

**Graduate & Professional Student Senate**  
GPSS Senate Meeting- 29 April 2015

Meeting called to order at 5:35 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  
ASUW Representative Amber Amin  
Executive Senator Elloise Kim  
Executive Senator Evan Firth (via Skype)  
Executive Senator Yasmeen Hussain  
[Executive Senator Eddie Schwieterman](#)  
Treasurer Elect/ Office Manager: Kerstin Hudon  
Associated Dean/ Ex-Officio of Graduate School: Kelly Edwards  
VP Elect-Internal Affairs/ Senator: Monica Cortes Viharo  
Assistant VP of Student Life/ Director of Counseling Center: Ellen Taylor  
Director of CSSC: Elizabeth Louis

**Approval of Agenda**

Yasmeen moved to approve the agenda, Elloise seconded.  
Agenda for the meeting approved without objection.

**Approval of Minutes**

Yasmeen moved to approve the minutes, Elloise seconded.  
Minutes approved without modification.

**Ellen & Elizabeth on Revision of Student Code of Conduct**

Alice: I hope everyone received the student code of conduct revision, we have been very involved in this process and I received an email with suggestion from Eddie. Now we will have Ellen and Elizabeth give us an overview of our progress.

Elizabeth: I would like to echo that Alice and Aaron have been very important assets in the process and so were their predecessors. Your voices have been represented throughout the process, and hopefully we are coming to the end of this process. Hopefully we will have a revised student code of conduct. So I know that Alice has sent the revisions out to you, and the executive summary. There's a few things that we would like to highlight and we can answer any questions you might have. The executive summary is 2 pages. I came to the University in 2007 and I have done student conduct work in various locations around the country. When I first got here and I saw the student conduct code, I still had no idea what the heck it meant. So I had to draw myself a picture to figure things out. It was very confusing. I thought to myself, if I can't understand this document, and I have read codes from other institutions, how are students

supposed to navigate this process and advocate for themselves? So in 2007 we started to think about what we can do to change this. In 2010 at the very end of the year, we created a large committee on what we can do with the student conduct code. We had some goals in mind, like making the process more streamlined. We wanted to review the off-campus conduct code. The off campus conduct code has three divisions currently. If the court of competent jurisdiction finds you guilty of a major crime anywhere in the world, and if the university thinks there might be any interest involved, the university can take actions against that student. So the victim doesn't have to be UW affiliated. The second part of the code is if you engage in physical harm or abuse and the victim is UW faculty or student, then we can take action under student conduct code. The third issue is regarding the quality of life issue in the North of 45th Area. We deal with noise and other issues in that area. One of the things we were noticing is that we are getting cyber harassment, stalking, sexual assault that is not rape, those kind of things. We were having a hard time proving when we suspended those students where is the physical harm and abuse because the harm might be psychological or not physical, or there's not a broken bone to show. So that was the reason that we wanted to revisit that section, because we realized that part of the code wasn't allowing us to be responsive to the kind of things that student were asking us. The third is to look at whether we want to implement some kind of medical leave in the student conduct code. Most institutions have some kind of involuntary medical leave, and it was tied to their student conduct code. We quickly decided to leave that project for a number of reason. The department of Education and the Department of Justice came up with the conclusion which said that University couldn't take action against students that are harm to self kind of things. And those were usually the reasons why students would be placed on medical leave. And so that was clear that that wasn't something that we wanted to pursue. So we also noticed that a comprehensive review of the code has not been done since 1990. What had been done with most of the tweaks had a lot of inconsistencies. So we wanted something that would be much easier to navigate. Another thing is that, in our current code, it lumps things together, for example, "it is violation of student conduct code to unlawfully possess alcohol or drugs." And so it is lumped together. And that's problematic because when we are charging students with violation of 3G, they would say "I had beer at the football game, why would you say I have drugs." Likewise, the sexual offenses were all lumped together. So it says "Rape and sexual harassment" and so when we charge student with sexual harassment, it may not be a high level thing, they would say that they didn't rape anyone, or assault anyone. So getting them to focus on the piece we want to talk about is really difficult. So our proposed code, you will see that we have expanded a lot about what is the prescribed conduct. And really what we have done is that we unpacked the current student conduct code and clarified a lot of what is there that didn't have any definition, so making the structure difference was an important part to us. So in terms of moving forward. We expanded the definitions, and clarified the structure, we have given each section its own WAC. We hope that in the future it will help make some changes easier rather than having to do something comprehensive. If we don't have the definition down right, we have a good system to fix it. We have changed the jurisdiction of the code to sort of say that the code applies to you regardless of where you are. It would allow us to take action under the student conduct code if it happens off campus. A lot of people ask that if I get caught drinking off Capitol Hill, are you going to take action? Well probably not, because I am not going to know about that. I am not scouring the newspaper. But it would allow us to take action if it happens during a conference that you are attending in Washington DC. It would allow us to take action on things that would affect your ability to be a student. So if Ellen and I go to a conference, and I did something inappropriate at the conference, and we have to work together, that's going to allow the University to take action to protect Ellen and her educational interests in the institution.

And we have created a separate process for discriminatory harassment and sexual misconduct, and this is an all faculty and staff board, no students sit on this board, and it will be one for the university. The reason we did that is because that group needs to have specialized training on an annual basis. We know that not one shot of training is going to be helpful, there's going to need to be a lot of trainings to be effective as a board. It is hard work when you are sitting there listening to someone talk about their experience. The review of complaints go to the university conduct board, and the appeals go to the President for the review.

Alice: When you are referring to sexual misconduct, do you mean blocks 340 through 344? Because I know that we changed the language from misconduct in the code itself.

Elizabeth: Yes. So if you look, we actually define sexual misconduct in the definition to be able to use one thing but Alice was really helpful in crafting what we were talking about in terms of sexual assault and so sexual assault was one time called sexual misconduct, but we have named that sexual assault. Then sexual misconduct was used to identify a variety of things including relationship violence, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual exploitation, indecent exposures, so we sort of use that as a catch all phrase.

Ellen: Under that umbrella term is also the discriminatory harassment, all of those things that were under the conduct that Elizabeth was just highlighting is in the purple color. One of the things about that side is that a complaint in those cases has its right for appeals on the gold side, on the campus conduct board side. So that's the other reason why we wanted to use the umbrella term, we want that to be true, whether it's sexual assault or stalking or hate related activities that's based on gender orientation and race .

Alice: And I just wanted to say that Elizabeth and Ellen were both amazingly receptive when we came to them about our concerns about this and other student groups like SARVA to be really involved in this process to prevent sexual harassment on campus. It's been a real pleasure to work with them even though it's kind of still in the weeds. I think it's important, and I have been really impressed with their receptiveness.

