over 300. Also, it was state mandated every 10 years. 10 years is a long time, they move fairly slowly but that is why 5-year review is being put in place now if something needs to be tracked more closely.

Sarah Harbert (Earth & Space Sciences): Do reviews have recommendations for changes?

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): Yes, they have recommendations, that are not extremely descriptive. Ultimately, they are making recommendations on what program should consider moving forwards (ex. Increasing diversity, curricular changes)

Christie Aesquivel (Museology): Do the departments have to accept recommendations?

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): Departments can respond to recommendations. Part of response is saying they can't follow through on certain recommendations if there is a rationale behind it. They must explain why they can't.

Recommendations are not mandated but are very strongly encouraged. Program reviews are about continuous improvement.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): Is the response from the department posted online as well?

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): Everything is posted.

Elliot Koontz (QERM): You mentioned a website where we can access review. Is there a timeline where students can see when reviews are?

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): Can go to program reviews on graduate school website that show all future program reviews and past program reviews. It is crucial that students know that none of this is hidden.

Elliot Koontz (QERM): Other than senators disseminating information is there any way that information about a coming review can be spread?

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): They tell departments to disseminate information to everyone. Tomorrow she is going to Board of Regents to launch two more certificates and one master's program they will be reviewed again in 5 years then they will go on ten year cycle of reviews.

Elloise Kim (President): What are the changes we are entertaining to implement more student involvement?

Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning): You as senators are important in getting information out there, we are thinking about a revised survey that has a higher response rate, and are trying to think about what issues are most important to graduates right now. The very beginning is the charge meeting that is when unit defining questions are asked. They would like to have graduate students at that charge meeting, it is where people understand what the process is. In the charge meeting they will see the outline for program reviews. Check in, with chair of department or Rebecca if someone sees their charge meeting coming soon,

Sarah Loeffler (Vice President of Internal Affairs): Sarah is the go to for program reviews, any input from someone that has participated in program reviews or knows their department has had one recently should talk to Sarah.

Elloise Kim (President): GPSS is doing their best to speak for programs and get student voice in more steps of process ex. Charge meeting.

Population Health Facility: Lyndsey M Cameron, Principal Architectural Associate, OPB, and Genie Nada **5:50pm**

Elloise Kim (President): They are here today to introduce possible sites for the new operation health facilities.

Genie Nada: They are part of University health initiative, Lyndsey will talk about three possible locations/types of buildings. Three entities that will be housed in this building, institute of health metrics evaluation, department of global health, and portions of the school of public health, and it is a hope that there will be greater collaboration around population health issues throughout the University. Looking at health from a broader perspective. UW wants to be leaders in population health initiative. They want to make sure we have a flexible space, they are using best practices, and sustainability. The building is about 300,000 square feet. This building is funded because of a generous donation from the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation. While, we could build a larger facility than this, this is a good start. The building has a lot of single occupancy work stations, collaborative work areas, things that could be reserved, active learning environments, and might have general use classrooms, computer labs, possible street facing community oriented destinations, etc. There may be a need for a visitor center or retail buildings nearby. The schedule is until October 2020, and budget is about \$230 million dollars.

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): As far as site selection goes, site review group pulls together all information about sites. Pulling together objective info that will go to the project head committee and will be forwarded to the president and provost who will pick sites, however the Board of Regents have the final say on the site. They have spoken with the community and students about the plans. This is an overview of sites. Site one is east of Gould, site 2 is around central campus, Site c is by fisheries. Site 1 is longer and less height, site b relatively unchanged, site c has lower flatter and longer building and will take up some green space. In A2 can remain green and will be a tower. B2 area will largely remain unchanged. C2 a little bit of green space is opened up, possibly will relocate garage by Health sciences. We would love to have some feedback.

Julius Doyle (Anthropology): Section A2 and C2 the spaces for those are currently occupied by other buildings. What buildings are they and where would they go?

