

Graduate and Professional Student Senate

Executive Meeting Minutes Session 6

November 9, 2016 | HUB 303

Members Present:

GPSS President Soh Yeun (Elloise) Kim
GPSS Vice President of Internal Affairs Sarah Loeffler
GPSS Vice President of External Affairs James Moschella
GPSS Treasurer Michaella Rogers
GPSS Secretary Randy Siebert
GPSS Executive Senator Joseph Telegen
GPSS Executive Senator Michelle Brault
GPSS Executive Senator Monica Viharo Cortes
GPSS Executive Senator Erin Firth
Graduate School Liaison Kelly Edwards
ASUW Director of Internal Policy Taylor Beardall

Call to Order 5:31 pm (2:19)

Approval of Agenda

5:31 pm

Monica Viharo Cortes Moves to approve the agenda as amended.

Michelle Brault Seconds.

Approval of Minutes

5:31 pm

Michelle Brault Moves to approve the minutes.

Randy Siebert Seconds.

Career and Internship Center: Susan Terry

5:32 pm

Susan Terry: She has worked with the Graduate school for many years on programming. Over the years particularly in the last few years programming has improved thanks to Kelly Edwards. Today she wants to hear from Executive Senate about what the needs for graduate students are in career and professional development. She just walked up from the Data Science event, she is excited by the turnout and all the employers there. Really, what her work is about is creating employer student connections.

GIVES HAND OUT

The handout shows some of the services that the Career and Internship Center provides, as well as a short report for numbers for attendance in some of their programs. In terms of reach they never reach as much as they want but in a given school year they have touchpoints with around 10,000 students. They would like to be talking to more people, and are always thinking about how to make more inroads with students.

Over the years the number of students that the Career and Internship Center work with that look at industry has increased; however, they still work with students that want to work in academia. Graduate students are looking at all avenues of work and it is the Career and Internship Center's goal to bridge that gap with graduate students between education and work.

Erin Firth: Has two questions from what she read and heard. Are you doing anything to reach out to faculty members who disparage student's efforts to move forward in nonacademic setting?

Susan Terry: Kelly has done a lot of work on making inroads with faculty. As her role in the Graduate School she is more empowered to make those inroads. The Career and Internship Center doesn't spend as much of their time making faculty inroads as they want to. The Career and Internship center looks for low hanging fruit, looks for faculty who are willing to have conversations with us. The Graduate school has been doing a lot of great work in working with faculty who do not see industry as a viable career option.

Kelly Edwards: We have more programs at UW that we can talk about later.

Erin Firth: Good to hear because her department which is considered progressive faces these issues with faculty on a fairly regular basis. Also, her second question is based off the literature. How much success have you had with making employer networking events specifically applicable to humanities students, science students, business students, and law students for example?

Susan Terry: Another 45 graduate programs have been added in recent years. We would love to provide niche specifications for everyone but we don't have the resources to do that for everyone. We try to do that as much as possible. Kelly and Susan have talked about how to do networking within departments.

Kelly Edwards: Recently, they took the historic annual career symposium which had an alumni networking reception that followed and broke it into two separate events happening in the winter. Although it was popular it felt too broad. One event is thinking expansively about careers in public service, it talks about what else is available for humanities folks with a focus on public service. The second event is about STEM careers and what are more pathways in STEM.

Elloise Kim: She invited Susan Terry today so that the Executive Senate is informed and can give ideas to the Career and Internship center so we can have a more fruitful discussion with the Senate.

Susan Terry: We had a great conversation with the Dean, Elloise, and Paul Ruckert (vice president for Alumni association) two weeks ago. It's the first time we really sat with the Dean

and talked about what more we can do for students. The Career and Internship center are gathering data points about what they are doing and what they would like to be doing to make some more programs for the Graduate school. We are always pushing forwards to see what more we can do with the current base of resources. However, right now want to hear more about the needs in professional development and career for you guys.

Monica Viharo Cortes: There are a lot of workshops she wants to go to but can't go to because they are not at a time she can make. So, more opportunism for after 5pm events would be nice. Also, having more things about the flexible PhD, there is a sense that as a PhD if you don't go into academia it's because you are less than. So, having workshop language about normalizing all career paths would be great.

Susan Terry: We are doing a lot of that work with undergraduates but not so much as graduates.

Erin Firth: One issue she ran into was how to create and formulate a thesis when you are not going into academia. Thesis still has to be tailored to academia even if you don't intend to go into that. Also, if you are already working on a thesis how to see it from a professional stand point. So instead of using thesis to set yourself up for further academic research, how can you look at the thesis as a launching point for further industry jobs.

Joseph Telegen: It would be good to have conversations about the academy itself and its transformation. What it means to be an academic is a current conversation. If the career center could provide guidance for those to clear up the ivory tower misconception that would be good. Real world vs. Academy dichotomy needs to be cleared up. The Academy is not a stationary/static entity.