Elizabeth: It was great because I read this thing so many times, I can't see things anymore, I know a few times in this, it says court, instead of course, so it was great to have another pair of eyes and great to have a fresh perspective.

Yasmeen: Why isn't there an appeal allowed on violation on codes, not on sexual misconduct?

Elizabeth: We don't want to give faculty the right of appeal for academic misconduct cases.

Eddie: So if you cheat on something, and the board said you didn't, there's no evidence to say you cheated, the faculty can't go and say oh you cheated, I wanted to appeal this.

Elizabeth: Yes, and that's what had happened. And it's one of the reasons that we don't allow it. It can start to become very nasty.

Ellen: Some of it is recognizing the power of faculty already has over student life, so this is sort of a way to have neutral body evaluating student misconduct. Use that as the best example, cheating, plagiarism, or whatever, a neutral body to evaluate that, and faculty who already has fair amount of power in that relationship to then continue to sort of put it back in the hopper and say that okay the neutral body looked at it, and decided that you were not responsible, you did not cheat, and we want to be able to close.

Elizabeth: And another thing with the board is that there is one on each campus, and that one does have a student, and the one on Seattle campus, it says at least one student has to be from the graduate and professional student group, and we have been really successful in recruiting those people to sit on those boards. Right now it is assigned randomly. But in the future, we want to be able to have an application process or have them appointed by GPSS but for now it is still random.

Eddie: I think it's a great comprehensive re-do of this document. I think this is very fair for everyone involved. I was wondering, why ~~it doesn't~~doesn't it use gender neutral terms? Is there some legal reasons that ~~we~~it can't?

Elizabeth & Ellen: Oh yes, there is. So we tried. We tried to get rid of "his and hers" as much as possible. And the reason is it is part of the Washington Administrative Code, and so it has to go before the Rules Coordinating Committee in the state legislature. And the state has not adopted "their" or "they" in their state language in Washington Administrative work.

Eddie: Is there a way to maybe say somewhere in the document, where we use gender terms, him/her, that we recognize the complainant or accused might not identify ~~with that~~with those terms?

Ellen: We will look into that, because we sort of bumped into that, I am not sure it ~~is legal~~is a legal issue but rather a procedural issue. It is one of those the rule coordinator said, it will never get through. They will just kicked it right back to you. I would like to try to figure out a way to say it in the preamble or somewhere else, some acknowledgement that we are not using gender neutral language, and that we are aware that what you have said.

Eddie: Because we don't want to end up with the possibility that you know, that there's a complaint from a gender neutral person who's potentially been sexually assaulted, and now ~~has they have~~ this code that they are working through that doesn't recognize their existence.

Elizabeth: We have cases like that when we are working with transgender students or people who are transitioning even. In our language, in our outcome letter, we use their name every single time. We stay away from the pronouns completely, because we really want to be sensitive to that. What we can do is that in the material we put around this document, we can name the elephant in the room rather than pretending that it's not there. And really try to bring awareness around that.

Ellen: We will also push a little bit. We will do a second push with the rules coordinator. It seems like a really hard law, but I think it's worth a second push. We can say that we met with out students, and this was one of the things that continue to come up. And we are the University of Washington, we ought to be operating under the 21st century in terms of language that we use.

Elizabeth: Trust me the committee was well on board. We had one draft that had “their” and “theirs” throughout the entire thing. It got a little confusing.

Ellen: So a lot of it we just try to avoid using pronouns altogether.

Elizabeth: Another thing that we can do is that we can take a look back at the document to see if there’s anyway to avoid his or her altogether. And see if there’s a different way that we can phrase that. I think that’s really good feedback? Other questions? Observations? Comments?

Natalie: I have an extremely minor one, are you going to add page numbers to make it easier to navigate? Or is it not possible.

Elizabeth: So at the printed documented, it would still be my friend, the table of contents.

Yasmeen: Eddie, I commented by email that, your executive summary request that GPSS make a resolution presumably this year. The things is that with this year there is only one more meeting left after the next one. We can’t do it this next week, because we don’t have one already written, unless someone already has it written. So we will do it in a couple weeks hopefully? But yeah.

Natali: I will need to receive it by May 6 to get it passed on the 20th. We are going to have a huge resolution line up on the 20th. Maybe.

Alice: The other thing that we can do in move of resolution is just, we can send out this version of code of conduct tonight and just let senators know that we will vote to move forward. Can we do that procedurally?

Eddie: That’s kind of what we did for U-Pass. And we could just write a shell resolution.

Elizabeth: That would be helpful actually. Because the reason we wanted to do this is so Alex is incoming GPSS president. So in terms of next steps on what has to happen, we are trying to get all of the student government support for this year. Because you all have been working so hard on it this year. But we know the public hearing on WAC would be next year, it would be October and hopefully it would be going to the board of regent in November. And it would passed in November, and it would go into effect in December, but we say it launch January one. So we know that they will ask what does GPSS thinks about this at the meeting, so it’s really important for us that has something that says you formally do support this document in this process.

Alex: Are we trying to get it before the Regents? Are there still amendments that can happen in the faculty council?

Ellen and Elizabeth: good question

Alex: I just don’t want to support a premature document.

Elizabeth: If you are supporting a premature document, we will come back and we will not hold you against that. We will not hold it against you. So with faculty senate, we have hope that it would move from the faculty to senate exec committee to the senate in May. Unfortunately we are not able to do it at this time. And so it will go before the faculty council and student affairs on May 5th, they devoted their last meeting to that, and May 4th is the Senate Executive Meeting. And so it can't go before the 20th. Basically, it is about the resolution process. They are going to take it through Class B Legislation, which is what they did with the code revision in 2007, and so basically it goes to the senate and faculty would vote on it, and then they send it to president for the signature. But this can't be active upon president's signature because the Washington Administrative Code, it's not the right process. But It's the only process to let them say that they are in support of this.

Alice: Can I just check in really quickly? Because we are way over time? Entertain motion to extend by 3 minutes.

Evan: So moved | Eddie: Second | No objections

Elizabeth: That's hopefully what the next steps are.

Alice: I sit on the exec committee now, and next year would be Alex. So that's helpful. Although we are non-voting.

Ellen and Elizabeth: that's okay. Student voice is really important in this. Because this is the code that will have great impact on students life. Your voice really matter.

Natalie: I guess I have a little bit hesitation of passing the resolution even on faith that changes would not be held against us. Because this is such an important document

Yasmeen: I wonder if we could, address that concern by passing the resolution that says we support changes to the student conduct code that review the general conclusion, but not the final document.

