

GPSS Executive Committee Meeting- 13 May 2015

Meeting called to order at 5:37 p.m. by meeting chair Alice Popejoy

Members Present:

GPSS President Alice Popejoy
GPSS Vice President Alex Bolton
GPSS Secretary Natalie Gordon
ASUW Representative Amber Amin
Executive Senator Elloise Kim
Executive Senator Eddie Schwieterman
Executive Senator Evan Firth
GPSS Senator Monica Cortes-Viharo
GPSS Office Manager Kerstin Hudon

Approval of Agenda

Douglass: Move to add item of "Transfer of GPSS Funds" right above the Officer Reports for 5 minutes. Evan: Second

Eddie: moved to approve the amended agenda | Elloise: Seconded

Agenda for the meeting approved with amended item.

Approval of Minutes

Eddie: I have a few amendments to minutes. I was present at the meeting. Also overall the minutes need some edits. I made some grammar edits in the student code of conduct section. There were some minor wording changes. Also I don't think I said "inclusion of negotiation between University union" (Document with track sheet sent to Natalie). I move to make these amendments as sent to Natalie.

Alex: Seconded

Elloise: Move to approve as amended | Alex: Seconded

Minutes approved with amendments .

Memorandum (MOU) between U-Pass Advisory Board, ASUW, and GPSS

Alice: The first document in your info tabs is a draft MOU with the U-PASS Advisory Board between GPSS, ASUW, U-PASS Advisory Board and UW Transportation Services. And we have Josh here. Josh do you want to introduce yourself?

Josh Kavanagh: I am the Director of Transportation for the University, also the technical advisor to the Universal Student Pass Advisory Board whom you charge with overseeing the U-PASS program, and advising GPSS and ASUW both.

Alice: Josh can answer any questions that you might have. I can also update you guys on the MOU. There needs to be a vote by GPSS and ASUW on the increased fee, but the previous MOU was a bit unclear as what the procedure was for each body, so I think the Transportation Services did a spectacular job on revising them and adding some additional clarifying language in there to make that more clear. There were also some other revisions on the MOU. The

version that you are looking at is track changes, just for the most recent version, so there have been a lot of revisions and amendments since the first revision. So I guess, one thing we have talked about is when we talk about termination condition, it clarifies that either GPSS or ASUW or the advisory board can recommend discontinuation of the fee. It outlines the process by which it would be enacted. It says that if the fee is discontinued, then it would revert to an opt-out program. It gives transportation services, GPSS, and ASUW the opportunity to leave the U-PASS program under certain circumstances.

Eddie: Minor question on wording: page 3, on top of page it says “upon receiving this recommendation that the ASUW board of directors, following presentation to ASUW Senate, may approve termination of the fee. That make sense to me, and then it says GPSS following presentation to the GPSS Executive Committee approval of the fee”. It doesn’t really make sense to me that the Senate would present to the Executive Committee. So who is doing the presenting?

Alice: I think the intent here is following presentation to the Executive Committee by either me or Josh or somebody representing the Advisory Board. Once this recommendation is presented to Exec, we will continue on with this recommendation and forward it to the Senate with our endorsement.

Eddie: I think I understand why the asymmetry is here, but that is because the ASUW Board of Directors are the rule-making top entity, whereas in GPSS the top body is the Senate. But it’s just the way it’s worded that is misleading.

Rene: Why don't you just flip flop it?

Eddie: I think the reason you can't flip flop it is because the Senate is the entity that has to issue the final approval to terminate the fee.

Rene: But that can be flagged as unclear language to be resolved before anything get signed. That's a piece of cake.

Alice: I don't think we want to get too descriptive here about who will be presenting, because some of the folks on the advisory board were unavailable to come to the meeting. And it's just the GPSS President or whatever.

Eddie: What if we just get rid of that clause?

Alice: Informally GPSS and ASUW are not ex-officio, but we sort of just come. We can choose or appoint senators or exec members or ourselves to sit on the committee, but right now we, like any other universities committee, just appoint GPSS Liaisons.