Susan Terry: It would be interesting to bring employers into that conversation

Monica Viharo Cortes: There are resources that people are not aware of they are resources for discussions like what Joe was talking about. Maybe bring together what we already have on this campus to talk about how to engage scholarship with the community we live in.

Erin Firth: Having frank discussions about the nature of a doctoral degree vs. other degree paths would be good.

Joseph Telegen: I think that is part of the conversations about the dynamic and fluid nature of the academy.

Erin Firth: There are broad discussions about that but they are never in one place or easy to find for students who need them.

Susan Terry: Would those discussion helps students decide if Graduate school is appropriate for them? (Yes) Kevin Mihata works with the Dean of Arts and Sciences and his background is in sociology. There is a lot of discussion in Arts and Sciences to communicate that Graduate school isn't the only option, he would be good resource for all of us to talk with.

Erin Firth: The only venue through which industry is seen as an exciting option is for Fellow students

Sarah Loeffler: Coming into a program that is very limited on time, with a lot of departments that require internships, there is a lot of disconnect with students taking on unpaid internships. Doesn't think current resources help students navigate how difficult it is to get in government positions. Right now people talk about relying on alumni and luck. There is not a lot of career development on side of the College, there are not a lot of partnerships being made. Not much is being done for a lot of masters' students that have short period of time and a lot of requirements.

Elloise Kim: This is a time to have conversations between different programs to create tangible changes. This is a good way to start that. Susan cannot be at the Senate meeting but Catherine Basl will be there and so will Kelly Edwards. Hopefully we can come up with more viable solutions at the Senate meeting as well.

Susan Terry: Susan believes we are stronger together. If we can figure out how to work together more effectively, students & staff & faculty, we can get more done.

Erin Firth: That was fantastic even from just the response in this room it shows that there is a pretty high demand for professional development.

Elloise Kim: Personally thinks that the Graduate School (Kelly Edwards) can give advice/perspective on what's viable with faculty, career center is about providing practical training and guidelines and UWAA is a resource before networking and connection with Alumni. She is trying to create a network.

Kelly Edwards: How is next phase of career and professional conversation going to work?

Elloise Kim: There are two purposes of inviting UWAA and Career and Internship center. First of all, its to inform Senators of what kind of resources there are on campus and second of all hearing ideas from them about ideas and chances we can pursue.

Student Technology Fee Committee: Bryce Colton

6:05 pm

Bryce Colton: STF a \$38 dollar per quarter fee self-imposed by students in late 80s or 90s in order to reimburse and invest back into technology on campus. Its funding student technology loan program, Mary Gates computer lab and much more. STF has roughly 5 million dollars that they take in annually. STF works on a grant based system, authors write proposal made by student, faulty, or staff and they hear the proposal then move through it. They have four voting members from GPSS, 4 voting members from ASUW, and one ASUW student senator as a liaison for a total of 9 voting members. Bryce counts out of constituency as a non-voting member. STF has staff positions that are paid. Also, STF has a large group of liaisons across campus that help make decisions.

Around 2014-2015 Jared the chair at the time created policy to delineate what STF did and didn't generally fund to make it a more formalized and get rid of some inconsistency. One of the policies was not to fund insurance, because its messy. The student technology loan program

asked for insurance for all their equipment and STF said no, so they had to go to SAF for emergency funding. This was a big problem and leadership asked STF what they were doing. David came in as chair in 2015-2016 year and he instituted visits to various organizations but had to leave at the very end of winter quarter for personal reasons.

Bryce and Kilson were called to step up and they made a lot of changes including implementing the continuous funding model. They wanted to institute a lot of changes to make STF better. They reformed the fee from \$41 dollars to \$38 dollars, the committee wasn't using all money it was bringing in and they wanted to be responsible with the money they were bringing in. Also, they extended the fee to Summer quarter because it just never was extended before and people who did not pay for the fee were benefitting from it.

STF was also moved to a quarterly model, they used to have a linear based schedule. People would propose something at the beginning of Winter quarter when they put out requests for Autumn. Autumn quarter there would be no meetings because STF wouldn't be doing anything. At the beginning of Winter quarter they would hear a lot of proposals and at the end of the year there would be a panic and they would quickly work on administrative budgeting. Before, if proposal author gave an okay proposal they would be asked to come back next year now they can come back within the year. Also, they hold proposal workshops to clear up misconceptions, and it has been shown to drive up proposal numbers.

Michelle Brault: If you are lowering fee but extending it into Summer quarter wouldn't you be making more money that way?

Bryce Colton: Based on numbers given by the UW Office of planning and budgeting we would be revenue neutral and may even decrease that way. However, UW is creating a lot of new programs for Summer so next Summer a lot of money may come in. So, we may lower the fee again if we get more money than projected.

They were projections STF got from OP&B.

Also, with the bylaw changes taking place STF didn't have time last Spring to make a funding plan for this fiscal year about what STF wants to fund. The paper in front of you describes budget, & categories that they fund.