Alice: So here is what I would recommend and propose if you are willing. To come and speak at the senate at the next meeting next week and get a general sense from the senate next week and from there draft a general resolution and go from there on. And you will have a chance to check in on the gender language, and we can bring that into the discussion, and you can say that you went to both exec and senate meetings, and this continues to be a thing that students are very concerned about. And following up on that we can write a resolution, like Eddie said, a pretty basic one approving or not approving moving to next by the 6th, and we can have a quick vote, if we have an extensive presentation on it. Is that something that you would like?

Natalie: We may not have time, that's my only concern. It's really full already.

Alice: How about for next week, if yall just want to save the date for our meeting, and if for whatever reason we are totally crunched for our time, then we can push it back two weeks, would that be alright?

The meeting is 5:30 in Hub 145 on May 6th.

Ellen and Elizabeth: okay we will do that.

**Student Technology Oversight Committee:**

Yasmeen: Student technology fee has in its bylaws the stipulation that the GPSS and ASUW will convene for oversight every three years to check in on the Student Tech Fee, how it's been run, managed, and to make recommendations on policy changes. We did convene this year, and we met in February, and we just finished meeting this month. There were two members of ASUW, three members of GPSS and some members of the Student Tech Fee, who attended the meetings regulatory wand also Sarah who is the HUB student advisor to student tech fee. We discussed many things. We discussed questions that have come up in GPSS meetings before. We made recommendations to STF to change the marketing strategy or add things to the marketing strategy because we recognize that having a good marketing strategy is a way of increasing the visibility of STF on campus, so they get better application turnout and to ensure that people who are coming to the university receive information about this fee. But basically we are looking at online presence, and on campus presence. They had the second round of applications. They are expecting 42 applications. And the strategy is obviously working. Speaking of RFP, we hope that the STF will reduce jargon in proposals. For example, RFP means nothing to many people, so in proposals, changes like that on their website and planning effective marketing to get more people who aren't necessarily familiar with the STF funding process in. So in our exec group, we discussed that STF convene membership. Because as GPSS, we have members on STF, so a few concerns were brought up by both GPSS and ASUW members and also the STF members. One thing is that there wasn't always a smooth transition into the next year, so the recommendation we came up with is trying to appoint members in the Spring quarter to be on the committee for the next year. So that's ASUW, GPSS, and ex-officio members. And also to encourage students without a technology background to be on the committee to appoint appropriate STF member for the following year. We thought it would be helpful for them to have consistent meeting time. It's just like ASUW and GPSS have. They have come up with some meeting time next year, and we will see how that goes. And we did investigate the number of GPSS and ASUW members. STF has been committed to continuing to review its membership, and is content with the notion of adding more graduate students internally. So the STF is reviewing internal policy review, and they shared with us some of their documents. They were considering the possibility of having more graduate students and one more ex-officio attendee who have more knowledge on subject matters and more opinions to put in. They produced a yearly funding plan that we approved every year, and we thought that it would be useful if they had a budget, and in there it had line by line budget. We will pay the Chair this much, we will spend this much on hours, all those things that were usually not included. And they also added job descriptions, and also raised their employee wages to the Seattle Minimum wage, which they thought would be feasible considering they only had one person that wasn't having that right now. A couple other things came up this year, they are now starting to accept signatures of deans of department or department chairs on the applications. Their annual report that the department required to submit is used as measurement, if the department complies, it's used as a measuring stick for future funding. So if they never submit their report that can be factor in funding proposals. And in the interim review policies, we had some opinion on internal reviewing policy review. Since they are content with their review, we encouraged them to continue taking in our review on an ad-hoc, less formal basis. They have their own perspective, we will continue to give them ideas as they come up.

Elloise: How many employee STF have right now?

Yasmeen: They have the chair, the program coordinator, and the communications director.

Elloise: So when you talk about the minimum wage, who does it affect?

Yasmeen: Yes, they also pay external contractors sometime, they are currently paying someone to help them design the website. So there's only one person right now that's under the minimum wage.

Eddie: you meant ~~the~~ \$15/hr.

Yasmeen: yes.

Eddie: I would just like to add, in terms of ~~advertisement~~, advertisement: one thing we suggested to STF was to create a brochure promoting the STF and the funding. And the brochure can be brought by the graduate volunteers who are going to all the orientations that GPSS organizes. We promote travel grants, and departmental funds, ~~But~~ but if you compare what STF has, their fund is enormous. So it would be an outlet to get graduate students to be more aware of STF. Also we asked STF to be more proactive in communicating with us so people can be more aware of RFP and departmental proposals, focusing on getting student-center projects, and graduate-center focus project. Expertise ~~thing~~ is a lot more important to the graduate students than for undergraduates. So just thinking about ~~whowhom~~ whom we are appointing, and just make sure it's someone that kind of has the tech experience. And one of the ex-officio is a treasurer on STF would be a good idea. They also asked if GPSS is going to submit a proposal for the second round RFP. We don't have anything planned but it's a possibility that we can get some funding through STF at some point. So we might want to consider that at some point. Just in general, it is important to take a proactive stand on the oversight. STF is a 5 million organization from student fees, so ~~it's~~ it's definitely worth our attention.

Alice: I will just say on the appointment front, we have our STF appointment like any other university committee appointment. Whoever applies, we interview, and if we say yes, they can have the job. Kind of like first come first served. But I think there is room for us in the bylaws to specify an internal policy that would help direct us to expertise driven pool of people on that committee. So I think that's a good point. We will have a few pretty senior members. So we have a few executive liaisons to STF who have been around a long time and know the ropes. And we did have some competition this year, so it is sort of a more contested situation. But for now we have over representation in this particular field, so we want to probably avoid that. So that's something to keep in mind as well. I have some questions regarding some of the discussion you guys had, and something came to my mind, but I don't know if you guys wound up talking about it. Was there ever a discussion on how to enforce the student access and use to the technology and the timeline on that happening? And I think at one point we talk about the language and policy that we encourage you to have student access beyond the point of STF but then nothing beyond that..? Do you talk about that at all?

Yasmeen: We did talk about that, I also had a conversation with the STF advisors, and basically STF has



three years of ownership of equipment and it's 7 years if it is very expensive equipment. But basically what it means is oversight over the running of equipment. So the reason the STF is limited to that number is because they don't have the means or person power to go check in with every department that has ever had a piece of equipment every year for the indefinite amount of time. So they thought the three years would be enough to instill the habit of having student access. Now as far as the language of encouraging departments, I think it came up, and they said they are going to have it in their policy review, but I am not sure where that is. That's a good question, I can check in with them that they are talking about that.

