

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday July 24, 2013

Chris Lizotte, Elisa Law, Kimberly Schertz, Renee Singleton, Chris Erickson, Evan Firth, Larry Huang, Evelina Vaisvilaite

Meeting called to order: 5:05

Chris Lizotte: Move that we insert inaction item to vote to support an insurance policy that allows people to opt into having explanation of benefits given only to them (pertains to minors) vote to tag along with other groups that support. 5A

Kimberly: Second

Evan: Second

Chris L: Approval of the minutes from June 5; entertain motion to approve min

Elisa: So moved

Kimberly: Second it

Chris L: Faculty senate is putting together adjudication panel to look into conduct of faculty member, ASUW and GPSS are asked to provide 6 people in where 2 of each will be picked to sit on panel, we're working with Alex (assistant to faculty senate) we'll appoint those people. Procedure in fall, sensitive situation, by faculty member against student

Chris L: Genesis cannot be here tonight due to a family emergency. Taking over a departmental allocation that was received in June (budget) for retreats. We are essentially going to charge executive committee to come up with procedure. What we have to do now is sign off and approve the request that was made (details in minutes that are in binder, under F&B Departmental allocations) F&B has already sign off, GPSS executive must approve

Kimberly: Move to approve

Evan: Second

Kimberly: How much was it for?

Chris L: \$500, for retreats we are doubling amount that they can get

Kimberly: Is it coming out of next years budget or budget from now?

Elisa: 2013-2014 budget

Evan: Second

--no opposed

Chris L: Motion carries

Chris E: Background on student named Paul Berry. Currently when people are on their parents insurance or spouses there is an explanation of benefits that go out to people, for certain services like mental health, sexual information, it could go out to parents, current process is that people can sign a form for information to be privatized but not ordered for all carriers. Tomorrow they will be sending letter in to insurance commissioner proposing changes; idea is to add our name to it in order to carry importance. Proposal> add name to letter as group that endorses the rule change to enforce privacy. With that I entertain discussion. Washington student's insurance alliance made by students

Evan: Are they simply requesting a rule?

Chris E: Real only push back if any, would be from providers, because it would add more work to put that in place and check for liability.

Chris L: Comfortable without seeing the letter

Kimberly: Comfortable supporting

Chris E: WSA would be good and ASUW; speak to them for support as well. Breaks barrier for students especially but people in general so that would like to have something done, can be done, without letting their parents know or those whom they do not wish to know.

Evelina: ASUW has a meeting tomorrow, could potentially be said that ASUW is considering supporting it. If there was interest from ASUW tomorrow, could they kind of sign up for that?

Chris E: yes, that would be great

Chris L: any other questions, comments. Entertain motion to add name to letter

Elisa: So moved

Evan: Second

Chris L: all in favor?

--- all in favor ---

Chris L: executive senator reports? Evan and Kimberly?

Kimberly: I sort of do, Elisa has been working with committee that I created "students for recognition and opportunity" regarding provosts post of questions for criminal background questions, provost is opening dialog to give students an opportunity to seek higher education.

Chris: can you briefly tell us what nature of your involvement was?

Kimberly: I found out about proposed question back in November or December and also heard about it from executive director when I was doing clinic work through law school and wanted us to reach out to administration and get more information to express our opposition. Not only impacts diversity of students coming in, we're also very concerned that people wouldn't have a meaningful opportunity to move past their mistakes. We started building our coalition with other grad students who are interested, when we wrote our letter to provost we had long list of members. Just reach out to the community, we are still opposed to the question, but at the very least we want to be part of the dialogue, to at least make sure the question is fair to enter.

Chris E: King county is moving to not use arrest records in any of their hiring

Kimberly: How this came out was a concern for campus safety, but crime that happens on campus happen by non-students and especially for sexual assaults because those normally don't have criminal records.

Chris L: do you know about the incident that precipitated this decision?

Kimberly: yes, and I also spoke to the student who was for this position. That is all

Chris E: Working with insurance companies. WSA retreat, I won't be available for the dates, but Chris will be there for our behalf. Have not heard anything from ASUW, we'll work on coordinating that to have some good representation. Need to meet with Chris L about Sage, generally cancel appointments. Without a new transportation budget, something like 650,000

Elisa: Orientation for GPSS and UW PD safety are coming along, half of department is scheduled. New roster for senators is updated. Archivist is almost finished with last year minutes and meeting agendas, and putting it all into a book, much like ASUW and having Mackensie work as far back as we can to get records organized. Moving forward, is to start reaching out to GPSS committees to recruit for orientations which includes officers. Can start working on dates and times for that so that people can sign up. Have not heard from John Vinson, UW Chief of Police

Chris: I'm meeting with him on Friday

Elisa: if you can send him my way. That's it.