We will start with page 3 which describes the main overall budget information. Last year a big push for his tenure this year is to clear up processes and make them streamlined, and clear up institutional debt. Before STF didn't have good handle on how much money it had because previous groups operated on an estimated budget. Over 3-4 year they were underspending and underbudgeting money they had. Last year they discovered they had 2.5 million dollars in money sitting in the budget ready to use. 3 million dollars for this year plus 5 million dollars that they will have from now to July 1st gives them a very big budget. So, committee proposed to take 2 million dollars and put it in another area for special projects.

We are here to get your input and maybe pass this right now.

Elloise Kim: We will not approve this right away because we want an informed decision, so we want to have a conversation after this meeting and then next time you come in three weeks we can make a decision.

Bryce Colton: One of your appointed members is leaving on the 25th to New Zealand on a project, so one of your members won't be there. However, we still will have quorum.

Elloise Kim: We still need more time, so we will make a decision later.

Bryce Colton: Proposing to take 2 million dollars off the top of the budget for special projects. We will still have 6 million dollars which is still higher than last years estimated expenditure of 4.8 million dollars.

Elloise Kim: Can you tell us how much staff are getting in raises?

Bryce Colton: No one is getting a raise, wages for staff were last adjusted winter quarter last year.

Michaella Rogers: If you could talk about the rationale behind percentages chosen for the budget, talk about blocks, and talk more about the 2 million dollars that would be good.

Joseph Telegen: With increases in Seattle minimum wage did administrative budgets go up last year accordingly?

Bryce Colton: This is the current payment for the roles. It was recently last adjusted at that December period. This is a report, STF is not asking for an increase in salaries.

Also, a major feature of this is a continuous funding model. We want to make sure no crucial committee will ever come in again and STF will just decide not to fund them. We are creating blocks, so STF can work more hand and hand with programs they are funding. Two blocks STF is looking at now are Student technology loan program and Odegaard learning commons. Blocks are ubiquitous features of campus, every student uses. We have allocated 6% of the budget for blocks for coverage of average expenditures of the programs. We are opening this up for inter-committee proposals. Committee members can propose new programs to make into blocks.

Michaella Rogers: These two specific blocks will be continuously funded every year, they have shown to use money wisely, and their funding is based on average expenditures.

James Moschella: In case that programs take a turn and students stop using it what is the contingency plan for that?

Bryce Colton: We can't remove a block without a 2/3 majority, if we do it triggers an immediate notice to ASUW and GPSS. We will be able to work with organizations and correct the shift.

Michaella Rogers: With blocks we still have to approve them every year as part of the yearly funding plan. So, there will be a yearly evaluation of performance.

Michelle Brault: Will the vote be one to continue or end the block?

Byrce Colton: Probably a vote to adjust funding level, but we are not completely sure yet because this is new territory.

Erin Firth: For anything that can have significant impact on student life super majority is needed for change.

Michaella Rogers: These aren't set amounts; they can be changed year to year. Just every year the yearly funding plan will be introduced and must be approved by ASUW and GPSS

Sarah Loeffler: Would approval of GPSS and ASUW be needed for a change?

Bryce Colton: No, we would do votes within our committee. We would only alert GPSS and ASUW if it was ever decided to defund a block.

Michaella Rogers: GPSS and ASUW give approval in committees and STF gives funding in those bounds. This plan will continually be reintroduced.

Erin Firth: If we ever want to stop defunding the block it would be very hard to do.

James Moschella: What is the procedure for determining how much money these blocks will receive.

Bryce Colton: Have yet to make procedures. We have ideas about that, want to see all expenditures that SAF sees. Will have bi-yearly check ins. Will also install key stats clients to measure use of equipment.

Sarah Loeffler: So, can those measurements used to determine funding for a block be included as part of the proposal? (yes)

Bryce Colton: The proposal is lacking mostly because this is new territory. This yearly funding program is not meant to be procedural that comes in the Bylaws later.

Elloise Kim: There should be some written language about how the procedure will be kept and conducted because otherwise it will be too arbitrary for us to approve. We would like to see the written language for the procedure of building an analyzing blocks on a regular basis.

James Moschella: Will the committee consider the Daily as a potential block?

Bryce Colton: The Daily has requested continued funding in the future, we will look into potentially block status of the Daily but that is not a surefire thing.

James Moschella: Knows the Daily has been struggling financially and wants to make sure STF is not the bastion that keeps the Daily afloat.

Elloise Kim: Shares same concern as James, not sure if they are the right body to ask for block funding.

Bryce Colton: We are not sure if we will give them block status either.

James Moschella: Can we get that defined (whether The Daily will be given block status) before the next meeting?

Erin Firth: Essentially it would allow the Daily to double dip on funds.

Bryce Colton: To be clear STF would also double dip in that they have STF, SAF, and UW IT funding.

James Moschella Moves to extend time by 10 minutes.

