

Graduate & Professional Student Senate

GPSS Executive Committee Meeting- 1 April 2015

Meeting called to order at 5:40 p.m. by meeting chair Alice Popejoy

Members Present:

GPSS President Alice Popejoy
GPSS Treasurer Douglass Taber
GPSS Vice President Alex Bolton
GPSS Secretary Natalie Gordon
GPSS Office Manager Kerstin Hudon
GPSS Policy Analyst Brian Taubeneck
ASUW Representative Amber Amin
Executive Senator Elloise Kim
Executive Senator Evan Firth
Executive Senator Yasmeen Hussain
STF Chair Jared Miller
GPSS Senator Monica Cortes-Viharo

Approval of Agenda

Evan moved to approve the agenda, Elloise seconded.

Agenda for the meeting approved without objection.

Approval of Minutes

Natalie moved to approve the minutes, Yasmeen seconded.

Minutes approved without modification.

All Student Email Update- Census

Alice: Our child care survey was disguised as a census to prevent biases and other factors that might interfere with the results. We are approaching 10% response rates in the survey. We wanted to keep our data pure and clean so we can have an unbiased data collection. We have about 25% of respondents who are student parents, which is much higher than expected. In addition, roughly 80% of students have never heard of Student Parent Resource Center. About 60% of respondents are women, additionally, we have respondents from Tacoma and Bothell campuses, so I have to look into whether someone forwarded the survey, or our student body already counts the Tacoma and Bothell campuses. We have to figure out what the 15,000 really represents and who our constituents are. ASUW will follow up and will send the census to undergraduate students as well. We will be able to separate responses submitted by undergraduate students though. Also, not surprisingly, according to survey, the number one concern of students is affordability of education, then career and professional development and as child care goes, 70% roughly support the school raising money for building childcare services.

Questions on Census

Yasmeen: When people ask, can I tell them it is anonymous?

Alice: Yes, it is anonymous. Though if they say “yes, you can contact me” we will have access to their emails. Actually, it’s on catalyst, so no. No, it’s not anonymous because it’s tied to UW Net IDs, we know who is tied to what respond, but even if we share our data, we won’t share it tied to their identity, but rather use it as aggregated data. But for all intents and purposes, we should say it is anonymous.

Elloise: When is the close date?

Alice: We are still deciding on the closing date, but hopefully when it reaches 30%. I will say a couple more weeks max. If we get over 10%, I will be satisfied.

Elloise: If there is another reminder before the survey closes, it might remind more student and encourage higher participation.

Alice: Good idea, I will put a deadline on it as well.

STF Second Round Proposal Presentation - \$1.3 million left

Jared: We are doing another round of RFPs because we have about \$1.3 million left. If we don’t use it the money will roll over, but it is not ideal to not use it up. The only changes from this morning’s version are grammatical changes, and we also added language to clarify the requirement of dean signatures, that you can get it from the department of the dean, not necessary from hosting deans. We especially encourage students who are unable to get signatures from host dean to go to Student Life.

Alice: Office of the Dean- so it can be chair of the department? Can you point it out where this is? I think it’s important to talk about it when there was a bit of abuse of power at the school level, restricting the proposals that were coming in to STF by not allowing students with great ideas to do it because the deans have pet projects they want it for. We collectively think that they should be competitive. I think we agreed to let department signatures be completely legitimate signatures.

Jared: We agreed.

Alice: There is a typo on page 5- eligibility

Jared: Wonderful. As far as the dean’s signature, we can fix it if..

Alice: Can you just show it now? What page?

Jared: it’s under eligibility, in the middle of the page. Page 5 of the PDF, page 3 on the other file. The sentiment is not to require deans, but to require someone with logistical capability.

Rene: But the dean is sitting at the top of all levels, they have a priority list. If you go down to department level, I think it would be easier for student to access.

Jared: I would be happy to change deans to departmental chairs.

Alice: I am sending an email to you on the modification of the language, so it will be very specific.

Jared: What language are you think about now?

Alice: Currently the sentence we are having trouble with is that “ the authors’ proposals must be approved by their deans or any equivalent.” Change to “the authors proposals must be approved by a department chair or equivalent.” A department Chair is Program Director if it’s interdisciplinary program and it’s not a set department.

Yasmeen: Can we just include all titles, including Program Director and etc in it?

Elloise: There is a plurals issue in the paper. In the same sentence with the deans.

Alice: New language is “the author’s proposal must be approved by their departmental chair, program equivalent, or dean.”