Rene: I am worried about controversy. GPSS has had more controversy on U-PASS than anybody else. Your senators and groups know that they are the group that get vote on this. But

you executives are the ones that are doing the work. So sometimes consistencies make it easier for the people on the outside.

Alice: So you are suggesting taking that out?

Renee: I am suggesting that the GPSS, when you do the approval of the party, you just put that in before the approval part.

Josh: Alex, if you are okay with that, I would like to put the conversation we are having today in context. First off, In terms of why we are looking at updating the MOU, there were a couple specific things came up as gaps in the MOU and as Alice highlighted, really this was driven by the fact that, four years in, this is the first time there was a fee change under the Universal Fee Program. So this was the first time that we actually got to run the mechanics of the MOU and found a lot of little opportunities for improvements and clarification. For clarification, this isn't a reaction to any specific thing, rather it was a very natural process. It was the first time we got to run a fee change under the MOU and we learned that there were opportunities to make it more effective. Second, I want to briefly discuss the process adopting the MOU. The advisory board ran through a deliberate process to come to the language, and Transportation Services provided staff and some advice in the development of that. But they are not the final say, obviously they are advisory, but they brought student perspectives into the drafting of that. The authority of Alice and Christina to sign this MOU on behalf of students goes back to the original authorizing legislation that established the universal student U-Pass 5 years ago.

Alice: is that an RCW?

Josh: No, that was resolution in GPSS or ASUW. Those stand on their own. Having the GPSS Senate and ASUW Executive Board authorize their president to sign the updated MOU, though that authorization is in place, is how we do everything in the daylight. So what brings us to the MOU today is the chance for you to provide feedback and concerns to Alice on the actual content of the MOU because eventually assuming this all goes forward, she will be the signatory for that. And also help guide participation in the conversation that's going to have to occur in the Senate as they reaffirm the authorization to the president to enter the updated MOU. Is that consistent with your perspective? Alice? and Renee?

Alice: Will we have another opportunity to make it more final? Next week we have a shell resolution was my thought.. or wait, we can't do a resolution. The idea was to send out draft language to the Senate, but my thought is that we will present this to the Senate and say this is an update on the MOU that the advisory board is putting forth if the Exec Committee feels comfortable enough with the intent of this document, and that we will make those changes before we send it out next week before senate meeting. And we will take a vote of the Senate, but not a resolution. But say "all of that in favor of endorsing this MOU" I think that would make me comfortable with signing the MOU.

Eddie: I think that is a great plan, Alice. I just have one maybe substantive question on the document. About the withdrawal by the transportation services, that provision, and I think I know the answer to this, but I want to clarify, that this would only happen if for example the transportation services notified the U-PASS advisory board, ASUW, and GPSS that a set of fee increases was required to maintain the program, and that authority is granted.

Josh: Correct

Alice: Correct, that's why it says "if the sum projected revenue is insufficient to cover program costs"

Josh: So we have in the language that we are bringing an early forecast in November. Now in terms of fees, we are going to say in November, "This is where we think the central subsidy dollars are going to be next year. We think contract cost are going to be this next year." We will project whether we are going to run out a recommendation in terms of fee change. So that conversation now starts earlier, and I read it as it's not allowing for an exit by transportation in any other scenario, and it certainly is our intent that it would be the only scenario that we can exit.

Evan: Is it worth specifying providing written notice to ASUW and GPSS? Right now it just says we will provide written notice. Is it worth specifying?

Alice: I think we can just refer back to the beginning where it says that "the parties, ASUW and GPSS, agree to the following terms", I interpret this to mean written notice to all parties. But we can definitely add that. Like provide written notice to all parties.

Josh: Yeah that's an easy flag. And that's really one of my hopes for our time together today. If there are some red flag issues or things that are still unclear, we are getting those marked up now. Maybe not in detail, but at least bookmarked so she and I can work on getting it ironed out so the draft that goes to the Senate avoids those pitfall.

Evan: One other one I notice is on the front page, the purpose of fee, I don't see "Link Light Rail" on that

Josh: That's Sound transit. Link Light Rail is a service of Sound Transit.

Alice: Any other questions, concerns? Do we feel comfortable just taking out Rene's suggestion? Just take out the part of exec with the understanding if it goes to senate, exec has to hear about it, because they are going to be putting it on the agenda anyway?