Sarah Loeffler Seconds.

James Moschella: The concern with The Daily is we consider the product of The Daily being a newspaper whereas for the loan program the product is giving away technology. So, we want calcification that we would be supporting technology to produce The Daily.

Michaella Rogers: Suggests to remove The Daily listed sentence in the proposal. When committee comes to it they can evaluate it. Shouldn't be mentioned in this, The Daily has a reputation and we don't want it to diminish the proposal.

Joseph Telegen: Why doesn't The Daily come talk to GPSS and get reasoning behind financial struggles.

Taylor Beardall: Daily started out as ASUW entity, they then phased out.

Joseph Telegen: We seem to have a concern about the number of places the Daily gets funds from.

Michaella Rogers: We do have a concern but would rather discuss that later.

Bryce Colton: Purpose of yearly funding plan is its required by Washington state law, to be passed by governing over bodies of STF. Real meat is in categories of funding not so much in blocks. We are not looking for approval of which blocks not to fund, we definitely will want your opinion sometime in the future but not now. The conversation should really be revolved around funding categories.

James Moschella: The percentages for this 2016-2017 proposal are decimals. Need to be fixed.

Bryce Colton: Has updated the website but that was an oversight due to sleep deprivation. He apologized, will fix.

Michaella Rogers: Also, date on the front needs to be changed.

Bryce Colton: These numbers are still accurate although they are not in correct form.

STF has seen good use of computer labs and can touch a lot of students with that. Remote commuting is for clouds and big servers that will hold slices that a person can remote desktop into and use high powered components on that server. Has seen a lot of requests for Remote commuting and has been a well-used technology. We expect to see more requests. Frontier technology covers area of things that are not standardized but show promise of standardization. At this time, it would include 3-d printers. Committee voted to raise that by 1% of funding because they have been reaching budget number and want to see more progress in this area. Machinery and research are big specialized machines that are used in labs. They have low usage

numbers and as a premier research university there should be plenty of means to find alternative funding for this. Thus because of low usage will reduce budget by 2%. Collaborative also lowered. Collaborative is like Allen library south like all the screens that can be used. Has seen a lot of usership but not a lot of proposals for it. Thus, are looking to decrease funding in order to move funding elsewhere. Portable would be GPS receivers and aerial drones. We have overspent that budget by a small amount by moving funds from a different budget into that one. Software is tricky they are looking into software because software requests received have been very specific. Looking to potentially remove software in future. It used to be that one could purchase software and whole campus can use it. That is no longer true all theses software companies now require everyone to have by device licenses, and they can't loan out from central repository. Has driven down desire for software and made it more specialized which means less people use it which means STF doesn't want to fund it. Have lowered from 2% to 1%. Software Development had one proposal, was ASUW & GPSS clicker proposal. Are looking into whether they want to continue Software development. If they do continue looking into working more closely with organization and UWIT. Blocks get own category and it's at 6% hits estimate of expenditures of two blocks that they know they want to fund.

James Moschella: With all the descriptions for each section, is it possible to include specific examples of technologies purchased with each section of funding and also reference what schools or departments take advantage of which funding. Also for new proposed funding can you include percentage change from year to year. Also, how are you sure allocations are accurate beyond just estimations of previous years?

Bryce Colton: On proposal funding category (yes). Have a new website that keeps track of all information in terms of whose proposing, handles all proposals. Bryce can pull information on a backend working to make information available on a front end.

This is built into bylaws and standard year to year in operating procedures but if we end up in voting meeting and overspend or underspend budget we can move 10% of the budget in or out in order to fulfill missed funds.

The 2 million dollars is set aside for special projects we would like to fund. For example, student technology loan program was originally special project.

Erin Firth: Because of 2.5 million extra there was two options. Put straight into YFP, keep in general fund, or put money to work. STF decided to put money to work with special projects.

Michaella Rogers: Also, STF talked about putting out a student wide survey to survey what students think are gaps in technology and using information to purchase what is needed.

Michelle Brault: Last year STF spent a little over 4 million dollars so is there the demand to spend 6 million dollars this year?

Bryce Colton: Probably not, we will probably lower fee with approval of GPSS/ASUW and Board of Regents in order to maximize budget.

Erin Firth: The intent is to lower the fee and operate on a small deficit over time until we match demand to supply.

James Moschella: Can we also have that in the proposal? (Yes)

Sarah Loeffler: In regards to the survey, 2 million is a lot of money to put into something that hasn't had student input seems concerning. If that's on the table to get student input can that be put into the proposal?

Erin Firth: One of STF goals is to better understand student demand through a variety of venues.

Elloise Kim: To enhance understanding can you put specific examples for high quality proposals? (Yes)

There is a sum for total administrative spending, but could you note how many hours' officers are given so how many hours per year they are paid at their rates.

Make sure to talk to anyone on STF committee if anyone has any more questions.