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): Would probably temporarily relocate people then permanently house them, we are meeting with people to see what needs of potential relocation people are.

Maxwell Nelson (Guest): Have you gotten a lot of pushback about relocation?

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): Not many people are happy about that, however, the University will try to find a better location for that, that may be permanent.

Genie Nada: This isn't a surprise that these sites are building sites, they have been on the 2003 masterplan as potential rebuild sites.

Jake Busche (Chemistry): For site b that building looks like it will take up a lot of street space on 15th avenue where there is also a busy walkway from central campus to the Ave.

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): They will double the size of the sidewalk, and can extend the ADA path through the building that will connect people from the police station to central campus.

Jake Busche (Chemistry): Why not make a tower?

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): Want to retain some green space, but also want to make sure that building isn't too high.

Julius Doyle (Anthropology) Moves to extend time by 5 minutes.

Erin Dunnington (Nursing-Psychosocial and Community Health) Seconds.

Giuliana Conti (Music): Is relocation process financed by the project funds or is it on departments to handle cost?

Genie Nada: If cost isn't integrated in grant money, then University will take on that cost, not individual departments.

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): The project funds will cover temporary leased space for three years.

Erin Dunnington (Nursing-Psychosocial and Community Health): Looking specifically at C2, two questions. One, looks like the building is near academic wing or health sciences will it block patient room views of water?

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): Some of the views will be blocked, but top two floors of patient wings may still have a view. Encouraged for everyone to look at 2018 masterplan, the plan tries to reinvigorate the waterfront.

Erin Dunnington (Nursing-Psychosocial and Community Health): Second, classroom space. South campus houses lots of programs and classroom space is tight. Will the new building offer classroom spaces to relieve the burden?

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): Population health education facility was one of her other studies. Its an active learning classroom learning only building down by the garage. The second location for the education facility is north of the rotunda.

Nicholas Graff (Epidemiology): A lot of talk in his department about which departments will be in the new building. Do you have a timeline?

Genie Nada: Three entities that will be housed are institute of health metric evaluations, school of global health, and school of public health.

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): He [Nicholas Graff] is wondering how much school of public health will get space in building, and which departments.

Genie Nada: Don't have an answer to that, but would be up to leaders of public health department.

Sara Jacobs (Built Environments): Do you have an estimate on heights or stories of the building?

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): Height of A is 65 feet (4/5 stories or 9/10 stories), site b is 101 feet, site c is 65 feet and asking for another 105 feet of height.

Sara Jacobs (Built Environments): What is the process of finding a design team?

Genie Nada: They are in the process of selecting a design builder, they have three finalists. A designer builder will be the primary contractor and primary architect teamed together. The Finalists will interview with the architectural commission at the end of January, should have selection done by the end of this month.

Elloise Kim (President): What is best way to reach out to you for further questions?

Lyndsey M Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate): We have a site, and also will send contact information to Randy, who will then send it out to the Senate.

Executive Senator Election 6:21 pm

Elloise Kim (President): We are here today to elect a new Executive Senator, we will get nominations from the floor. People can self-nominate or nominate others. Opens floor for nominations.

Erin Firth (Oceanography): Nominates Peder Digre (Global Health)

Peder Digre (Global Health): Accepts Nomination.

Elloise Kim (President): Closes nominations, has sole candidate. Needs to hear from candidate about what kinds of plans he has.

Peder Digre (Global Health): Currently, works with all the officers in some shape or form on different committees he is a part of. He is on Finance and budgeting committee, the State Legislative Advisory Board (SLAB), and also vice chair of services and activities fee committee. SAF committee allocates about 15 million dollars of student funds every year. Also, on STF committee and all of them are important links back to GPSS.

Elloise Kim (President): Any questions?

Bucoda Warren (Evans school): What will you do to bridge gap between Executive Senators and the rest of the Senate?