Alex: I think it might be just easier for Transportation Services to see what our process is, and just laying it all out there.

Evan: A couple more. On Rate Stabilization Fund, two things, does there need to be a mechanism in place to reevaluate that 1/12 figure?

Josh: That's a great question. I don't know if there needs to be, but there could be. Prior to this year there had never been a recommended level. It was that we didn't want to see it go up or down. This year was the first year that they started to wrestle with that and came up with a recommendation. We figure that as long as we are codifying things, maybe we should take that recommendation and formalize it in here. We could write in a mechanism for review of that, or we can just use the amendment mechanism that's already specified at the end.

Evan: Finally it says 1/12 of annual operating expenses, do you want to specify previous year's operating expenses? Projected annual operating expenses? Your annual average operating expenses?

Josh: Since this is referencing rate setting, it would be projected operating expenses. I think clarifying that would be a great addition.

Alice: Is there somewhere in here, other uses for the student trust?

Josh: Yes. So the purpose of the fee, the underlined section on page one.

Alex: I don't want to jump the agenda, but I have a question about population.

Alice: Yes. That's a separate document that we will talk about.

Alex: It sounds like that this would be agreed to now, and in the process of re-evaluating it.

Alice: So in the first paragraph where it says "those students who pay this" so if you pay SAF fee, you pay U-PASS.

Josh: I think you got the flow right. But the motion that was made in the senate when it was approved included a request that the AB examine options for exempt students who are distant learners but we knew that work would not be completed in time for the changes to be implemented for the Fall Quarter. So what we're doing is updating the MOU by having a nice clear amendment of procedure in the MOU, so we can come back and change the population when needed.

Eddie: Sorry just one more thing. In terms of the final statement about amending the agreement- should there be any language about ASUW and GPSS presidents consulting their student bodies before signing addendums to the MOU?

Alice: So I think the spirit of that make sense, but we have language about any changes to the fee have to be approved. If we are just approving the MOU with population, I mean, I don't know. Josh may be able to speak to the initial intent just having it be the president?

Josh: It's mainly because they are the original signatories. I can tell you that I will have apprehension about signing on behalf of any of the administration if there wasn't any consultation. So that is pretty well baked in.

Alice: Also it's in our bylaws to make sure the president of GPSS will seek approvals or input from the senate. If the president were to sign a MOU without consulting the exec or the senate, I think they will in direct violation of their job responsibility. So I think it might be redundant to put it here and somewhat restrictive.

Eddie: thanks for the clarification

Alice: So the two changes I have here are 1) under the termination condition, taking out the following presentation to exec, and at the end of that sentence, maybe add " following discussion with exec committee" just so that it's there for ASUW and transportation services to know, and 2) Evan's point to the written notice to the parties. Those are the only changes I have.

Evan: We also flagged that the annual operating expenses should be specified. It on page 4 on the top bullet point, add "projected"

Alice: Assuming those 3 changes are incorporated into this, I do just want to get an endorsement from the exec before we take this to the senate. So we can bring this to senate with endorsement? (Straw poll) All in favor of MOU?

Approved unanimously.

Distant Learning

Alice: Let's briefly talk about distant learning. That is another information item. I think there was an official amendment at ASUW to make sure Transportation Services looked at distant learning. Of all the emails I get from this, there are actually a few emails that address this issue. They live in Tacoma, they are wondering why should they be paying to subsidize someone else's convenience in Seattle when they are never going to use it. We do have a decent amount of students in the WWAMI program, I think there are about 240 students who are in it. One of the challenges is that we don't have a clear definition of distant learning and what a distant learner is. Is it just students who are taking online courses, and living in Seattle or is it that they live far away or is it UW Medicine students? So it's complicated, and under the current model, these students pay all the regular student fees that the Seattle students pay. So there has been some substantial questioning about this model by ASUW and within the Senate. And so maybe Josh can bring a brief synopsis on this.