Review of Nov. 2 Senate Meeting

6:45 pm

Elloise Kim: We had a very active and vibrant conversation. It's always good to review what happened so we can have a better plan for the coming meeting. Want to open up the conversation to learn what you thought and where we could do better.

Michaella Rogers: It's kind of rough when we have difficult topics. It's can get out of control easily, if we do something like that again we should be respectful and have a strict timeline. Thankful last meetings discussion happened but can be nerve-wracking.

Randy Siebert: Thank you Michelle for bringing up Milo Yiannopoulos.

Erin Firth: One direction that might help GPSS to give guidance to Senators during this discussion is instead of taking about partisan topics discuss effects on students as individuals. That is something that is much harder to get into conflict about.

Joseph Telegen: Questions whether good of the order is going away from what originally was planned to be. Firstly, because it originally was going to be a free flowing and organic forum as opposed to being topic based as it currently is. Also, secondly it being a place to talk about issues on campus that are troubling specific senators. However, some of the things that were brought up last time when it was a guided discussion were things that were happening on campus. Wonders if it is less organic than originally intended.

Sarah Loeffler: Since it was a new transition that was not done before the intent was that during the first couple of meetings guided discussions were to help Senators contribute and understand what time could be used for.

Elloise Kim: On day of last week's meeting, officers thought about what the plan for the Good of the Order could be. Not intention to direct conversation. However, it was last minute preparation for more fruitful conversation. As for a more organic conversation we started with campus climate around election and it went off from there. So, it was kind of free flowing.

James Moschella: The intention was always to have it be organic but to revolved around singular issue so when discussion was finished GPSS has ideas to take back and use for programs etc.

Joseph Telegen: The Executive Senate did bring up topics.

Sarah Loeffler: The way we proposed this is new, so maybe we can decide as a group how to implement it moving forward. We did look over minutes and saw there were suggestions but no consensus on what to discuss. What do we want to do now? How should we go about Good of the Order moving forward?

Michelle Brault: Good to have topic in mind for first few Good of the Order. Good for instructing Senators on what to talk about. However, do think Joe's point is good, don't always need a topic. What Sarah I think is suggesting is if we can think of something that is urgently necessary to talk about we could make a topic but in the case where there is no consensus on what that should be we should leave Good of the Order open to Senators. Not our job to set that intention every single time.

Joseph Telegen: We are a democratic body and not the only members of the Senate. Much of what happens in the Senate should be anchored by Executive Senate but doesn't think we should determine content for every as part of Senate meeting.

James Moschella: Then we run the risk of opening up a 20-minute section where we sit and hope someone says something.

Joseph Telegen: Thinks that is something the Senate has to determine themselves because that is a group of people that all should participate.

Elloise Kim: Executive board is here to set guidance for how Senate meeting will be conducted. We can decide as an Executive body about how discussion time can be used. Agrees we don't have to set topic that must be discussed but going in without a plan may be more detrimental than going in without a plan.

Michaella Rogers: Can we try to go into the next meeting without a topic?

James Moschella: I think the goal was always to leave it open and to have back up topics.

Michaella Rogers: During the first meetings it really wasn't, we had topics and were trying to get it established. Thinks they should keep it open and see what happens.

Michelle Brault: Having a topic doesn't have to stop people from bringing up other things.

Erin Firth: Also, there's a difference between having a backup topic purposefully and during the course or the conversation at the Executive identifying a potential topic. Last time Executive

Senators identified an issue that mattered to us and brought that to the Senate. If that Senate does not pick up on that it's fine but if it does resonate with them it's good that we brought it.

Kelly Edwards: People in this room spend a whole evening deeply engaged in these issues most Senators go about their lives and the meeting is a small part of it. Part of the benefit of 5 Executive Senators is having a voice of the Senators and if Executive Senators are coming up with a topic that feels meaty then it should be brought up without expectation that whole time has to be filled up and Senators can take the conversation in whichever ways they want.

Randy Siebert: Also, wants to bring up that during the course of the meeting only 5 Senators got up to leave, Good of the Order is pretty engaging.

Kelly Edwards: This is the most she has seen people stay and stay engaged during Senate meetings.

Michelle Brault: If we do open up the next Good of the Order without designated topic, we should tell Senators that the Executive Senate has brought topics they think are important and if they have topics they think are important email the Executive Senators.

Elloise Kim: Mentioned that in the last meeting.

Sarah Loeffler: Was also mentioned that in the email Randy sent out. The first couple meetings were guiding and they were successful so she is hesitant to go into backwards faulting of every little detail. Criticizing of something that went really well can be draining. Should focus on what went well and what can be improved on.

Elloise Kim: What she is hearing is that in principle Good of the Order should be an open conversation for anyone to bring up an issue but having a plan so room isn't silent is a good idea. The Officer and Executive Senators meet with a lot of people, and they can think of a topic as a plan b or c.

Joseph Telegen: How are we going to make the determination to move on to a topic?