Peder Digre (Global Health): Executive Senate is just a way to get information from the Executive meetings to the Senate, Executive Senators are here to hear the Senate's voices.

Elizabeth Oestreich (Public Health Genetics) Moves to vote.

Adam Bell (Education-Learning Science and Human Development): Seconds.

Elloise Kim (President): Will do hand votes if everyone is okay with that. (yes, everyone okay). Who votes for Peter? There is a unanimous vote for Peter. Peter is our new Executive Senator.

Resolution on Science-Informed Leadership

6:26 pm

Elloise Kim (President): This is one of our regular business, in general the Senate will try not to have more than two Resolutions per meeting unless it's very urgent. Authors of this Resolution please come up.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): One of his constituents Ted Cohen brought to his attention that UC Davis got a bunch of graduate students to sign a joint letter (a consensus statement) basically asking for the new nominees for cabinet positions in the federal government for incoming administration. That decisions by those nominees be made by taking into account Science for upcoming decisions, so there are good data based decisions. This is a nonpartisan effort, they would like to make one change to the Resolution. Second back clause, requested that GPSS Executive Committee send the consensus letter, if this is approved, they'd like to change that to the Science and Policy Steering Committee. The Science and Policy Steering Committee has agreed next Tuesday to meet and put together the letter with GPSS signature if approved. Due to way nominations are being made and process of appointing people. Would like to have vote on this tonight if possible, need 2/3 majority.

Randy Siebert (Secretary): Right now, if we are having a first reading Q&A however someone on the floor can move to vote if they think the Q&A is sufficient.

Adam Bell (Education-Learning Science and Human Development): Point of information, are you taking friendly amendments then? (Yes)

Elliot Koontz (QERM): What is the timeline that you are visualizing to get to government?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): UC Davis will send out their letter out tonight. We are using their letter but sending it separately to our own legislators. There are a number of schools, at least 15 that have signed on to the UC Davis letter and others that have made own letters because of theirs.

Giuliana Conti (Music): Will this affect all people on campus?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): I think this is important to all of us, however there are definitely departments that will be more affected than others.

Giuliana Conti (Music): What would that mean for departments like the arts?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): To him this is this is a show of independent inquiry and scholarship. Obviously, science is not the only part of policy, it's also important to take into account human effects it's a good nonpartisan way to inform and make policy decisions.

Jay Eckard (Drama): Who is audience for this? Doesn't seem like lots of nominees are on the fence about using science when making political decisions nor will this sway many people.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Thinks this is a part of the process/effort to provide support as a community to people in the community. Also, thinks it's important to talk to people in the community with different views.

Jake Busche (Chemistry): If we are using the letter as a symbolic effort, have we reached out to Universities in more Republican areas, to include other ideological backgrounds?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): UC Davis has been reaching out to all types of universities, it's up to universities if they want to sign on. As a student body, saying we all agree on this is an important stance to make. It's important to show support if this is something we will support.

Erin Firth (Oceanography): This, can also inform future GPSS senators, can also show students and administration that students are supporting progress and speech in a certain direction.

Dan Herb (Leadership in Higher Education): Do you see any potential political backlash for this?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): It's hard to know with the current political environment, on a personal level he feels that it's important to take action on issues that he stands behind not just those that don't make political backlash.

Ted Cohen (Guest): Can't see letter getting much backlash.

Giuliana Conti (Music): Having a hard time seeing how this will fit in our University. Hard to see how this will be beneficial to all departments.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Thinks part of reason that has happened, is science and engineering has traditionally not asked participants to be involved with policy decisions. Scientists and Engineers have frequently been left to own devices. This letter is asking for Scientist and Engineers to take more responsibility for policy decisions and understand that science and engineering they are doing has an effect on society and can negatively impact lots of individuals even if they positively impact many people. Agrees with sentiment and hopeful for the future. Science and engineering can inform policy for the better, if we take into account data in inclusive and intersectional manner.