Jared: Anything else?

Alice: Can you talk about the priority for student use?

Jared: It is owned by STF for student use for 3 years for any proposal under \$50,000 and 7 years for any proposals over \$50,000. After that period, it’s same policy that belongs to that department. We encourage to remain available for student use, but it’s never our policy to enforce that.

Alice: Why is that?

Jared: Because it would be a bit too much for us to check up on. We also never really talked about it this year or last year.

Alice: \$50,000 is not insubstantial, but it seems strange that there’s no policy in STF that says not that we recommend students to be able to continue to use it, but we require that this is always something that students are able to access and have priority to access. But you have an internal policy, students can come to you.

Jared: I have not spoken to the committee about this, so I am not sure if I want to change the policy in this meeting. I agree with you, but I am not sure if we can change that now. We can discuss this in the future, and make all fundings contingent upon the time of appointment.

Alice: I wonder if there is a way that you can make the language stronger, without changing the policy. “ the policy must be for student purposes.....” Can you put strongly encouraged? I will be there on Friday for 30 minutes at the meeting. Was there anything that Eddie mentioned in the email that I didn’t address?

Yasmeen: The timeline is really short

Jared: Purposefully. We want to give out money as soon as possible. We don't want it to sit in our bank account for another year. We have two weeks to write proposals, one week for meeting at the office, one week to pass it. We cap it at \$100,000 and ensure not one proposal gets all the funding.

Alice: Another thing Eddie brought up is the communication of this.

Jared: Since Fall quarter, we have seen this as a problem and we have been reworking the strategy on how to communicate this. We have been working with the Daily on running an ad campaign, we are trying to email this out to everyone through all email lists, and all ex officios. 2:00pm on Monday is our meeting time.

Alice: I will be your ex-officio. I will attend.

Jared: The point is we have a plan. Hopefully we will have a trial run next week. In addition we will be working on rebranding, and redesigning our logo. We will be making banners and signs for next rounds.

Alice: Are you planning on having UW IT in these?

Jared: Yes, UW IT and Libraries, and every department.

Alex: We can be resources too.

Alice: Do you want to come to our meeting Wednesday?

Jared: I would be happy to come to any Senate meeting.

Yasmeen: HUB 145 5:30PM.

Jared: I might also send our Communication Officer to the Meeting

Alice: Have you guys approved this yet at ASUW Amber?

Amber: No, our meeting is tomorrow.

Approval of STF Proposal

Alice: I will entertain a motion to approve STF's RFP presented to us by Jared with the following changes on page 3 of the document and page 5 on PDF, eligibility changed to eligibility, and then in the sixth paragraph, change from deans to department chairs, and change the language to "strongly encourages" Also, can we add accessibility? I will entertain the motion to approve the aforementioned changes.

Natalie: So moved, Evan: Seconded. Passed without objection.

Application of Increase Minimum Wage of Student Employees.

Alice: Yesterday, I got a call around noon, informing me that we have around until 5:00 o'clock yesterday to have a position on whether or not the University should increase minimum wage to \$11/hr by today, which is the deadline to be part of this in the city of Seattle. Since we haven't discussed this yet at GPSS, I wanted to bring it up here. The minimum wage policy is approved by the City of Seattle to increase incrementally every six months so the first stage is \$11 all the way up to \$15 went into effect today. Some high profile newspaper said that UW hasn't taken a position on this. Basically what UW has been hearing from their employees is that the city minimum wage does not apply to them because it is a state institution so it does not apply. Obviously this is very upsetting for many campus organizations and it was a difficult position to be in as GPSS and ASUW presidents to take a position on this applied to student employees, so if they get backlash one way or the other, they can say we consulted students about this. The university has only about 70 employees total who fall before under \$11/hr, so they have all agreed that they will bring it up to \$11, with no intention to match it up to \$15 in the future. Just a stop gag at \$11 currently, and a statement has been issued. There are a lot of students who are being paid under \$11/hr, thankfully not GPSS. If SAF-funded units are required to go up to \$11, that's a huge increase to the SAF unit, and would basically bankrupt SAF, which would highly affect GPSS because we are funded by SAF. They wouldn't be able to fund our funding request. This is a tricky situation to be in, especially with administration asking us to respond within 5 hours. So we had a meeting over the phone, and we essentially decided that in theory, we supported increasing student wages, however, because of the short time line, and the uncertainty about how this might impact us, we can't take an official position on whether we support this by today. So that's kind of the position that we independently gave. The additional complications that are raised are that we can't just raise the SAF fee to meet the minimum wage requirement, because we haven't consulted students on that, and I think it's ethically problematic. If we do increase minimum wage and cause student employee layoffs because it costs more, then you are actually paying fewer number of students with a lot more burden. In state laws, the SAF fee cannot be raised, we can only increase SAF fees in proportion to tuition increases. If we did in fact decide to raise the SAF fee above and beyond inflation to be able to pay for this, we will have to lobby for this to the legislature. I think we should bring this up at the Senate meeting to get some student feedback and thoughts. It's a really big issue, and I am not comfortable with only me, or only this exec body making this decision.