Alice: Yes that would be great. It's just something about it even saying that, even if we can't enforce it, sometime like we required that student always have access to this. Giving you this, is based on the good faith that student will always have access to this. I am not sure, but I think it is worth exploring.

Yasmeen: To answer your previous question, GPSS president is non-voting ex-officio.

Alice: Okay. I just couldn't made it to any meetings this year.

Alex: Eddie you mentioned the idea that ~~it's important~~ it's important that we continue to monitor through an oversight, do you have any idea on what they would look like?

Eddie: If the treasurer ~~really does~~ really does go to every meeting, that would certainly help. I think maybe making a bit more effort to check in with the executive liaisons would help, and if one of the active liaisons is a senator, that would probably be the best case scenario. It's not necessary some form of structure in the bylaws necessary, but just try to aim things that way.

Alice: We have our VP of Internal Affairs in the room, I think given the fact that we will have a 5th officer position, who has specifically in her charge to have contact to the executive liaisons instead of the president will help. Having the VP of Internal Affairs to figure out that role with organizing university structure, that's three people touching the exec liaisons and being able to coordinate those meetings. So I think SAF and STF are two really important ones that even though we have been having these executive liaisons for the first time, those two committees in particular, we can have targeted effort, it would really improve our effort.

Eddie: Over time, there has been a problem with STF committee throughout history, the Chair was removed in 2011 and there's an ongoing saga with this, and the problems are solved but the oversight kind of goes away and problems emerge again which frankly we are is-dealing with too much money for that to happen. It would be great to make it our policy to have an executive senator to sit on the committee. That would be the ideal scenario. Like we have Evan on SAF.

Alice: We have to move on now, but I know we talked about some of the bylaws thing at the end of the year, maybe in the fall with incoming officers. So maybe that can be part of it. Thank you so much Yasmeen for chairing and Eddie for being on the committee. So next up we have a quick thing, innovation fund request for the Childcare feasibility study. So that's something that came up pretty recently, I know SAF is entertaining its innovation fund request, and I heard that now would be a good time to submit an innovation fund request for SAF to fund a feasibility study for a childcare facility on

campus. The timing is right for this, the spacing is right. The west campus and north campus, there's a lot of development on, there are just a lot of spaces for opportunity. The university is pretty much saying to Amy Hopkins that we don't know we are really ready for the feasibility study. They are dragging their feet on it. So if we come in with an innovation fund request, and come in say that we would like to do the feasibility study through GPSS by SAF funding and ask the University to match in conjunction of working with Amy and working with SAF, so that would be a collaborative feasibility study, that would catalyze the movement for the study. And really a feasibility study is what you need if we even want to start with capital project for next year and the year after that. This is kind of the groundwork for future development for that. If we do this innovation fund request, it would catalyze it and move the project forward. But I don't want to move forward until I have run this through you guys. What do you guys think? (Eddie thumbs up) any questions?

Yasmeen: I have a concern about that. If the university is not willing to move until students put in money for things, and it continues to be like that, the university will never come up with money for things that are important to students. I like the idea of the matching fund, but at the same time, why student funding for things that the university should have had done? They have a staff member who is supposed to work on this.

Alice: So she doesn't have the expertise to do an architectural feasibility study, they have to hire outside firm, and she has no budget. She is being paid to do her own research on child care on work with people and moving forward with collecting data, but she doesn't have the budget, and she is lobbying for it. She is trying really hard, but especially with State budget now. ( Yasmeen: but SAF budget is also really strained)

Eddie: Clarifying, this money is appropriated ~~from~~ the innovation fund? Are we just handing money over to the administration?

Alice: No it would come to GPSS. GPSS would be the requesting unit for the innovation fund to do a feasibility study, and we would hire someone. ( Eddie: and that hire power is completely on us? )

Rene: We have research entities everybody pays on campus to do that. So the GPSS person can be the appointed person.

Alice: That would be the advantage for us to go through SAF instead of going through the University. The way that the faculty senate resolution on Child Care was framed at the meeting, was look at the proportion of childcare slots on this campus that are dedicated to faculty, its much lower than the other universities. The more we are getting close to have childcare facility on campus, the more risk we have them take their proportion back. We can have more stake at the claim if we do it through SAF. We can say that we did the feasibility study, we are putting forth money to building, we require this many slots, and we have backing to say that this is ours or just letting the university taking over. It would be a travesty if we did all the hard ground work, and the university picks up what we have worked on. And if the faculty and staff want to do something separate great. But they can do that. They can follow our led. But by doing this, we can guarantee spots for students.

Eddie: But does that mean we pay another fee? How is that money going to be allocated?

Alice: I think that is too premature to say. I don't think anyone would support students paying any other fee for these services. I think people who are using the services would be primarily responsible for paying that, I know the state is also talking more about childcare, and childcare matching stuff. I know the City of Seattle is doing a whole push on childcare stuff, and once we are not in a budget crisis and get some funding in higher ed, I think it would be easier for us to say, hey since we have been doing all the ground work and the plans and the projects are in place, it would be easier for us to say that we need the funding. Instead of giving all the responsibility to them. It has to be the other way around.

Doug: Yeah, SAF has been talking about this that this is something that has to happen. There is a document that details how a feasibility study would be conducted.

Alice: And SAF actually funded a few childcare studies that were done in '98. So there's precedent for it, and I think it could be successful. Regarding the innovation fund, it is generally different from the SAF fund. So it is separate pool of money.

Yasmeen: Yes but it comes from the same pool of money.

Alice: Yes but they are allocated already that they can't spend.

Doug: There's an artificial fire line.

Alice: Also Mac said he is going to send the innovation fund application forms, do you know if they are out yet? Doug, can you send it to me? One more thing, I have been going back and forth with HFS all year on North Campus development for undergraduate student housing. I finally was able to put myself in their shoes and understand what kind of argument needed to be made for us to be eye to eye on this issue. I just said that, don't you think there would be a lot of incoming undergrads that love babysitting who would just think it would be a great way to pay for their rent if they can provide babysitting services. And he saw the marketing for it. So I got a call from HFS yesterday, and they said that if someone wanted to propose to them a program that we can do during the day like flexible childcare, maybe a few hourly education undergrads, it would be employment opportunities for undergrads, he would be happy to sign an MOU for us to have some common spaces in the north campus housing development to serve as this flexible childcare space. If we do this early enough they can actually build this into their design plan. I think it's a potential win for us as soon as the North development happens. If you have any ideas for what that may look like, please come to me.

Monica: I know we currently have some childcare facilities on some of the campus affiliated housing, I just wanted to make sure we are not stepping on anyone's toes.