Evelina: Office space reorganization. Tomorrow at our meeting we are finalizing office space finalization, summer advising organizations, conversations about homecoming, husky leadership retreats

Chris: Officers briefly met, and have decided to come up with purchasing procedure, and everything will go to Genesis. We have highered development coordinator : Cory & hired special assistant. Coming up with happy hours, events to build community. Point one to get current graduate students to involve themselves with GPSS students. Idea of having a GPSS Gala (Rene idea) black tie affair that would be geared among promoting endowment, money raiser. Last week, Michael Kutz and I, Bergis, and guy from environmental group were brought over to Starbucks headquarters where we were given informative presentation where starbucks tried to convince of what good they do in the world "green". UW is entering with starbucks sponsorship agreement, we are thinking about ways to work proactively with Starbucks, one of the things is that they have compostable hot cups but not anything else and this clashes with campus ideas, all recyclable but not compostable, but they will develop those compostable things in the next year. Try to milk them for starbucks coffee for meetings, events, etc.

Chris E: Two questions: some of thier stuff that is fair trade, is that the only coffee that would be served and two what does that do for price point? What does that do to the other coffee shops?

Renee: if its run by HFS, then they fall into the big agreement to convert into Starbucks. New day, new time, new approach to sponsorships. I would send Chris back to confirm, but for now its Starbucks.

Chris E: where is USAS on this?

Chris L: USAS was contacted, but they have not responded.

Chris E: They have power, and have people behind what they do. That's not something we want to deal with after the fact.

Chris: they were in the loop from the beginning, so no idea why they haven't responded. Easier to address concerns beforehand

Evan: didn't expect anyone to jump on sponsorships so quickly.

Chris: we already have one with Coca Cola

Renee: we do. It goes back and forth, but larger aspects now, we have a department, we have staffing for sponsorships. Invite sponsorship meeting to see what's going on

Evan: so we can get those that can maybe be opposed to the sponsors, before things go too far along

Chris: Alaskan Airlines is also trying to sponsor us for travel. Sponsorship as part of the advancement development. Finally able to get a meeting for tailgating tomorrow and that is moving forward, and I will be able to assemble people who are interested. We have been in business with Foster and Law people. Michael Kutz and I have met twice so far with the President, and we have built a good relationship. Both Michael and I... student life has been a priority. In next couple weeks I will be writing a letter to provost and president to ask for money for events that are coming up, ex: Gala, Tailgating , anything else that people can think of, just let me know, for next time

Entertain motion to adjourn

Elisa: So moved

Evan: Second

All in favor -----

Meeting Adjourned: 5:55

August 7, 2013
GPSS Executive Committee Minutes
HUB 303

Attendees:

Chris Lizotte – GPSS President
Genesis Rodriguez – GPSS Treasurer
Kimberly Schertz – Executive Senator
Larry Huang – Executive Senator
Alice Popejoy – Executive Senator
Evan Firth – Executive Senator

Meeting called to order: 5:01PM

Chris L: Entertain motion to approve agenda

Kimberly: Move to approve

Genesis: Second

Chris: Agenda is approved. Minutes from 7/24, entertain motion to approve min

Genesis: motion to amend, for changing Cory to Joey Hunziker

Alice: Second

- None apposed

Chris: Accept minutes as amended.

Tail Gaiting: have an event at newly opened Husky Stadium, GPSS Sponsored to create community. Good opportunity to tie events and alumni records, moving people from law school, business, Evans, to come up with fun series of tailgating opportunities for graduate and professional students and alumni. I'm still hammering out the dates, two options in parking lot – traditional tailgating and the other one is called "the zone" where they have a space you can rent where there is live music. Looking at this for a big game like homecoming game or the Oregon game. 500 dollars to reserve space, but advancement tends to believe it is 10,000 dollars to reserve. Emailed Ryan, in charge of game day experience over at athletics and he will be talking to me about this. Hopefully going to be something to help, not only for GPSS events and to get graduate and professionals to show up at games.

Kimberly: are we back at our stadium this year?