Erin Firth: Senators have the power to motion to table, and also to shoot down motions to table.

James Moschella; Are you saying how many minutes of silence we will wait for? (yes)

Joseph Telegen: How long are we going to give people a chance to be organic?

Kelly Edwards: Can preface by saying Executive Senators have things we want to discuss but we will hold until we hear from someone else.

Monica Viharo Cortes: Are you looking for commitment for everyone in this room to be okay with some awkward silence? (Yes)

Michelle Brault: Mood will be apparent.

James Moschella: Senate is not a classroom, and people are free to leave. If people don't hear anything then they may just leave and create a chain reaction.

Michaella Rogers: Doesn't think this will be an issue. Proposing to do this at the next meeting and see what happens.

Elloise Kim: Good of the Order is for conversation but if there is a significant topic they want to discuss it should be told to the Senate so they can place it as an Agenda item.

Michaella Rogers: All agree to do this at next meeting, and give open space? (Yes)

Monica Viharo Cortes: Doesn't think all the Senators are clear that they can move to table things. So maybe we should give that instruction to Senators as well.

Michelle Brault: Has been impressed by engagement this year. Doesn't think there will be awkward silence.

Elloise Kim: We've had very successful previous Good of Order conversations were so fruitful that we ended up bringing up guests to extend conversations from Good of Order. Wanted to talk about guests as well but thinks they both went well. Next week will be about Career development. Also, aftermath of election is another useful topic for the Senate to work on.

Nov. 16 Senate Meeting Agenda

7:06 pm

Elloise Kim: Did some work on the agenda beforehand to save meeting time. PRESENTS DRAFT VERISON. Feel free to add or remove anything.

Sarah Loeffler: Is in works with Upass and they may or may not cameo in for a quick introduction. There is the potential for another fee increase at the beginning of the next calendar year. Their idea is they want to come and introduce their services before they come in and ask for an increase. However, based on how much time they spent last year in the Senate we may want other resources to come in and present as well. They are also not sure if they have materials ready to present. Thoughts?

Erin Firth: A cursory overlook for Upass is good but it may be unfulfilling or may inspire people to ask for more insightful questions which may not be fruitful at this point if there are no answers.

Michelle Brault: Senators will probably want an extension of time to talk about Upass past 10 minutes even if they just come in for an introduction.

James Moschella: If people say we don't want an increase of fee, before they start talking about a fee increase that may help.

Sarah Loeffler: They don't know if there will be a fee increase just a possibility.

Michaella Rogers: What's the timeline for potential fee increase?

Sarah Loeffler: They themselves are not sure yet. They want GPSS to have their backs if there is a potential fee increase.

Erin Firth: Who are the GPSS Liaisons for Upass?

Sarah Loeffler: It may be Cooper and I.

Erin Firth: If it is just liaisons then its more informational and Senators may cut expectation of a more in depth investigation.

Sarah Loeffler: She thought about just including it into her officer report, but Upass would rather be present themselves.

Michelle Brault: Likes idea of introducing liaisons for Upass so if people have questions they know who liaisons are. Think that's more useful than having Upass themselves come

Erin Firth: People have an idea of what Upass is and what would be better is understanding GPSS input to Upass, previously it was not provided by fellow students.

Monica Viharo Cortes: Thinks it's better to have Upass and Sarah present. There were questions last time this happened. Also, good to introduce Upass to new people. Doesn't think there is a way to get around people asking questions. Thinks this should be set up as an information session and there should be time for some questions while knowing that some of those questions may be contentious.

Erin Firth: May be nice just to have Student representative because if students ask a contentious question representatives can take it back to Upass vs. if representatives are there students expect an answer then and there that Upass may not have. It can be more confrontational with Upass than informational.

Sarah Loeffler: Would be beneficial to have Upass and GPSS liaisons to present to Senate as an informational format.

Monica Viharo Cortes: If Upass really wants to be there they can be there to listen and asked not to jump in. They can be there just as long as they know they won't be presenting.

Elloise Kim: 10 minutes will be given for this segment of meeting.

Also, for the two guests should we give 20 minutes overall or 25 minutes? They will each get 5 minutes to present and then have question time.

Erin Firth: Given Executive Senate interactions with UWAA and Career and Internship Center 25 minutes would be good because that gives 15 minutes for questions. (Okay)

Elloise Kim: Our first resolution will also be brought up and it is written by Joseph Telegen. We need to send out the draft tonight.

Randy Siebert: The resolution will be given a new number because it is the first resolution of the year. Will change from 2nd to 1st.

Elloise Kim: Joe do you want to introduce resolution?

Joseph Telegen: Yup the principle is to encourage UWPD to include as part of notification of criminal incidence a component giving people guidance in terms of seeking counseling and in the event of certain events seeking people to help with trauma. Based on fact that criminal notification emails tend to report crimes and tell people what not to do, but doesn't say what people can do if they are feeling unsafe.