Alice: We have 270 slots serving the entire university, so providing more slots would not be stepping on anyone's toes. I think everyone would be happy to have more childcare. I want to move on to WSA.

**WSA- Alex Bolton**

Alex: Two weeks ago, ASUW board discussed where they were, are forming a sub-committee on what they might want to do. On the back of your information packet there's a draft of MOU that would be between ASUW and GPSS, the UW chapter WSA and SAO, this is very preliminary stages, to give you kind of an idea the way ASUW wants to go. And we need to have some conversation on whether this is where we want to go as well. I have been going through WSA meetings and GPSS meetings, and I need to do some more, I have also been meeting with past officers on what they think about the overdue payments, and when those decisions were made, whether or not they are committed to pay those dues or not in the long run. I would like to stay away from the discussion of do we get value from it now, for us this is the decision from the past. For us, the officers from the past made a decision, do we feel obligated to it to discuss more. If that's the case, what do we need to feel like that is what happened. We can also discuss moving forward what the values is, and what this would do. And I would say that if we decide that we would consider not paying anything that was not paid in the past, we should probably consider leaving, just because our reputation on other campuses would be damaged pretty bad.

Natalie: Are we with ASUW staying together and leaving together?

Alex: That's what we want to be. But also if we were to pay things, I sense less of a willingness for ASUW to consider leaving right now. We will have to consider how that affect us now.

Eddie: In terms of what it would take to pay ~~the spark~~this back, what would it take to pay ? We are not talking about ~~raiding~~adding the GPSS budget right?

Alex: No. It could be a chunk. There's different option. One of it is smaller upfront payments. We can say we will give you this much which would be considered below our debt and just move on with it and be done. The other option would be an installment plan which would cost us a lot more on the long run.

Eddie: I would say spend \$0 from the GPSS budget on this.

Alex: So not commit to anything.

Eddie: I don't think there's any advantage ~~gained from~~ paying ~~back what we owe quickly~~this.

Commented [ES1]: I really don't think I said this as originally written

Elloise: How much percentage of people are paying WSA?

Eddie: It was like 3-6%

Elloise: Is it possible to increase the people who are paying for that fee instead of us paying for that due? So few people are supporting, and we really should not support this since so few people are aware of what WSA is doing.

Alice: Just a little more context for why so many other schools that are part of WSA feel strongly that we pay back the debt in proportion to our student body. When they found out we have the STAR programs and that's how we were using and paying for the dues there was huge upset, because most of the other schools use their budget to pay their WSA dues, and a lot of their capacity to lobby is based around

WSA , so they really rely on the report, and the director, they rely on the coalition of WSA much more strongly than we do, because we have a really robust OGR for ASUW, and we have VP of External Affairs. So I think that's where the pressure is coming from to use GPSS money. They are like, we pay for our dues, why don't you use your student government money. But I agree with Eddie that we are in a different situation and I recognize that indication that if GPSS pulls out, they are pulling out too.

Rene: I have some things that I can share with Alex about the things with SAO. Historically, the first entity that got the ability for your Board of Regents to lobby was ASUW. ASUW and GPSS pay people to do their lobbying, so they have their external of VP and ASUW has their OGR, and ASUW members and GPSS members were innovative in the concept of getting Washington students lobbying together a long time ago. But ASUW traditionally doesn't need the funding into it. The other schools in the last couple of years did get that, and they are doing things through WSA, but you can also encourage them to do what you are doing because they can have the same kind of things on their campuses that ASUW has as an option that should you decide not to be part of the entity anymore except for the locals that you have to be part of it.

Alex: My thing on the historic thing is that the narrative you are giving is exactly right. But to me the problem is some of our predecessors made promises that they couldn't keep and they knew it, and what we do as student government with the promises our predecessors made. And how do we want to be perceived that one year is good and then.. well.

Rene: Just to be technical, anytime that you guys enter some kind of agreement with anyone going forward, it needs to be documented. Your own minutes for your own association, that's why it's there.

EddieAlice: Eddie thank you, I will entertain the motion to extend.

Evan: Move to extend by three minutes | Eddie: Second

Eddie: I will just say that we confirmed it, the GPSS Senate never agreed to this right?

Commented [ES2]: I don't think I said this

Alex; I haven't gone to that part yet.

Alice: It's clearly in our bylaws, that the VP and the President are the board member of WSA, but there's nothing in our bylaws about financial contribution.

Eddie: So if there's nothing written down saying that we are committed to doing this and if an officer says that we are committed to doing this, it is not the same ~~with as~~ the senate ~~committed~~ committing to doing this. ~~But~~ If it didn't get passed by the senate then I wouldn't see it as binding.

Doug: So I was going to say the same thing, getting an organization to promise something would have to go ~~through some~~ through some procedures. I understand what you are saying, if an officer goes and promise someone something, that's a pretty incompetent move, and not being followed up by anyone.

Alex: It is a tricky thing too. The assumption was that they would pay it and no one never assumed what

would happen if the fee does not pay it. Some of it would be okay, and we are in the place to make the proposition.

Doug: And it's also fair to say with what SAF is going through and what the University is going through, it's not the best time to be spending.

Alice: Especially on the order the \$30-50,000.

Amber: Yeah, I just want give some updates on what ASUW says. Historically on the ASUW side, I went through all the minutes since 2010, and we never actually went through these budgetary changes, they were never at the board table. And also the year before I was a freshman, 2010 or 2011 I believe, they took as a line out of our budget, I believe there used to be a WSA line in there, and it was reallocated to something else, and that was when we thought the STAR system will just pay for it. And obviously that wasn't true. And so that's just some of the stuff we found. ASUW never passed a board bill, it has never been discussed. And also at least last week, ASUW board had a conversation just about philosophically separate that one, do we want to stay at WSA? The second conversation is that, if we do want to stay at WSA, then we will talk about how we will handle the unpaid dues situation. Last week the ASUW did say that they want to continue to be a part of WSA, but I wouldn't say that it was unanimous, but the majority say that they want to continue.

Yasmeen: I move to extend time again by two and a half minutes | Doug: second.