Michelle Brault (Molecular & Cellular Biology) Moves to extend time by five minutes.

Kathryn Cogert (Civil & Environmental Engineering): Seconds.

Julius Doyle (Anthropology): When you talking about science and engineering do you mean just hard science? (NO)

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): My understanding, the social sciences have a role to play. It's getting the right people in the room with data so we can have informed decisions. It's about data driven informed leadership.

Michelle Brault (Molecular & Cellular Biology): This isn't trying to say that people in leadership positions need to be scientists. It's about looking for best available scientific evidence, not advocating policy that will have a conflict of interest with scientific things, and they should commit with engaging with scientific community. It's about being open to seeing if science can make contribution and being more open with people who are experts in things that politicians may make big decisions on is something we should support.

Adam Bell (Education-Learning Science and Human Development): Julius, the second to last paragraph on the consensus letter it does mention social sciences. Point is, this is including all types of science. It's about appointees to the cabinet, it's not about every senator everywhere.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): If you look at appointees to the cabinet, there are many with little science backgrounds but have run big science boards well. The letter just asks to respect scientific data.

Jake Busche (Chemistry): First two points require quite a lot from cabinet appointees, which eh likes. The third one, wouldn't it be smarter to state something a little stronger?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): This is part of the letter that is already being sent, the letter as a whole does a good job of pushing agenda while still trying to appeal in nonpartisan matter to everyone. We need to understand merit of letter as a whole. The more important part is if we agree with sentiment of letter as a whole.

Jake Busche (Chemistry): Moves to extend time by five minutes.

Michelle Brault (Molecular & Cellular Biology): Seconds.

Michael Diamond (Atmospheric Sciences): Moves to take a vote, after a set number of speakers

Kelly Brown (Evan School): Seconds.

Elloise Kim (President): After, four speakers there will be a vote

Elliot Koontz (QERM): Will we not see the Resolution again?

Elloise Kim (President): Tried to spread out resolution process to two meetings now, but when its time sensitive we can try to pass Resolution at one meeting.

Randy Siebert (Secretary): If Resolution is passed today it can, if it isn't passed it can try to come back.

Elliot Koontz (QERM): Just wanted to give confirmation that the vote we gave today would be final vote. (Yes, would be final vote for resolution.)

Dan Herb (Leadership in Higher Education): Needs to move to second reading, and move to suspend rules.

Michael Diamond (Atmospheric Sciences): Moves to move to second reading, suspend rules, and close debate.

Scott Spencer (Bioethics): Seconds.

Merzamia Cagaitan (English): Can you expand a little bit more about what you mean by nonpartisan. Also, the Resolution itself is different from the letter. Resolution is more for this audience, and letter matters. Is this a Resolution that GPSS came up with? Is this the same Resolution circulated around the nation?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Resolution he wrote is just for UW purposes, letter is written by UC Davis and will be spread around government. It really depends. Resolution is more tailored for this audience and tried to include more background.

Jay Eckard (Drama): President elect Trump said he is trying to get rid of politically driven science, doesn't this politicize science in a way that would further cause action against it?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): That is a very complicated question. My response is good science, is not political in and of itself. The science itself says what it says. The way we take action through policy is inherently political with science.

Jay Eckard (Drama): Seems like this could do more damage than help. President can point to this and say that this politicizes science.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): There are a number of areas that the current administration is taking action that will hurt many people, just because we have a target doesn't mean we shouldn't take action. This is really trying to find a balance between too weak and too strong. This Resolution isn't going to do anything to change their minds. The only thing that will change swing voters is for us to go out in the community and talk about this. Thinks this is very nonpartisan statement that asks for decisions to be made with data not ideology.

Laura Taylor (Molecular and Cellular Biology): Moves to close debate and vote.

Michael Diamond (Atmospheric Sciences): Seconds.

Elloise Kim (President): Needs 2/3 vote to make it passed, registered senators and proxies can vote.