Doug: I am glad that we have time to dissect what it is going to be, because it affects SAF and it will have significant effects on us.

Rene: Using Senate, and using the undergraduate senate is a good way to start collecting opinions and suggestions. You can also put issues on the ballot for the election in April

Alice: If your lowest paid worker gets wage increases, other workers' wages will also need to increase, I think we should have additional outreach on this issue in addition to bringing it up in Senate. We should also send out a catalyst for those people who might have a strong opinion on this issue to have a platform.

Brian: We need to figure out, at this point, what our legal options are.

Alice: To our ability to increase the fee?

Alex: The policy stuff is pretty much dead, but the budgeting is still an issue.

Alice: Mandatory fees are also part of the union contract. It's state legislature, but it's also the Union. Any other questions? Feel free to send me emails, otherwise we can just table this.

Yasmeen: Can we write a note that we can have a link to related articles on minimum wage so they can be prepared for the conversation? Maybe Ana-Mari's statement, or a UW article that would link to it.

Update on GPSS Budget Request to SAF

Doug: In our Senate meeting we approved our budget with an increase of \$65,963 from the previous year, that 7.3% and mandatory increases which is about a 10% actual increase from the cost of the restructure, which is really good, so good job for F&B and the committee for adding a new position with a tight budget. It could have been a \$68,000 increase but with all the hard work and consolidation efforts, we got to a much more reasonable number. I think SAF will like what we are doing, and considering how much we are doing with the increase, it is very impressive.

Alice: Do you have a document that you can send out to everyone

Doug: The one I sent this afternoon is pretty much it.

Natalie: When is SAF deciding whether to fund us?

Doug: April 10th.

Alice: And you are working with Patricia to talk about that?

Doug: Yes. SAF has a lot on its plate.

Alice: The next Monday is the deadline for getting your information on the website so we can wait until we hear from SAF.

Doug: SAF gave \$15,000 more for departmental requests.

Update on Restructure - Timeline

Alice: Deadline to post application on the website is April 14th, and the election is happening on the 22nd.

Natalie: The deadline is April 13th, and we are posting the information on the website on April 14th.

Alice: Doug, did Marlee ever send you stuff on the budget document?

Doug: On the questionnaire? I read through what she sent. I incorporated that.

Alice: An additional thing about the budget is the issue of tuition compensation that we give officers. If we have 5 officers who are third year law students or two law students and two fee-based program students, it would entirely bankrupt our budget. We will have no parties, no programs, no staff, and no nothing. So an idea that has been floating around is try to cap that

tuition compensation at tuition based compensation, which is problematic for students who are fee-based, because that's not their full tuition, and my heart bleeds for them, because fee-based programs is one of the issues that I have been crusading this entire year. However, given the sustainability of GPSS, we cannot have that liability moving forward. So I have had conversations with the president of the local UAW to make sure that we are not stepping on any toes, because the Union contract states that we are bound to provide full tuition coverage, or cost of education coverage for any graduate student employee, which we currently define as officers. The meeting I had with the president was positive and we came to the understanding the GPSS does indeed need a 5th officer, and this is an undo liability for our organization to have that requirement. The one concern we share is that if they make an exception for us, other programs may follow and disadvantage fee-based program students. The strongest point we have now is that we are an entirely student funded unit, we are the only one, aside from ASUW, that doesn't get any other university money, other than for parties and stuff. But the procedures we have to go through is that we have to go through UAW to write it into the university contract that the student government would be exempt from the tuition coverage under the Union Contract. I think that's something we can feasibly get. I haven't received any confirmation from the president, but I think if we make a strong case that SAF is not going to fund us because of that liability issue, without this tuition compensation cap.

Doug: I think it's reasonable to cap that compensation.