Alice: I think there's value for us to be a part of WSA, particularly since they have recently voted to put graduate student issues on their agenda, and I think the representation that Alex gave to hold WSA at the retreat actually was very educational, because most of them are undergrads, and they had no idea what it meant to be a graduate student, how graduate education works, and some of the issues graduate students face. He humanized graduate students to a lot of these folks to say that our issues are really pressing too. Also when you say student to a legislature, especially when you are representing a student government, that includes graduate students. Having us be at the table as a mature institution and proving that kind of perspective, I think list up all graduate students at the university of Washington if they are more savvy about graduate student issues in general. So I don't think it's a waste of our time, but I do think that giving them \$30,000 would be a waste of our money. So I am hoping that we can come to some sort of compromise that they understand the values of having us being a part of WSA, as much as we recognize the values of us being at the table and then working with us on a feasible financial model, or even forgiving us on the debt. Because I think they are losing something really valuable for us to leave, especially if ASUW were to leave with us. And I think there's a lot of ego around that board table, and people were just like we want an executive director, we want this we want this, but it's like you were given \$2000 a year to be part of this, so you can't always get what you want. I think some of those needs to be put in check, and I am happy to go to another WSA meeting even when we are done to represent that perspective. Because if they are not working with us on the feasibility side, I say we leave, because I am not okay dealing with that.

Amber: I think the thing that needs to be presented is that the amount of money being paid, doing it by students is why we as a university are paying so much. But I think the value that we get out of the money

is different from other schools. Because some other schools rely solely on WSA and I think being up front that we see value in WSA, we want to continue with it, but it doesn't make sense for us to be paying this much on our end in terms of negotiating the amount we give back otherwise it would just be a barrier to us. Because it's not like ASUW doesn't want to continue, but it's just that it's not feasible, but that amount of money is just impossible.

Eddie: Just one little thing, what if we really mount a campaign to get more people to find out about the \$3, and our commitment to WSA will be resolved in the money from the campaign. And that's it. We will actually try to get a presentation at like ASUW senate and GPSS and actually have instructions for people on how to talk to their department about signing up, maybe even an advertising campaign to show that we are trying. But it will be a very democratic decision, student will decide if they think it is worth it or not. They are deciding now.

Doug: I think it's important to explain to students that now it's go time. Because right now people still don't care.

Alice: So are we hearing that we want to bring this to the Senate? Or do we want to see where we can get with this?

Yasmeen: I think we can probably work within our group now. But I think before it goes to the Senate, we will probably need to do more work on our end.

Alice: Let's move on now, we will have a longer discussion later on MOU in our next exec meeting to see where we are at this. And maybe I can even make some calls to WSA. So let's move on. Thank you all, this has been very helpful.

#### **Ad Hoc Committee on fee-based programs,**

Alice: We met for the first time this week. Five people showed up even though originally 16 people showed interest. I think it's just hard to schedule. It was very helpful, and we have folks from different fee based programs that gave me a lot of insight on what their situations is. There's basically a four pronged issue as far as I understand it. One is PCE admin issue. If you are in a fee based program, administrative PCE, the process to register for classes, is that you have to download a form off the website, print it out, fill it out, and either mail it, fax it or scan it email it back, or call them. And this is the most "innovative" unit that has all the online classes, in tech areas. It's absolutely ludicrous. Some of the stories they told me, one of the committee members, brought in his five envelopes of identical mailing of confirmations of his registration. So even if you send an online registration, they send you a paper confirmation of your registration with a list of your classes, and you get it multiple times. There's no paper opt out options, so they always get multiple ones per quarter. Sometimes they have to pay for their credits. Their elective credits. But they can't take four elective credits. So if they can't fit in their schedule, they don't want to take it because it is not the elective they actually want, they have to pay for it anyway. There's no connection to My UW anyway, so even if it shows zero balance, PCE is still sending them bills saying you owe us money, even when PCE really in fact owes them money because they overpaid. There's a whole world thing going on at PCE. So what I recommended is we work with the Vice Provost for education outreach who runs the PCE to develop a student advisory board so that

students who are having to deal with these administrative stuffs can provide feedback to PCE and help them fix their problem so they don't have to deal with it anymore. And that's just one of the things on the list. My goal for the meeting and for the ad-hoc committee is to develop a set of criteria that established what a fee based program should look like. So the University of Washington shall not make any fee-based program that doesn't fit these criteria. And there is a list of criteria that's floating around that Ana-Mari put together but they are really preliminary, and somewhat problematic. We need to go into more depth on what it should look like. Faculty senate is still stuck on transition land. So that was my goal, but I told them to let me know what are some of the issue that they are facing in fee-based programs, I heard that PCE is a big problem. So my first goal is to establish a board of students to PCE so they work that out. Another thing is program reviews. Every tuition based program gets a 10-year review that's very extensive with an external review board that's run by the Graduate School. PCE programs come through the approval process of the graduate school council and the faculty council. But once it gets approved, it lives in PCE land, and it goes through PCE process and they don't have to go through another process that other fee-based program goes through. So like if they want to raise tuition, or they want to increase class size, if they want to do any of these things, they don't have to go through any of the regular processes, including program review. So there are no Graduate School run program reviews of PCE programs. The Graduate School needs to play an active role in looking at PCE programs. And I know it's going to be tough because its administrative toes that we are going to be stepping on. The Graduate School need to own up to the responsibility though. Faculty Senate, really good development. The ad-hoc committee, maybe from SPCB from new incarnation from Jack, the new Chair. That ad-hoc committee is going to recommend that SPCB vote on this permanent policy never to transition tuition-based to fee-based ever on any circumstances. Done. But I am excited about it. And we should all be really excited about this. That being said, I have heard some rumors that the School of Public Health, PhD program will be transitioned to fee based. But I would be happy to forward the information to them later on .

Yasmeen: So transitioning existing program and transferring it doesn't mean that they can't cut a programs entirely and start a fee based program next year?

Alice: So I actually made a point about that in ad-hoc committee, I made that suggestion on departments might be doing that, but Gerald Baldasty was like this has never happened, and this is inappropriate use of our assets. Do we have examples? Because I have been looking. I am looking for examples on that this has actually happened, so if we can all go out and start talking to our people, and finding out programs that has done that.

Yasmeen: Not sure it's a thing that has already happening, but it might happen in the future. A fee-based program could be started, but the regular program might be cut.

Alice: If you can do some digging on that and report to me that would be great. Because I would like to report to the provost on programs that has done that. So thank you for bringing that up. Maybe in the future when we evaluate the criteria for the fee based programs, we say that this shall not have been similar to any tuition based program that is recently closed. Some sort of safeguard in regards to reincarnation, because I think that's a way to address it. They want to move forward with that direction to look at the criteria for the creation of the fee based program. My hope is that we already have the draft of the criteria from students who are experiencing these things, and we can just hand them our draft to the



faculty senate and they can kind of get on board. The other thing that came up that I think is worth noting is that the issue with fee based programs not really being eligible, it's hard for them to get position as ASEs, because the hiring department would be responsible for covering their fees. So what's happening is that in departments where they want to hire people in fee based program, they just change the description of the job. No longer it is an ASE, it is a 25% position. Maybe the responsibility doesn't change, but it's just now 25% so they don't have to comply with the union contract. Or they just move to hourly. We just need to keep an eye on it. I have asked them to come up with a preliminary presentation and at our next meeting we are going to put together a strategic plan for a timeline for drafting the criteria and how the GPSS is going to be involved and how the Graduate School is going to be involved. Really paying more attention to this issues.