Passes with more than 2/3 vote. If you have further concerns, then please talk with Officers or Grant.

Resolution in Support of the Washington Yacht Club

6:58 pm

Elloise Kim (President): Authors and Senate sponsors please introduce themselves.

Yacht Club (Guest): Previous President of yacht club for two years, he is in Graduate school.

Elloise Kim (President): This is the first reading.

Yacht Club (Guest): A quick summary is, they have existed as an RSO since 1947, have 150 students, alumni, and staff as a part of the RSO. It is more than just students. In 1973 they moved to Waterfront Activities Center and were allocated some space there, he talked to the person who

helped the club move there and they have been down at the WAC since then and operated out of the WAC.

The reason they are here is the manager of the WAC has approached Zuanana him and demanded that certain actions be taken by the club without consultation with students or public announcements. Chris wants GPSS's support that is not okay for the WAC to blindside students with big changes. Also, students very much pay for WAC services, and not allowing students to voice their opinions seems hypocritical.

Laura Taylor (Molecular and Cellular Biology): What percentage of your club is represented by Graduate students?

Yacht Club (Guest): Don't think they have an official count. Many, of the people who join and stick with the club are Graduate students.

Laura Taylor (Molecular and Cellular Biology): Can you be more detailed about the issue?

Yacht Club (Guest): In essence only got one written document that says they want 72 feet of their [Yacht club] dock space, and the letter also mentioned ways to do this. The WAC wants to make a public kayak rental program for profit in that dock space, the money from the program would go back into the WAC.

Matt Newman (Water Activities Center Representative): Introduces himself as the director of recreational sports, says they don't have a business plan. One idea was to approach Washington yacht club to discuss these things. Plan is to use 72 feet of 742 feet of current dock space. There is no business plan.

Yacht Club (Guest): They have brought up many concerns, and have tried to get in contact with Matt Newman many times. They have a meeting scheduled for Friday now. They have had conversations where they have expressed many concerns that were not met.

Kathryn Cogert (Civil & Environmental Engineering): Point of this Resolution is to get the Yacht club and WAC to talk, to ensure SAF money doesn't get spent on monetization of student space.

Elliot Koontz (QERM): As a non-friendly amendment, they would strike line 72 and 73. Thinks that having public kayak space is important, University clubs are very exclusive, and it might be nice that UW branches out and allows the public to enjoy the water space.

Elloise Kim (President): At the second reading you can come with a revised version.

Yacht Club (Guest): Wants to clarify, that they are not against the kayak program, but rather that it should not be in at the detriment of student space.

Randy Siebert (Secretary): This reading is just a hearing of what the Senate thinks about the Resolution, not rebuttal time.

Michelle Brault (Molecular & Cellular Biology): In light of fact that there is no meeting yet between the Yacht club and WAC, until you guys have had more chance to talk, she doesn't think its GPSS's job to be in the middle of this issue. Moves to table this Resolution.

Sarah Harbert (Earth & Space Sciences): Seconds.

Bucoda Warren (Evans school) Objects.

Michael Diamond (Atmospheric Sciences) Moves to hear speakers with questions then table the Resolution.

Laura Taylor (Molecular and Cellular Biology) Seconds.

Kelly Brown (Evans School): In this Resolution, it assumes that since 1973 there has only been a verbal contract between the Yacht club and the WAC. What efforts have been made to have a formal written contract?

Yacht Club (Guest): During his first term as president they were on a verbal agreement that was the way it had been run. During end of the second year as president there was a draft to have a formal agreement between the two parties, but the draft never went anywhere. It stated what was in the verbal agreement. The only one issue with it, is the WAC would have control of when the Washington Yacht Club members could go sailing, once they shared their concerns they never heard anything back from the WAC. Haven't heard anything in a year.

Yacht Club (Guest): The new administration has made no effort to pick this up and carry it forward.