Josh: This is snapshot of what we know. In the discussion of the advisory board, there has been discussion and plenty of opinion, we try to make sure that none of that was in the progress report. Because we don't want it to start looking like the actual findings. Those would come in

time after we gather a few additional facts, and in particular the financial realm, where we haven't be able to build really good models yet. Also there is something that has been uncovered in this, which is the relation between different but similar fees. You can imagine that we will use the IMA bond fee as a great example as something that your ability to use it or not is geographically oriented just like the U-Pass, and what it would mean to students overall if we started taking geographic considerations into paying certain type of fees. There will be precedents that will be set that would invite additional exemptions. So one scenario that is conceivable to me is that the scope of this exploration should be expanded, so that the core issue is that the location based services and global fees get balanced for all fee types because that would just invite the same conversation over and over again. So the AB will come back with recommendations on that.

Eddie: Just a comment, it seems like for the geographic problem for example, the IMA fee is worse than the U-Pass fee. You can take advantage of the U-Pass in the Puget Sound region. But I think you are right, there is a set of fees that is geographically dependent. And it seems like it goes well beyond the U-Pass, and there should be more effort looking into that too.

Rene: I kind of agree with that but I guess, as we are going into the version where we are going to do more online work, or other kinds of systems, you could have a scenario where you have more students who are not physically here than students that are here. We have a lot of building fees, and these are things that students wanted. It's not going to be an easy check, but there might be a way where people can just pay for only 10% of the total worth, or something like that. Because we won't be able to sustain ourselves without some of these fees that we agreed to ten years ago. But I don't know how far away do you get to be or what it would look like.

Eddie: I would like to expand that and say I think the conversation that needs to be had is that the fees were agreed to by those students who are no longer here. What conversation do we have about that? How do we view that as a student imposed fee if the students who are currently living the consequences of the establishment of the fee perhaps don't agree with it.

Alice: You could also make the argument that for the IMA, if I am an online student, and I live in Montana, but I plan on moving to Seattle for my residency. You could imagine that the person would eventually come to use the facility at the IMA if they get a position or get into medical school. By nature of their affiliation with UW, they benefit from it some way or and another. But I think it's in the same spirit of what Alex was saying, similar to U-Pass, it's a perception game. It's perceived as a service that's provided to individual students, because folks don't really have the information on how much it would actually cost without this universal plan, and people don't really see it as a community good because they are not part of the community, then they are like why should I pay into this community good for people who I have never interacted with, and never going to. And it seems hard to pitch it as a long-standing community good if it's something that's so directed to individuals.

Eddie: The agreement switched out that the University will no longer charge the ASEs the building fee. So it's like \$150 for ASEs. ASEs will just pay for SRS and U-Pass.

Elloise: Move to extend time by 5 minutes | Alex: Second

Elloise: I have a question. I think we need to consider all kind of possibilities, not just for now, but for the long run. The problem now is that we don't have a definition of what distant learning actually is. Can you share what kind of program that's currently existing that can possibly be considered a distance learning? And who identifies themselves a distant learners?

Josh: So we don't have a sense of who identifies themselves as distance learners. The case with WWAMI learning is a very interesting case because in the course of participation in the WWAMI program, they are doing campus-based things outside of Seattle, they are doing residency rotations through the medical center in Seattle and other hospitals, they are also doing residencies elsewhere. So we have folks that may consider themselves not a campus based learner, which can be another way that we talk about it. Another term that has come up that the advisory board is wrestling with is online learner, which is different from distance learner potentially. So we do have a crude marker that we have been using to try to come up with a rough financial analysis on this. But again, this assumes two things, one is that we can have some degree of confidence in the integrity of the data that's in these computer system we have, and the other is this is based on the assumption that the definition we are using is the one that will be settled on, but neither is probably true. But we look at students who are registered only for courses that have off- campus locations or online locations, and are using that as a proxy as a distance learner, but, if we apply that definition, it would disenfranchise a whole bunch of the students who do live in Puget Sound and are taking advantage of their U-Pass today. We will need to ask the question on whether we want to disenfranchise those students and see their U-Pass cost almost double as they migrate into the opt-in program.

Alice: So is this all we are doing, or?