Erin Firth: Just heard about this today and thought it was a very good idea, because those emails make her anxiety spike.

Joseph Telegen: Cosponsors are welcome.

Elloise Kim: Will give 20 minutes for Good of Order. James and Elloise have met with Senators from different schools and they have concerns and questions about how they can disseminate information to their constituents effectively.

Officer reports, announcements, and adjournments are on there as usual.

Michaella Rogers Moves to approve the agenda.

Michelle Brault Seconds.

Executive Senator Reports

7:18 pm

Erin Firth: Attended SAF and STF committees. SAF has anywhere from 9,000 to 90,000 dollars of funding depending on how things pan out. The bias reporting response tool is something that functions across campus and gives students anonymous resource by which to contact, communicate, and find solutions to problems. They have asked for 10,000 of SAF funding. The tool is still in beta form, and what to do with information collected is still in progress. Plans to continue working with initiative although they may not get all funding requested. Still thinks bystander training can be of benefit. Joe has signed up for bystander training and she plans on communicating more with bystander training to see what they think they can do to deal with the post-election situation. SAF is going well. They are on board with ideas for post-election stuff. Successfully funded stuff for travel grants.

Michelle Brault: Looked into bystander training but regular class was full this quarter, but they allow group trainings. Is that something we as a Senate could do? There is more demand than there is supply and maybe if we as a Senate could organize for people that would be great.

Monica Viharo Cortes: Also, if we could make that convenient for people that would be great. Also, thinks that active shooter training would be one that would be nice to have a group training on.

Erin Firth: Those are two venues by which GPSS and/or SAF could definitely assist. Nothing is planned large scale for health and wellness. As for request for green dot triaging we can definitely look more into options available for Graduate student training.

Elloise Kim: Can we do co-sponsor of GPSS training for Graduate Professional Students?

James Moschella: Does anyone know why it is called green dot?

Erin Firth: Because an actual green dot can be placed on places to represent a safe space, she thinks.

Michelle Brault: Attended second faulty council on research this morning it was a pretty somber meeting. Had a presentation about changing administration and overhauling how much administrative burden is on research. It was presented to council as a grain of salt, because post-election everything could change. Also, a presentation on post docs and making them an actual thing that has representation with a student government, making them actual recognized part of body of UW. Also, Science and Policy committee has event on 30th that they will hopefully be putting out flyers for soon. It is science communication skills workshop/panel.

Monica Viharo Cortes: Has been volunteering with UW housing food pantry. Has information gone out to Senate?

Elloise Kim: Has asked director of events to post information on Facebook and website.

Monica Viharo Cortes: Thinks it will be helpful to make announcement to normalize anyone's desire to utilize service. Also, the experimental college taskforce is scheduled to meet next week on the 16th, will give an update on that.

Joseph Telegen: With new resolution for Wednesday definitely looking for more co-sponsors and coauthors. Wrote it with Erin Dunnington last year. If anyone wants to jump on board with that go for it. Working on applying for still open committees and liaison-ships. Active shooter video last week was great, as someone who wrote resolution last year on subject it was very fulfilling to see that happen. In Travel grants they gave a lot of scholars a bunch of money. F&B didn't give anybody any money today. ASUW Senate, still trying to find someone to continue legacy of being liaison for that. Meetings are Tuesday. There is a lot of value in being a mentor and liaison to ASUW. Talk to me if you want to do that.

Elloise Kim: Can you share ASUW liaison-ships in announcements next week? (Sure)

Joseph Telegen: SLAB met on Friday, Michelle did some research for mental health white paper that's developing. Have been working on putting that together for concrete asks for Olympia. Also, working on white pager for non-stem major funding.

Michelle Brault: One thing out of research is that one of the top predictors of Graduate student wellbeing and happiness is feeling positive about career outlook.

Officer Reports

7:30pm

ASUW:

Today ASUW released on behalf of Board of Directors a press relief titled "Looking ahead, our commitment" she is proud of people who wrote it. Also, they are planning some type of solidarity event, hoping to facilitate some type of conversation that ends in a hopeful sentiment. Will keep GPSS updated on that.

Last week they released husky stories campaign has really good traction so far and hoping that it will continue to have really good traction. There is a survey attached to that and Graduate students are more than welcome to fill that out, outlines experience with UW. The survey will help collect data and lobby this winter.

Next week is student safety awareness week, there are lots of cool events happening next week. Also, the “Safe Space Free Speech” panel will be then. Also, ASUW officially killed another entity, Off Campus Housing Affairs Advocates (OHA) was an entity of ASUW that they tried to kill. Basically functioned as craigslist but mainly benefited landlords. So, took OHA’s responsibility from OHA and gave it to ASUW OGR. Also, College game day is this Saturday. Moreover, ASUW is working on a professional business closet for students that graduates can definitely be a part of. They are working with Fosters School of Business to get business sponsorships with hope of creating a professional business attire closet for students who can’t afford nice professional attire for interviews.