Michelle Brault (Molecular & Cellular Biology): Can a lot of this conversation happen another time, and can we table the Resolution?

Yacht Club (Guest): The reason they are here, is they tried to approach the new WAC manager over the course of 9 months and it has taken 9 months to get a meeting with Matt.

Julius Doyle (Anthropology): How much total dock space is there, and how much have you [WAC representative] asked for?

Matt Newman (WAC Representative): They asked for 72 feet from a total of 740 feet.

Julius Doyle (Anthropology): It is important to share total dock space with GPSS. Also, would like to second Michelle that GPSS shouldn't make a decision until WYC talk to Matt Newman.

Elloise Kim (President): Under the condition that the two parties will discuss their issues, this Resolution will be tabled.

Good of the Order

Striked.

Officer Reports

7:15pm

Vice President of Internal Affairs

Sam and Sarah working on feedback survey. If you haven't had chance to fill out the link is on the slide, and will have announcements with the link. For Science and Policy committee Grant Williamson and Scott will speak to that. They are working on a project all quarter and maybe Spring quarter.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Will be doing white paper workshop to learn how to do white papers in specific fields. Wants to do this as a much more practical and applied thing, where a product can come out of it that can be given to legislators. Will have advising sessions for them. Also, white papers will be distributed.

Scott Spencer (Bioethics): Open to anyone as well, and especially for folks with expertise in grant writing and how to tailor what they know to a broader audience. Will be backlogging these white papers. Right now, people can sign up for different topics they are interested in. If you have any questions, feel free to reach out to Scott or Grant.

Sarah Loeffler (Vice President of Internal Affairs): Wants to release a white paper, but also the committee could be a good Segway for Resolution making for those interested in that. Also, the Science and Policy committee is an open committee, just reach out to Sarah or Scott in order to join. Other committees she works with is the New Graduate and Student Experience committee, they are helping consolidate resources on campus and disseminate information to Graduate students. This is a uniform place to get voices heard. She is still taking new members, so contact her if interested. Also, Elloise and her are working hard on Program Reviews, contact her [Sarah] if anyone has done them [Reviews] before.

Vice President of External Affairs 7:15pm

Matt Munoz (Director of Legislative Affairs): James is in Olympia, lobbying with state legislators on legislative agenda. Some of the topics he has focused on heavily since start of this week (legislative session) and start of his time their last week. He reports atmosphere is positive, and sponsors are making themselves apparent across the board. Fee based programs is being focused on heavily and they are pushing for mandatory minimums disclosure requirements in all public higher education institutions, searching for a champions and sponsors. James expects support. Matt is working on a one pager and working with University administration

As far as mental health, James is meeting with key stakeholders to discuss possible bills. Right now not a lot of bills are coming up currently, but there will be as session goes on. James is thinking about pursuing a specific budget item for funding but it's hard to push that through without budget writers and having more information for them. There currently aren't many mental health champions but James trying to change that among legislators. Lots of headways being made on sexual assault care and prevention and related issues. WSA, Washington State Students Association is pushing a set of recommendations that stem from a past course of work released by the council of presidents. James personally doesn't know if the chosen suggestions are best move forward but we are a part of WSA so are supporting recommendations that WSA is supporting.

James plans on consulting with SLAB on what other options are possible, if anyone has any input on this please contact James or Matt. For student loans James is part of a coalition in WSA to provide better consumer protection, and there are bills regarding loan transparency. There is one bill that has bipartisan support, and there is another that is being released and pushed for by Bob Ferguson the Attorney General. There is also a student loan bill of rights that will be presented by one of the State Senators in the Seattle area who in the past has been ally for UW.