Josh: So, unless you want to provide additional concerns back to the Advisory Board as they continue their work, we felt that with an update to the MOU coming forward with the language about the population that the AB should show responses to population concerns with the current revision. So this sort of summarizes the work as of today, and highlighting that there is a bunch more work to do and that the AB will do that. Realistically I don't see anything getting resolved on this presentation to the senate until they reconvene in the Fall just because how much time is left on the calendar and how complex the problem is.

Alice: So maybe Alex and Monica can touch base on this with the exec liaison in the fall. Thank you so much for coming. Evan, do you have a question?

Evan: One thing that might circumvent the whole thing is - is there a reason that it cannot be based off of usages? If you don't use your U-Pass by blank then it is deactivated and you are not considered a U-Pass member? And If you use it by blank, the you are an activated U-Pass user?

Josh: That would have some administrative complexity associated with it that would have a cost. It would undermine the universal nature of the program, so it would cease to be a universal program at that point and the benefit that students derive from this sort of broad socialization starts to fall away.

Evan: I just assumed that it would be easier to implement since it falls into a similar framework with how the refunds work.

Josh: That was not easy to implement

Alice: Is it correct to say that the universal U-Pass is allowed to be as inexpensive as it is because there will be folks who pay it and never use it?

Josh: Or there will be folks that use it less than our cost to serve them.

Alice: Thanks again, and see you in our next meeting.

MOU with WSA by Alex

Alex: In part thanks to all the fun we have had this year, we decided it might be good to have things in writing. This is Julianne's idea, almost like a retroactive idea. Basically it's all the things we have done already this year, and just creating the precedent with expectations of each year to have schools commit to each other in this format. Like this is the expectation, and this is what you will do. This creates kind of the expectation that they will create one in the spring, and one in the fall. We had some discussion on this in the General Assembly a couple weeks ago. And I kind of had this epiphany that part of the reason we are in the mess we are in is because people may have been acting without bringing things to their boards. So I was very adamant about taking these back to the boards and having them sign off on them, because none of us really have the authority to sign off on these. Here is the proposal that we worked with Julianne to draft. The only one that I might have a little bit of issue with is that last bullet point on the last page that says we must have a designated funding source. We have a designated source, it's stable and it's never been below our dues now that we have the readjusted dues amount. So if you want, we can make some edits to that one. So once again, part of the complication is that we are the only one that has an opt-in STAR system when registering, all the other schools do it through their SAF. ASUW is opt-in. So that's been another fun issue on where the pre-check is.

Evan: I agree with removing the stable part. I can understand designated.

Eddie: Get rid of stable, and replace it with designated.

Rene: There should be a termination time. Let's say if a bunch of puppets are taking your places and they don't want to deal with it, they should be able to end it. If all the graduation dates for all schools are similar, I would put in some time frame with the new officers coming on. If one year you guys decide that you don't want to be in it, and ASUW decides not to, it would have a stop date. Something like September 20th to June 20th.

Elloise: Does it need to add UW after GPSS?

Alex: I will ask for those changes. Are there any other thoughts? Cool. I will ask for those changes to WSA.

Alice: When is our final meeting? 27th?

Rene: You can ask for a special meeting if you want one more.

Alice: Yeah I think we will need to have one on the 10th since there's a Board of Regents meeting the next day. Is anyone opposed to have a meeting on the 10th?

None opposed.

Senate Agenda Setting

Alice: We have Ana-Mari coming. She is really excited.

Natalie: Can I start with what I have so far? Abe from SAF is the one to be Spotlight, but he is still unsure if he can make it so maybe we should put it on there and make adjustment.

Evan: Either Doug or myself can step in.

Alice: Well I though Ana-Mari is the spotlight. Did he say what he is going to talk about?

Natalie: They will be talking about marketing efforts.

Evan: I think it might be an action. Like actually actively marketing the fact that SAF funds all these things and get the word out that SAF is behind all this. Like put a name on this, so everyone knows you are a real entity.

Eddie: It seems like something that should have happened in Fall Quarter

Alice: I was going to say, it's a little late given the amount of things we have on our agenda. Now if you want to talk about why SAF voted not to fund PACs chair.

Evan: I don't think it's been voted on though. It's just where it's currently sitting.