Alice: We are talking about the fee-based programs that are 40% higher than the highest paying tuition programs. And those students, because the University changed the policy on who is responsible for paying, for fulfilling that UAW contract, is now the hiring department. So departments now just simply don't hire students from fee-based programs anymore. Instead of cutting them all off, we can just set a cap. I am waiting to hear back from the Union. It's important, should we decide, that we fully disclose our decision at the meeting for the election packet intro.

Doug: Would we cap to the highest non-fee based tuition?

Alice: I like tying it to highest tuition based program instead of the law school.

Evan: Can we say average?

Alice: Average the highest tuition based programs?

Evan: I think the average of the top X percent would be the best solution

Yasmeen: would that knock people out?

Natalie: Yes, it would.

Alice: For FY15, the highest tuition I have seen is graduate tier-3 Master of Public Health, Master of Public Affairs, College of Built Environment, Dental (55.4, highest)

Doug: If you want, you can send it to F&B to look at it.

Alice: I would be more comfortable to have a sense in the Senate to make sure which direction we are going.

Alex: I have some concerns: the relationships with the unions haven't been good. We might need to desegregate to ensure other students don't get affected.

Evan: Student government is funded by only student fees so it may be exempt from such requirements. I did a quick model of this- it adds up to about \$63,000 (average of top 3) , if you take the average of top 6 it works out to about \$50,000, and then \$44,000

Yasmeen: We can't actually fund 5 people at that level. We can't even fund graduate students out of state at tier 3.

Doug: Also, a lot of it is out of state tuition right?

Evan: Is the cap based on in-state?

Kerstin: If you remain a student employee or you receive scholarships, you count as in-state.

Alice: We have fully revised the election packet with a new time line and the new officer descriptions we presented at the last Senate meeting. Where are we on the bylaws?

Natalie: I have received the bylaw revisions, judicial met yesterday, and we split up, we will do them individually, and we will compile our thoughts on Tuesday and present them at the meeting. Alex and I tag teamed on writing the amendments.

Evan: So back to the model with in-state tuition, if we take top 10% it's \$38,000, 35%, it's \$33,000...(Law & JD, Medical)

Kerstin: I was reading about fee-based program, it's typically the same for in-state, and out of state.

Alice: What can we actually afford? What's our max?

Alex: I think it was \$115,000 for 5. (35% \$33,000)

Yasmeen: We proposed \$117,000, if we have three people at \$33,000, it's a difference of \$20,000. That leaves \$20,000 for the other two people. It's not a permanent fix.

Evan: Capping it high (highest at 35,000) is still within \$8,000 of the max. That is if you get a bunch of MBA, JD, Dental students, you are still not completely screwed. But if you just get one person from College of Built Environment those all have range from \$ 15,000-16,000 each, so they are all well under the cap, and they can go to fund others.

Alice: So can we have a policy where if we have extra, that it goes back into it. And the remainder who is not being covered...

Rene: The bigger issue is getting through this now, you can deal with the personnel thing later on a case by case basis.

Alice: So are we at a rough agreement at the top 50% of graduate resident tuition?

Evan: We can include graduate and professional, includes anything tuition based.

Alice: Make sure you explain the in-state part. Also make sure to explain that the out of state and in state difference does not make a physical impact. I am more than willing to present this.

Natalie: It's too late to incorporate this in the bylaws before we go to the Senate if we are going to be in accordance with our bylaws procedures.

Alice: I thought Judicial has the ability.

Natalie: No, they only review the changes, but we can add it at the meeting.

Alice: Can F&B discuss this before the meeting, and if F&B can be the one to propose the amendment, that would be awesome, and I can clarify questions. If you guys can get that to Natalie by Tuesday!

Doug: We can talk about it tomorrow at F&B, it's not on our agenda, but we will try to get it done by then.

Natalie: Do we want to write all those in to our bylaws for the next meeting or just move forward with this general direction? I think it would be better to wait to hear from the union before we change this in our bylaws.