Eddie: There are a lot of students who think there should not be a thing such as fee-based programs in a public university at all. A fee-based program is a money making endeavor that has no place in a public institution. At least that is my opinion. ( Alice: Noted\*)

Alice: Anyone who wants to be involved, especially Monica, just internal stuff. It would be great to have you guys at the meeting. Elloise feel free to join the party. I think this is the next big thing that we are going to be dealing with next year. So happy to build the groundwork and lay the strategic plan for how this should be implemented, but it would be up to you guys to figure out how to move this forward.

#### **State Budget and UW Medical School Budget Update.**

Alex: Information tab again. I sent this through email as well. This is a draft that Brian and I have worked on together on reaching out to the Medical School Association and the students who are currently in Spokane as well. The idea is that we are trying to do a joint letter through GPSS and MSA and the Spokane people. I tried to channel some things from an earlier Spokane letter, and a letter that Ana-Mari sent to the Spokane community as well. Which is the direction I took with the letter. Timing would be pretty good. A group of incoming students to Spokane just got very quickly organized and sent letters to the legislature. Another one just went out today stating their concern to make sure that they are not the last incoming class of Spokane community. And that's starting to get some heat. And also, the idea is that if we can approve this today the Medical Student Association has their meeting on Friday, and they will approve this on Friday and we will send it out next week. Timing wise, it would be perfect if you guys are okay with it.

Yasmeen: I have edits but I can just hand you the piece of paper. (Alex: Sure) I just think that the letters are a good idea. I just think that it can be worded more strongly. For example, the fourth paragraph, UW would like to eliminate operation. I would like to change that to "force us to". Or that "we ask you to please fund" would be "we ask you to fully fund"

Alex: The likely I put in there is just because a student government I thought that we don't have any role to say what WE would do. That's what the administration is telling us, but I just thought I would put the likely in there.

Yasmeen: Going down on the student perspective, I actually don't feel like that the student perspective is much about why UW staying in Spokane is important to students. I mean it's pretty vague to say that they

need support.

Alex: Those are from Spokane.

Yasmeen: Great in that case, would it work for you and Brian to frame this in a way that says, the reasons they want to stay there is because their family are there, they are closer to home, or whatever reason they gave you.

Alex: That's the language they gave me, I trimmed it down a bit.

Alice: I would agree, it sounds like that they found a community, WSU, that has welcome them. That's how some of them feel.

Yasmeen: It's an idea to include more specific examples on why someone would like to stay in Spokane.

Elloise: Can you explain about the last sentence? Why the shame?

Alex: To give up the opportunity state residencies have on the nation's premier institution it would be a shame. I might have gotten strong in the wrong place, weak at the wrong place. But I can edit.

Eddie: I agree with the intent of the letter, and I think ~~this is~~ this is great.

Alex: If we can try to get the edits by tomorrow, I can send it to MSA. The special session started today, and the governor can only call for 30 days of special session. So That's effectively through the end of May. I haven't heard much, so not much is going on. They don't really feel the pressure, but we will see until the end of the fiscal year in June. Ideally they will get it done in May so we will see what happens.

### **Meeting Agenda Setting**

Alice: Can someone pull up the list of things that we talked about on the laptop, Natalie sent us an email on the priority on the upcoming events? Do we have a spotlight?

Natalie: Ana-Mari.

Alice: Natalie, are you going to be getting a bio to have a more robust introduction? I will do the introduction. Let's give her 10 minutes to talk and 10 minutes for questions. I think everyone would prefer 10.

Eddie: What is she going to be talking about specifically?

Alice: I think I want it to be an ~~open-ended~~ open-ended topic. Whatever student issue is bubbling up..

Eddie: I think it would be great to have her at the Senate, but at this time with the contention over the wage issue, and the connection over union negotiation. What I don't want to see is like that it's a platform

for Ana-Mari to counter student perspective.

Alice: You meant you don't want her to have a platform? I think Ana-Mari wants to hear from students. She is not here to lobby the University's position on things. If she gets blasted by questions on the Union, she will respond with the University position. But she doesn't need a platform to do those things. She has people who do that for her. My impression is that she wants to come to the senate to hear what we want to hear about and talk about. She wants to be available to answer questions.

Yasmeen: In that case the 5 minutes would actually work really well. Because then we can have 15 minutes of questions.

Eddie: Yeah, if she wants to have 5 minutes introducing herself and 15 minutes for Q&A, that would be great.

Amber: You can just say 20 minutes total, and she can talk however long and we can tell her it's 20 minutes. ( Alice: She might talk for 20 minute though)

Alice: Well she was a graduate student at Yale and she will talk about graduate student life and issues if she wants to.

Elloise: She can offer her perspective on those issues even though she might not identify with our perspective attending the graduate school many many years ago.

Rene: There's plenty of things to talk about. Don't limit any direction.

Alice: I am going to play an active role in facilitating. If its ex-President Young I might feel different, but I don't want Ana-Mari to be invited into interrogation. What do folks think that we should give her as a prompt? I think we should give her 10 minutes to speak.

Amber: I was just going to say, maybe the climate is different right now on certain issues, but at least if we have Ana-Mari or legislative speakers come on our agenda, we will also ask people to think about the questions that they might want to ask. But I don't think we have ever set a limit on how much they can speak. Also, unless Ana-Mari is look for feedback on something, if you want to make sure that it doesn't become a platform for students to attack, if you phrase it as bringing question and question only, then I think you can prevent that from happening.

Natalie: I could even just ask senators, if we are worried about time, email me questions, and go through them. If we have enough time then we can go through them and open that up, and have more structure.

Eddie: I am just worried that people would say that it's cherry picked.

Natalie: So we should have them be prepared to ask questions.

Alice: I would actually like to have her for 30 minutes.

Yasmeen: Can we look at the rest of the time first?

Natalie: Yeah I think that would be ideal but with so many things going on, we should see what we have and then come back. Otherwise people would leave.

Amber: Also if you set it at 20 minutes, people would absolutely extend.

Alice: So we have two resolutions. Have you heard from Vanessa? If she haven't responded, we should take it back off the agenda.

Natalie: Marnie Brown is coming too, because you wanted them to come together. There are a couple more on Veterans on the 20th.