Chris: Yes

Kimberly: that sounds like a great idea

Alice: I feel like some people might have objections to GPSS having to do with drinking things but if we have an "alumni networking" angle, it would work best

August 7, 2013
GPSS Executive Committee Minutes
HUB 303

Chris: Yes, that would be why I'm trying to get Evans alumni, Foster alumni, Law school alumni. Questions or comments?

Genesis: no

Chris: next thing; the Liquor control board of state of Washington has modified some of its rules, and I think everyone at UW has been kind of broad sighted by this but apparently new rule is that if you receive alcohol in a form of a donation or discounted rate, you are no longer allowed to simply give it away, you have to sell it at cost.

Genesis: that's ridiculous

Kimberly: yea, that's ridiculous

Chris: There are a lot of events in which alcohol is given out. It says, at cost.

Alice: but if it's our cost, which is nothing, we can charge like 25 cents. Is there somewhere online that I can look this up?

Genesis: I don't recall us getting a lot of donated alcohol but I think we do get a discounted rate

Kimberly: that's not a donation

Genesis: there's a total difference between donation and discounted rate

Chris: A lot of this is still ambiguous. I will say on a related note; we can no longer use volunteer bartenders, we have to use trained bartenders. We have no control over that

Kimberly: is there a problem that caused that?

Genesis: I think there have been complaints about our socials and using sub senators to bartend and the monitoring of tickets, and then people just not caring and giving as much alcohol as they want as the night goes on. I think after the Spring Social it became an issue, but it came full circle after Spring Social. I think we have to pay their hourly wage, not too sure. I haven't been given the amount of that, but I'm pretty sure it would have to be the hourly wage of bartender and corkage fee.

Chris: There is a silver lining. I had lunch with Kathleen and Malik today, and according to Malik there are places on campus that are designated as "wet space" in other words it is always available for alcohol space and one space is in the UW Tower. It's a space available to us in the future, and there are other places on campus we can look into where we can use it, but this will definitely affect our social events in the coming year

Kimberly: Is this trained bartenders just aimed at GPSS?

Chris: I don't know if it's aimed at us, but we're pretty much in that category, but no, it also applies to other groups on campus, events in the university where they need to now need to use trained bartenders

August 7, 2013
GPSS Executive Committee Minutes
HUB 303

Alice: I'm looking at their policy, and either they haven't updated or it's a bit strange. But it says that you CAN give it away, in "trade association conventions" I don't know if its just in trade associations where you can do this. But there has to be a loop hole

Genesis: We are going to have to meet with SAO

Alice: if we, as GPSS determine that the interpretation differently, will we be in trouble with the University if we go against the memorandum?

Chris: we would be violating state law

Alice: but if state law, isn't particularly clear. Presumably there is room for human error

Genesis: but I think it will also be needed for us to ask for clarification and do our due diligence

Kimberly: I think technically we could go off of our interpretation, but I think they will think that we should've known better and we should've done our due diligence

Chris: Any other questions, comments on that? Ok, moving right along. So, what I wanted to do, if possible, we don't have to make a decision right now, but if we can come up with the meeting schedule for at least the fall quarter, the way we are going to do this is where we have alternating executive and senate at 5:30 Wednesdays, all we really need to do is determine kind of the first date and then we can go from there.

Genesis: I believe school starts on the 25th. So maybe have the meeting on the 2nd of October?

Chris: My recommendation would be probably to hold off and let people catch their breath

Alice: just from my programs experience last year, I feel like there were a lot of people saying that they didn't have enough time to elect senators before the first meeting which was kind of frustrating for us who wanted to do it, so I would just encourage more time, it would be best

Genesis: it looks like our first meeting last year was Oct 3, so it was one week plus a few days

Alice: October 9 is exactly two weeks after school starts

Genesis: I think if we get the word out... I mean people will be here before the school starts

Chris: but if we start on the 9th, we will have 5 meetings in fall quarter

Genesis: we had 4, last year

Kimberly: were we meeting last year once a month?

Alice: no it was every other week

Genesis: it was twice a month, it looked like

August 7, 2013
GPSS Executive Committee Minutes
HUB 303

Chris: I think it works out to be roughly 4 times a quarter, every other week-ish. So that would be what I'm inclined to go with

Genesis: starting with the 9th

Chris: yes, starting with the 9th. Because if we start on the 16th, that would only be 3 meetings which is not ok. So my suggestion is that we start on the 9th at 5:30 on Wednesday and alternating Wednesday's and I guess December 4th we can either just say right here, "we're not going to do it", or just play it by ear, because we can always cancel a meeting.