Lobbying strategy is breaking off into teams, coalitions, James is part of the Loan/debt one, affordability, sexual assault, and child care coalitions. He is not leading the teams but he is contributing the Graduate student perspective on these teams. There is a lot of action being taken on open education resources as well also with bipartisan support, there are lots of bills but it is unclear which one will be most successful right now. James is hoping to convene SLAB meeting next week to update on how things are going in Olympia. With SAGE coalition leading and working on student debt paper for student trip in Washington DC. SAGE has implemented registration fee for conferences. Lobby day as of right now will be on Feb. 7, will send out two surveys tonight to Senate. First survey is about where to focus individuals on lobby day, second survey is registration for lobby day. Please email Matt, if you want to be a champion on an issue.

Michael Diamond (Atmospheric Sciences): Is Feb. 7th firm date? (yes)

Matt Munoz (Director of Legislative Affairs): Also, on that day there will a lot of State Need grant advocacy as well.

Randy Siebert (Secretary): It's a Tuesday.

Elloise Kim (President): If people can be there all day or part of the day that would be great.

Matt Munoz (Director of Legislative Affairs): As they get more details on lobby he will update everyone. If there are any other questions or anyone wants to be involved email Matt.

Michelle Brault (Molecular & Cellular Biology): Moves to strike Good of the Order.

Elizabeth Oestreich (Public Health Genetics): Seconds.

Secretary

Volunteering on Sunday to plant some flowers on MLK day, at Rainier beach park in Shoreline from 9am-12pm. Send email to randy, to get a registration link for this as well.

Also, for the Polar Plunge they have 9 members registered for their team. They raised a fair amount of money, and have about a month left. Will have thrift shop shopping day soon, to get outfits for plunge. Giuliana will host hot cocoa, and hot shower after party at her house

Treasurer

Submitted orientation documents for Services and Activities Fees, talks about where GPSS has been with funding in last few years and if we have met our goals. Also, met with health and wellness, and student vet life about history and funding. Big project for this quarter is making fiscal year budget. This morning funded three departments for retreats, have more funding

available. Also, she is currently grading early winter travel grants. Next cycle is open for travel grants. She is also working on getting sponsorship for GPSS events. Personally, she is in search of a proxy for the STF committee, where students present on tech they want to see to potentially get funded. Let her know if anyone can do that. Are always accepting new members to F&B (Finance and Budget committee) which meets from 10:30am-12pm on Tuesday, and travel grants meet 4 more times 1pm-2:30pm on Tuesdays. Please let her know if anyone is interested.

President

Our work now: The critical Role of Graduate and Post-Graduate Students in Post-Election America. First Graduate conference of GPSS on May 6th. There will be lots of different options to explore. We will hear from me from multiple different channels. She also now has access to all Graduate student emails, she will try not to over use it. Board of Regents have met today, and will meet tomorrow all day long. Diversity blue print will be approved by Board for Regents and CSE building phase two will be approved. Graduate student enrollment trends report will be introduced tomorrow. Faculty salary policy is a big topic at the upcoming meeting. She is working on fee based programs internally, and the monthly meeting with Rovy Brandon is set. PACS report about previous programs will be made, in order to see best ways to improve program management. ISHIP (International student Health Insurance Program) advisory board launched. So if you know someone who has ISHIP or someone has used ISHIP let her know, so she can understand benefits and concerns of program better. Husky 100 nominations are still happening

Announcements

7:34 pm

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): Friday Jan 20th. Working with UA4121 to do a day of action and resistance will be in the intellectual house and there will be programming throughout the day. They have some things from science and policy, they will have immigration lawyers in there and can tell you about your rights. Will also have free immigration one on one consultations. Also, student wide walkout going on in Seattle that they will encourage students to be a part of. Also, will collaborate with ECC on their evening with Kathleen Cleaver, come to our event during day and may guarantee tickets to ECC. Pre-register for safety, at ECC front desk or email them. Card may be needed on entrance.

Elloise Kim (President): Highlighted a few events during MLK day, and the Kathleen Cleaver event will be happening during Milo's visit. More info available at the link.

Adjournment

7:37 pm

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

Michelle Brault (Molecular & Cellular Biology): Seconds.