Natalie: I will email Abe. Last week during Vanessa's presentation, they said they will have a resolution, so she sent me one that night on suicide prevention. It will have a lot of friendly amendments that they are going to add to it. We also have Brandon's resolution on an Office of Veteran Life. And we have a shell resolution on endorsing the new Student Code of Conduct. When Ellen and Elizabeth presented, they never sent me a shell resolution, so I had Aaron wrote one.

Evan: What is the veteran resource center about?

Natalie: From what I have heard, students veterans have been having conversations with SAF. Brandon just said that SAF wants evidence that they have the support of students. It would be similar to the Q Center in terms of what it's for. But SAF just wants evidence of student support but they want it in the form of resolution.

Alice: Ana Mari Cauce for 30 minutes. 10 minutes of presentation and then question and answer. And there are three resolutions: student conduct code, veteran resource center, and student mental health. Oh I forgot Marnie is coming. So we will move the student code of conduct endorsement in between for 10 minutes. 10 minutes but hope for 5 minutes. So what do we want to call the Marnie thing? Alex? She wants feedback from people. Student feedback on the UW presidential search with Student Regent Marnie Brown for 10 minutes. And then we will do our two other resolutions. Which one do we want first?

Natalie: Resolution on suicide prevention?

Evan: It sounds like the veteran one would be really fast too. They are just seeking endorsement.

Alice: And then student code of conduct as an action item. Suicide prevention will be presented by Lauren and Vanessa? Or I will just put me on there, since it's action. So 10 minutes for each resolution. I feel like there are other things that we need to address?

Eddie: We can talk about the resolution of UAW?

Natalie: Alice, it's the Office of Veteran Life.

Alice: oh, so we have the U-Pass MOU. So endorsement also? Should we put that earlier on?

Brian: Wouldn't that just bring out a rehash about stuff that has been addressed earlier on? Senators themselves will bring them out. Do you want to restrict questions or put it towards the end?

Alice: I just want to be careful with that because there were concerns to doing action items when attendance is a bit low. But I am fine putting it after the resolutions. Another thing is that we might have people like Josh from transportation services that want to be there. Do you mind if I put this right after the student code of conduct?

Alex: Yeah I think the mixing things up thing might work.

Alice: Is that action or information? And now, we have an hour and a half. That doesn't include officer reports though. Is there anything else at the end? That's an hour and fifty minutes.

Evan: Can you just start putting announcements for 10 minutes?

Alice: Yasmeen said we should put announcements at the beginning of the meeting.

Amber: ASUW tried that, but we found that the time when people were most alert was at the beginning of the meeting, so that's why we save that for formal businesses that we want to get to and then keep the announcements at the end.

Eddie: Plus those people who want to make announcements would have to stay.

Alice: So now we have spotlight, resolution on student code of conduct, U-Pass MOU, student feedback on presidential search, resolution on student suicide prevention, resolution on office of veteran life and then officer reports.

Eddie: We should consider having every item on time.

Kerstin: I will make sure that I keep us at time.

Alice: Maybe just knock when we have one minute left. I don't want people to perceive it like I am steamrolling through it. I will entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

Eddie: So moved | Alex: Second

Transfer Funds - Douglass Taber

Douglass: I discovered \$4,00 in my account that was for a tech recharge fee that should not have been applied to us. So I took it out of next year's budget, and this year it's called variable overhead spending variance. I am requesting to spend \$2500 out of the treasurer's fund to transfer it to the grants fund, so the grants fund has money for the summer. Specifically for \$500 to travel grants and \$2000 to departments. It doesn't have to be spent it would just go to the general fund, just like it is now. So I move to do that.

Alice: Could you talk quickly about the SAF approval? Can you give us an update on SAF funding? In the context of this, are there any areas that we may not be funded? Do you have a sense on what it might be given your best estimate?

Douglass: We contacted the University Architect, her name is Rebecca. You are referring to the childcare fund right?

Alice: No, I is referring to the general budget.

Doug: That's May 22. I have a really good sense that we are in really good water.

Alice: but I have been hearing cut increases

Doug: Oh yeah, but our cut would be insignificant.