Alice: what about if we do like a little GPSS mixer, interest activity on the second? So we can already get people departments who already have elected senators, to mingle and invite other grad people to the mixer. So that way we can do something on the 2nd week and do something fun.

Evan: Yea, mixers are always good; we can do it in the office

Chris: so we need to approve the meetings, I will entertain a motion to hold meetings October 9, 23, November 5, 20th, and maybe December 4th we can do something holiday related

Alice: so moved

Evan: second

Chris: any objections

- No objections

Genesis: do we need to approve for other quarters?

Evan: hopefully just the fall because it gets complicated and we have to approve budgets

Chris: so now, exec meetings, when to start them?

Kimberly: Mixer is on October 2nd?

Chris: yes

Genesis: I think we should meet before the first senate

Chris: yes, I think we need to come up with the agenda before the first senate meeting

Kimberly: do we not have a meeting in September?

Chris: We have a meeting on September 4th, or we can meet on the 11th to get back on the schedule but I would say the 25th at the very least and go every other week except for thanksgiving

(Sept 25, Oct 16, Oct 30, Nov 13, skip the next one cause of thanksgiving, and then we have the 4th is like a holiday thing and I don't think we're going to meet on the 11th)

August 7, 2013
GPSS Executive Committee Minutes
HUB 303

Evan: and the 25th meeting would be for planning the mixer and making the Agenda. So would we have to meet another time in September to set up orientation? So keep the 4th

Kimberly: yes, keep the 4th

Alice: ok so we're meeting on the 4th

Chris: entertain motion to schedule meetings at 5:30 on following days: September 4, September 25, October 16, October 30 and November 13

Kimberly: move to approve

Genesis: Second

Chris: any objections?

■ No Objections

Thank you guys , this is really great, so now we can do our room scheduling, this will be fantastic.

Alice: when?

Chris: 5:30 all the time. So, that brings us to Exec senator reports

Kimberly: don't have anything

Larry: nope, nothing

Evan: nothing

Genesis: office manager position is up , posting closes this Sunday but might be extended, I will be posting budget analyst and event coordinator, so that's coming up

Chris: So I've been sort of yammering about development and advancement, my attitude is that we cant do it without as many partners as we can get, so I've been trying to figure out how to partner with alumni association, graduate school, and professional school and once Joey comes back that would go smoother because he has a lot of experience and I don't. We are kind of at the pivot point where we are getting oriented to our jobs. I met with Denzil Suite and Michael kutz today; I think he's going to be a great guy to work with. But I believe this is all I have at the moment. But yes, those are my announcements.

I actually have an announcement. Elisa asked me to remind you all, that she emailed out a document that has the script for new student orientations that we will be doing, and has brochure of pamphlets, and she would like us to look it over. Kimberly and Larry I think you have it in your emails, but I think I sent it earlier today.

Kimberly: Yea she sent it to me earlier today, and I remember I had a comment, but I forget what it was.

August 7, 2013
GPSS Executive Committee Minutes
HUB 303

Chris: I think it's also on the drive so you can look at it their too. I think the pamphlets look pretty good

Genesis: the black and white one is the new one

Kimberly: I have the talking points in my drive but I don't have the flyer

Alice: so this is for like, editing?

Chris: Yes. So she (Elisa) has been working diligently on the "not for tourist guide", but also feel free to edit that, which should also be on Drive. But if you cant access if for some reason, then just speak to Elisa.

Kimberly: I think the only comment I had on the flyer, was um, just the wording that says that "senators are required to attend monthly meetings" which should sound a bit more fun, not so formal

Alice: Yea, I was just about to comment on that

Chris: any other announcements? I will entertain motion to adjourn the meeting

Evan: So moved

Genesis: Second

Meeting Adjourned: 5:45PM

August 21, 2013
GPSS Committee Executive Minutes
HUB 303

Attendees:

Chris Lizotte – GPSS President

Chris Erickson – GPSS Vice President

Genesis Rodriguez – GPSS Treasurer

Elisa Law – GPSS Secretary

Evan Firth – Executive Senator

Kimberly Schertz – Executive Senator

Larry Huang – Executive Senator

Alice Popejoy – Executive Senator

Mackenzie – Archivist

Minutes called to order: 5:12

Chris L: Entertain a motion to approve the agenda or amend it. I actually have an amendment id like to make,

Chris E: So moved

Genesis: Second

Chris L: So executive senator reports will go to Item 7B after that, can I get a motion to approve agenda as amended

Elisa: So moved

Chris E: Second

Chris L: Entertain motion to approve minutes, motion to move it to next meeting

Elisa: Second

Chris L: any objections to that motion?