Eddie: Maybe it would be good to bracket Ana Mari in between the resolutions.

Alice: We should go into resolution then? It's not an actual resolution?

Natalie: She just wants to present.

Alice: So that's information for 15 minutes. So Eddie do you want to talk to us about the resolution?

Eddie: This would be great to get a response from the University. There's 20 cosponsors, it basically calls us to follow the \$15/hr wage schedule. It brings up the fact that there are a lot of programs funded by SAF that are legally fundable through the general fund. Not all of them are. But it also details the history of what happened with the Seattle Minimum wages.

Alice: What else do we have? The other thing is student code of conduct. Can we just give them 15 minutes and just let them give a brief presentation/update on it. If we can just give them 15 minutes do a much less presentation. Could we put them in there? We will give them 10 minutes even. I mean this has been a multi-year process. I think having 10-15 minutes extra in our meeting is a small price to pay. Maybe that's what the majority of the people would prefer.

Natalie: Are we still wanting to do a resolution for student code of conduct on the 20th?

Alice: It would be way too packed. I think we should get the presentation part out of the way, and just have the resolution on the 20th.

Natalie: I agree with you that the issue is incredibly important, I just think we need to structure our time to make sure we still have good attendance. I am committed to have us staying on time.

Alice: I think that's active shooter training is not high on the school priority list, student code of conduct is everything. I know someone spent a lot of time on this, but maybe it would be better addressed at the TA/RA training.

Yasmeen: Is Ginger a senator?

Natalie: She was for a long time, but she is actually not now, because she wanted to give someone else the opportunity.

Alice: Also we have graduate student community presentation by HFS.

Yasmeen: I think the part that I would be least interested in hearing is the spotlight. I think my priority would be to take action first.

Elloise: I think we can put people first, so they can leave. Usually spotlight come first. It might be weird if we have resolutions.

Alice: Particularly with HFS, Ben was so patient, he is really committed to the graduate school student experience, and he really wants to find out what we need, and he would be instrumental in collaboration with HFS in crafting resolutions on children and stuff. We are a political body sometimes we need to do things that are just political. You guys put so much time in GPSS stuff, I find it hard to sympathize with any other senator who only show up briefly every other week to complain about 10-15 extra minutes meeting.

Yasmeen: But It's never 1.5 hour, it's usually 2-3 hours.

Eddie: Two resolutions, one is on the minimum wages adoption schedule. The whereas clause is pretty much stating who is affected, and details that there are several programs that can be funded through UW administration funds. The administration asked us to give answer on March 31<sup>9</sup>th. If the SAF fund were to increase to meet the wage increase it might be limited by CPI. ~~there~~There are alternative funding through UW general fund. And just spelling out the consequences of not increasing wages. And just addressing that there are currently people who are making 0 dollars now.

Alice: I am little concerned about bringing the social work issue back in, we are not making that claim, so we shouldn't be emphasizing that part of the work. Because we are not doing that with other departments' practicums. So two resolutions, in support with Seattle Minimum wage, and in support of student bargaining. So how much time should we give?

Eddie: Maybe have UAW first, because people might be more passionate about minimum wages, and if folks still feel okay about having active shooter preparedness going after resolution, we can have that .

Yasmeen: can we make the minimum wage 20 minutes?

Natalie: I can also ask Ginger to come to next week. We potentially have three. Because Vanessa still wanted to do the Mental Health Resolution, and Brandon just sent me the Veteran one.

Alice: I feel like those all kind of go together though.

Elloise: I think the realistic expectations should be a ~~two hour~~two-hour meeting.

Alice: I think it's fair to say that we keep our meeting fairly short. We usually keep it under two hours, which is pretty reasonable. Going through it.

Yasmeen: Move to approve the agenda | Natalie: Seconded

**Senator Report:**

Yasmeen: My only thing was with STF, and also I am meeting with the Real Food Challenge people tomorrow to talk one on one about the real food calculator and how it's been implemented.

Eddie: I know that Union is planning for a strike, and it's really serious. They are organizing departments. It's at Condon 311 from 10-4. ~~At 4 is the big election.~~ They are not really communicating, since the Labor Relations wasn't there, the University pretty much is just dropping by to drop off a piece of paper.

**Commented [ES3]:** I definitely didn't say anything about an election. It seems like a lot of what I said was missing from here.

Elloise: I am on the Student Regent Selection Committee, and the final three candidates are Vanessa, and Juliya, and someone from UW Tacoma, it was a very productive conversation.

Alex: SAF, Budget, Spokane, WA.

Natalie: Should I include the draft of student conduct to the senate email?

Alice: And can you also say that Ana-Mari will be there?

Natalie: Also I got a response from School of Social Work about the resolution that we sent but it's a ten page written response. So yeah, I will send that around for everyone to take a look, it's interesting.

Eddie: Can you send it to the whole senate?

Natalie: I wanted to send it to you first and have exec input to decide on what we want to do.

Amber: We are having the same conversation on WSA and we are talking about how to approach the unpaid dues. And last week we talked about the engineering application process. Our election is underway. It's fun to see the other side. We also heard Real Food come to our meeting too this week. They will come back next week again.

Alice: There are some MOU changes regarding the U-Pass on procedural issues. They asked me to respond by Friday, which I don't think is responsible because you guys haven't seen it, and I will send it to you guys if you are comfortable, and we can make suggestions. Another thing is resolution on Women in Academia, Aaron?

Aaron: Yeah so we heard a fussing of a combination of things happening in between the Council on Women in Academia and the Council on Multicultural Affairs. Because the Council on Women in Academia didn't have a chair. We drafted a resolution, which is ready to go in the Senate if it arises.

Alice: Quick update on that, I talked to Ann today, and the person who stepped up who is a male faculty member stepped up to be the acting chair and was not appointed by the senate leadership. So we will see. That's where they are at. So they are not in danger anymore. But there is severe in-fighting. SAF wants to

talk about the Tri campus issues. Because each campus has their own SAF, and they want to have a tri meeting because they heard the university has been giving us money to pay for Seattle minimum wage, so if other schools are also going to go for minimum wage, is the university going to backed those reserves. I don't know much about it.

Aaron: But their initiative is 15 immediately.

Alice: Also on the higher ed summit, we met with the graduate experience committee, we have been saying that there are just too many things going on, all staff and everyone is maxed out, it's just not feasible. So we just decided not to approach a higher ed summit. So finding some balance for future years would be great. But I do want to move forward with a student digest at the end of the year, highlighting some of the things that GPSS has done, and advertising the events coming up.

**Meeting Adjourn**

Alice entertain motion to adjourn

Yasmeen: So moved | Elloise: Seconded

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 pm.