Alice: Can you just tell me the amount?

Doug: No I prefer not to. I will ask Max if I can tell the officers individually.

Alice: Could you tell us what it might be? Given your best estimate?

Doug: It's a little bit less than what we were asking for. It's going to be insignificant.

Alice: Is the cut just up to us to distribute? So if we have \$1600 less hypothetically than we requested, it's up to us to decide where we will be getting that fund?

Doug: we can do anything, SAF can't tell us which item to cut

Alice: So we can cut it from travel grants?

Evan: So Alice is asking whether we should have that \$1600 in our general fund?

Kerstin: So we still have \$1500 which will cover that \$1600.

Doug: So I will move to approve to transfer the \$2500 to the grants account| Eddie: Second

Executive Senator Reports:

Eddie: The union contract expired last Thursday. The resolution was reached that day with the University. The resolution was presented to 150 UAW members gathered outside Condon Hall waiting for an action. Those members seemed to really like the deal. There is a tentative agreement among the bargaining committee and the university. There is a vote going on to ratify that agreement, and all the terms are on the website. Non-economic things are really big: Gender identity is protected now for the first time. Transgender services are now covered. The definition of micro-aggression as grievable offenses are on the contract. ASEs are protected against systematic discrimination. On the economic side, on wages, the UAW and the UW have agreed to tracking the median compensation for base rates among the global ASEs. There's going to be 24% raise compounding 3 years. And the fees that were paid by ASE will now be waived, including the building fee that was \$150 for ASEs. There's a table on the UAW website with all the changes. In exchange, the ASEs have agreed to pay for STF fee and U-Pass fee. Effectively, ASEs who are using U-Pass now will pay for \$80 less next year. Health insurance hopefully will remain at \$0 premiums and there's a removal of caps on the benefits the university has adjusted. Hopefully the benefit cuts we experienced this year will never happen again. There's an agreement to more transparency between the UW and UAW on obtaining health care plans and getting insured. There's going to be someone working at the benefits office that will help coordinate claims between Lifewise and ASEs because everyone at some

point has some complaints about Lifewise. The current state was that if you call the benefits office, they would tell you that they can't do anything, and they would redirect you to Lifewise. You had no alternative but to meddle with Lifewise. The benefits office was spending a lot of man hours on helping people with this issue. And a lot of it is miscoding. So now, there will be someone in the benefits office answering questions about Lifewise.

Monica: So the election update, voting is robust. We are at 1958 right now. Our goal is to get 2000 votes for the ratifications.

Alice: How many emails are you getting? Because I have been getting 7 a day.

Eddie: You can email UAW 4121 to ask them to stop.

Eddie: That's a great deal. I know the union wanted all the fees to be waived, but it's a lot of improvement. But I think the wage increases are really going to help, and the amendments are really going to help people. All these protections are really going to matter.

Monica: This union is really paving the way for UAW. I think it's great that we are pushing that on behalf of entire country.

Eloise: We shared our resolution to support minimum wage in the Faculty Senate. They did not have sufficient knowledge on the resolution so Eddie provided great information. There was a short discussion on whether to endorse it, but there were some concerns regarding the School of Social Work part. The hope is that the council can draft a resolution so that it can be passed in the next meeting.

Alice: On the School of Social Work thing, we spoke to someone at the School of Social Work, and they gave us some thoughts on how we can turn our resolution to real time advocacy. The way we should think about it is with some short term approaches of identifiable things that can be done and that we can logically make a case for, such as not requiring any hours above those recommended by the accrediting body, asking them to justify why there are more hours, and stressing the importance of educational excellence for those education experiences. If these are truly educational experiences, we endorse any effort to ensure that those are truly educational in nature and students are benefiting from them, and there may be an audit. But we are calling the audit to focus on the educational piece, while not forgetting there are some long-term goals aside from our immediate ask. But also don't forget there are broader conversations on compensation about all types of practicum experiences. We want to make sure that students learn from that. Not forgetting that there are some long term goals and perspectives that need to occur, like fair compensation all over campus. If you are contributing to the workforce, what would be a reasonable compensation for graduate students in practicum? We want to have some tangible goals but at the same time not forget the long-term perspective.