Alice: We should still have F&B do a presentation but not do the bylaws yet. But we should inform the elections committee about it

Doug: I move to make a recommendation for F&B to draft this, so I can go to F&B to add this on the agenda. Evan: Seconded

Agenda For Senate Meeting

Alice: The deadline to submit the Student Regent application is May 1st. The full Student Regent application packet is done. It's going live tomorrow. I will send an all-student email to advertise it. We will have two weeks for students to respond to those emails and apply for Regent. It will be two weeks of intense work. I would like to appoint Elloise, and I have two more spots, is anyone else interested? (Monica- Exec and Kerstin-internal) Your participation is contingent on your availability. If you are celebrating 4/20, you are also ineligible. (Laughs)
Spotlight- Melissa Watkinson - NOIS (Native Organization of Indigenous Scholars) 10 minutes
Student Tech Fee presentation on Second Round RFP (advertise) 5 minutes

Update from Election Committee- Bylaws

Mental Health Resolution Presentation (5 mins)

Another Judicial Member Election

Update from Ad-Hoc Committee (Colin) Bylaw Revision - Natalie presents

Bylaw Revision Approval (20mins)

Presentation of Revised Election Packet

Approval of Revised Election Packet

Discussion for Minimum Wage Increases for Student Employees.

- Natalie: when is the compensation cap discussion coming in in the meeting?
- Alice: I think we should talk about it in the presentation of the revised election packet because that's when we are officially opening the conversation.
- Natalie: You can just say Alice Popejoy and Election Committee. You can just talk about it briefly before they do their thing.
- Alice: So presentation on revised GPSS election packet. (15mins)

Alice: What is our total on this? It's only two hours.

Alex: I would like to do a legislative update. The budgets are out.

Alice: If you can give Natalie slides on Legislative update during the VP update, rather than just doing verbal update, I think slides would be helpful.

Alex: Ok.

Alice: Because we have 20 minutes for Officer Reports.

Yasmeen: Can we cut down the Officer Report section and put separate Legislative Update section? Just so people know what we are going to be talking about.

Alice: Ok, let's give you a separate legislative update. It's right before anyways. Can we make this more appealing than just legislative update?

Natalie: I think at that point of the meeting, short and sweet is going to hit home more than talking longer. Alex: It would not just be talking, but people asking questions.

Alice: Natalie, who is giving the presentation on judicial? You know what I am going with this. Just make sure that whoever is holding the judicial presentation....

Natalie: It would be, at least, me, Devin.

Alice: Just make sure on your presentation, it is not robust.

Natalie: Ok.

Alice: Let's give you 15 instead of 20. What if you do it?

Natalie: Ok.

Alice: oh! How about State and Legislative Update? Because you are going to be talking about states right? (OK)

Natalie: I think we should keep our agenda one page right? (Alice: yes) Are we done with it? I can do it while we are doing Officer Report.

Alice: Student regent. I guess I can just do it in my report, I just feel like it needs something.

Yasmeen: Can we announce the opening of Student Regents in 1 minute? Well, people are going to get an all-student email about it, right? And also the next meeting.

Alice: I will do it in the beginning and just get it out of the way. I will do one minute.

Natalie: that agenda looks really packed. Is it download ready now?

- Alice: Entertain motion to approve the agenda | Natalie: So move. | Alex: Second
- Agenda passed without objections

Executive Senator Report

Yasmeen: We are just working on STF oversight now. It's going great. I will email you things.

Amber (ASUW): Yeah, nothing especially big to report, but happy to be back.

Alex: Budgets are out, House and Senate Budgets, they are very different. There are some cool things that we advocated for are included in the House Budget, pending, with potential new taxes such as more residencies for medical students, and also, house protect UW medicine program is Spokane by transferring most of the money from WSU to us, and continue. Senate basically said that WSU and UW, despite their divorce, should work things out. (possible collaboration with GSA?) That's the budget in a nutshell, if you have more questions, please let me know.

Doug: On behalf of Travel Grant, awesome committee, we are doing a lot of good work to close- so basically out of the 12 months of a year, we only fund people for about 9 of those, so we are trying to close that gap to increase accessibility. Finding ways to introduce small meetings to close that gap. Travel grants are down \$7,700 which is right on schedule. Budget is done, and tuition cap thing will be worked on. SAF meeting should be very interesting, because we will be talking about wage increase. Also, eventually fixing the accounting code.

Natalie: Diversity committee is meeting on Friday, so we have three applications to go over, which is grea. We are going to plan our events. Judicial committee, despite the heavy turnover, is extremely active, and has a lot of great idea. We are going over the bylaws now.

Alice: quick mention: mandatory U-Pass fee for graduate students who are not in Seattle. That is one of the most coherent issues I get in emails I have received. They made a really eloquent case on why they shouldn't pay the U-Pass fee, and I agree. So I will go to the U-Pass Advisory Board meeting this week or early next week.

Meeting Adjourn

Natalie: move to adjourn | Alex: Second

Alice: Adjourn!

Meeting adjourned 7:45 pm.