Also, wants to talk about UW mindfulness change. UW mindfulness used to be housed under Health and Wellness but outgrew compacity so it moved over to the IMA. Since then IMA has swallowed the program, and has taken away student input there is also no student leadership really. It’s now just a fitness thing and all mindfulness components are gone. Really just like Yoga glasses, SAF funded them 120,000 dollars and now they are not using that money wisely in student’s opinions. There used to be 1500 members of UW mindfulness now there is 150 and before they had every class packed now they only have about 1 person attending classes. She is working with them to decide how they can potentially fit within ASUW, we have a working group there. If you know of any graduate students interested on being on that work group that would be good. If any of you have questions about the Senate, there was an act to remove their speaker, then you can ask Taylor.

Vice President of Internal Affairs: Hired director of Graduate Student Relations, Sam. Will be joining at some Executive meetings as his job requires understanding of stuff out of office. For program reviews Elloise and her have been meeting with Becky to get a better understanding on how to move forward. However, sounds like program proposal will go to regents tomorrow, and they weren’t notified on that so ideally Elloise and Sarah will try to sit in on meeting.

Elloise Kim: Program reviews will be represented between 9:30 am and 10:20 am.

Sarah Loeffler: Has been sitting on Tri-campus faculty Senate and has attended the taskforce as well. So, if there are any questions, that something she is working on.

Vice President of External Affairs: On behalf of GPSS he sent a letter in remembrance and appreciation to Senator Andy Hill, ASUW OGR did the same. He will be attending UW State relations legislative kick off next Tuesday in Olympia. WSA has general assembly meeting on November 19th in Ellensburg, that is the meeting where they will approve legislative agenda so a lot to talk about. Has a meeting with groups of Senators to help discern what their constituency specifically cared about for legislative agenda reasons. Matt and him have been working hard to create work groups among Graduate students, Undergraduate students and Faculty about specifically student debt and campus climate. State relations were very positive on that idea so

they will keep pushing forward. Wants to remind everyone to celebrate small victories. Democrats picked up a few seats in State House and didn't lose any in State Senate. SLAB is going pretty well, and they are pushing for December 4th agenda release date. He thanks everyone who contributed on that. Also "Get Out to Vote video" has over 2000 views. Also, 2.2 million people have voted in Washington already and the voting number is probably a record high.

Secretary: Diversity committee met, got 3 applications they have not decided on yet. They will meet a few more times. Senate meetings are coming along; food for next week will be Jimmy Johns. Last turnout at November 2nd meeting was 57% of Senators showed up.

Joseph Telegen: What was the change in Senators that showed up?

Randy Siebert: First meeting 43%, second meeting was 53%. Also, keep in mind that we have added a lot more seats since first meeting.

Treasurer: Today had Travel grants meeting to discuss fall applications, gave out good amount of money. Also, held F&B, had someone come in and it was a newer RSO so gave them some guidance and told them to comeback. She has been working on STF, which everyone heard about tonight quite a bit. She will hold GPSS and ASUW off the record talk on how they feel committee is going so far and any input they would like to give them and propose to STF. Just because it's hard to get everything done in a meeting because we don't have time. SAF started and it looks like a really good group of people.

President: Has been a long day since last night and hopes everyone feels not too flat and tired. Glad there is some good conversation across campus. Lots of people have checked up in the office to make sure everyone is okay. Board of Regents meeting is tomorrow in HUB 334. Program review will be discussed around 9:30 am to 10:20 am it would be great if people could come by. International Graduate Student group has been formed and they will meet sometime next week. Eloise along with James has met with Senators from different schools so far they have met with School of Medicine, Evans school and Public school will be next Tuesday. She will contact 6 more groups to meet with soon. The staff dinner will be tomorrow, and the Executive Senator dinner will be scheduled for November 20th.

Sarah Loeffler: As it stands it will be November 28th with Michaella being the only one that can't make it. If you have suggestions restaurant suggestions that are close to campus, we are hoping to get Michaella takeout before her class. (Joe still needs to give a response). She will send final email out soon.

Elloise Kim: Just handed out a copy of the letter she has been working on this afternoon, personally didn't feel proud that GPSS had not issued a statement or letter of support when there was a significant event in the nation or on campus. She wanted to do something considering how tense the climate has been. As a student government, we have to represent all voices, with help of other officers she made this draft. If everyone agrees we can issue it as a letter coming from the Executive boards not just officers.

Monica Viharo Cortes: Likes reaffirming commitment, but subtle call to action.

Joseph Telegen: Agrees with Monica, planned on coming tonight with resolution on condemnation of nonspecific language and sentiments, but will wait for another time. Happy to see something so positive produced already.

Elloise Kim: Will try to finalize letter after meeting and issue it right away.

Sarah Loeffler: Everyone feels comfortable that this is going out signed by Executive Senate?
(Yes)

Announcements

7:49pm

None.

Adjournment

7:49 pm