Eddie: I agree with that approach. Especially you know, more practicum hours than required accreditation, and narrowing in on issues like that that are achievable in the short term. I would

say that in terms of how our resolution has been crafted about compensation, clauses of our resolution basically only affect practicums that are substantial enough to be the equivalent to the work that a full time employee would do at any site. If the practicum were to stay a true educational experience, that would be an alternative way to meet the goal of the resolution, but I agree with the long term and short term view.

Alice: I don't know if you read the 7 page response to our resolution, the person we talked to has a really good point on that "we want to work with you to utilize practicums to achieve academic excellence" rather than that you are breaking the laws and that there are going to be lawsuits.

Evan: Travel grants are going well. In general we have a ton of great applicants and hopefully we continue to get more travel grants. For example, some students were invited to go to plenary talks but the trip is not paid for so it has been a great applicant pool.

Officer Reports

Alex: I've been working on the MOU that you already saw. I'm also working on SAF things as well. And statewide letters to students. Spokane is still up in the air. Another thing is a legal education program in Tacoma.

Doug: Travel grants went well. My goal for end of the year is staff and office guidelines on spending. It would be nice for people to know how funds can be spent. Also the exec committee just approved \$2500 fund for next year's fund. We also started the data collection process.

Evan: We also have that data to make sure that there is no gender bias.

Doug: SAF innovation requests fell short. Kerstin contacted the University Architect, Rebecca. She didn't get back to us in time, but she will let us know what the process would look like, and what it will take to move forward.

Alice: So why would we need approval from Rebecca? Did we look at the innovation fund for IMA and for HUB? It's the same cost for a feasibility study.

Kerstin: Because this is something that would end up requiring capital.

Alice: Thank you for doing the initial outreach. We can touch base on that and get that conversation going before I leave.

Kerstin: We did talk to Rene and Lincoln, it just turns out that it's too tight of a turnaround for the meeting. SAF also says that we also need to make sure that 50% would be funded through the University administration.

Alice: Also make sure that we work with Amy Hawkins.

Evan: It was over 4 million than SAF was expecting.

Natalie: The archive book is coming along. I am currently at 500 pages. Last year's was never done and so I am doing that too. The archive book includes bylaws, constitution, proposed budget, approved budget, senate agendas and minutes, exec agendas and minutes, and F&B agendas and minutes, and event documents.

Amber: We had a marathon meeting on Tuesday. We went through reading resolutions on disaggregating data on API. We talked about on campus ballot drop boxes and having voter registration with the resident move-ins.

Alice: I have a Regent meeting tomorrow. There are some interesting student protests. One is on divestment in coal, I expect the Regents will approve this. We also have our PACs presentation tomorrow. We will be presenting on a number of issues, including School of Social Work issues, and PAC's recent opinion statement on tuition use for capitol project which says that tuition should not be the primary funding sources for capital projects. This was the PACs opinion and recommendation, and we would like to turn it into an MOU that would basically say that if they want new buildings, they need to go through us. We will also include the minimum wage, and childcare also, and also a veteran center. The meeting is at Academic Affairs at 8:30. There are a lot of grad student related issues on administrative shuffling like canceling certificate programs and such. I included in my email to you yesterday a draft of the recommendation of the sub- committee that is going to present. I am really happy with it, I think it reflects really well on the issues that we have been talking about. We got on the agenda for the child care survey. We also talked about college councils. It turns out that the School of Nursing has college councils that talk about budget that are not on the PACs list and so that's good that it's added. But the School of Dentistry has one council that doesn't talk about budget and they are requesting leadership training to bring budgetary issues into light. Also since we have people on SAF in the room, another fire that came up that we need to put out, ded SAF vote to not fund the PACs chair?

Evan: They haven't voted on that

Alice: SAF would not be funding this, the decision is final. The reason historically to have the PACs chair funded by SAF is so that it has autonomy. But since it doesn't have an administrative unit, I think there are some personal politics going on, and I am hoping that you guys can pick it up.

Adjourn

Evan: So moved | Doug: Seconded

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.