■ No Objections

Chris L: make a motion to approve minutes in next meeting, and we'll need to coordinate minutes. Also, appoint Devin Bedard to the college council

Genesis: do we need to review anything before having this presented?

Chris L: He is the only at large person that showed interest from the college of the environment to be appointed to the council

Kimberly: I wasn't aware that anyone needed to be appointed

Chris L: To my knowledge there hasn't been a process assigned for that, now that college councils are becoming more solidified we might want to come up with a process to abide by. So what I'm doing here is sort of not official, but I would move that we appoint Devin Bedard to become part of the College of the Environment college council

Kimberly: So moved

Evan: second

Chris L: Any objections?

- No objections

Chris L: I will verify to make sure if there is an existing process if not then we can talk further about creating one

Elisa: So, Mackenzie, can you tell us what your job is and what we can do to help improve?

Mackenzie: Basically what I'm doing is archiving, getting all of your important things together in one thing. You just kind of need a place where it's obvious where certain things are. We met with Renee when we first started to determine, and this is all just your electronic documents first, I haven't even touched the papers, and just make the senate rosters with just kind of the tenants. Personnel tracking especially, the end goal for me, Renee has these really nice bound books for ASUW and I think it should be our goal every year to have that made, nicely presented, mostly for accessibility, in case an alumni comes by and asks what happened this year, its mostly institutional memory, and if you find something or see something that you needed and don't know where it is, I do. I feel like everything I've done is pretty obvious where it was moved to, and I'll be working on a list to give everyone so that you can put them in the folder it needs to be in.

Chris L: Have you devised a standard naming format that we should be using?

Mackenzie: Yes, I'll send out an email soon.

Elisa: So, you've organized the absolute essentials of what GPSS has done?

Mackenzie: yes, and just one copy

Elisa: So at this point you are done with last years book pretty much?

Mackenzie: well, I'm still waiting to hear back from last years execs

Elisa: so moving forward, you would suggest all the officers and staff to save their documents how?

Mackenzie: well in terms of file making, just what committee, or what person, what DATE. The date is very important.

Genesis: but this will all go out in your email of how we should be doing things?

Mackenzie: Yes

Chris L: anything else? Ok, well thank you so much for what you have been doing

Elisa: If you'll go to the back of the book, there is a sheet for amending the proposed budget from last year. So the budget that was proposed for last year was to have another research analyst, and so I spoke to the officers and it was decided that that position was no longer necessary. So taking away the research analyst position, and changing that over to fund the archivist through the year. So Mackenzie will be working 18 hours a week for 15 dollars. That should leave us with a positive balance; we won't be needing any other money to go to that. So basically to get rid of the research analyst position and change it over to archivist

Evan: so the research analyst was going to work under you?

Elisa: well the purpose of the research analyst was to tell the alumni about our events and what could be improved, and I think what we ended up with was a really long report that probably won't be used

Genesis: Moroni was our research analyst last year, and the survey was his biggest project. So it's just better to roll over the requirements of that position to the archivist or to another staff member, and therefore the research analyst position isn't needed.

Chris E: The other part of it is that I know that the policy job that I'm going to hire for is going to look a little different, because I would put it more to the idea that we're changing the research analyst position to the archive assistant, a new job description as opposed to what it was before. So no objections

Chris L: I think each of us have broad discretion to assign the money that's been budgeted for us for our staff as we see fit. I think its great to bring it up to the exec, but strictly speaking it doesn't require an action from the exec

Elisa: well, since the archivist position was only made for the summer, I didn't know if it was the exec decision to extend it. Well, when I was doing the interview, I told the interviewees that the position might possibly go through the rest of the year. Do you think that's an issue?

Chris L: No, I don't think it's an issue, because if when you were interviewing you presented the position as such, than its ok, because it's one thing if we advertised it, and then pull it back, that's something else, but since not, it's ok.

Chris E: So without any other pressing questions, I would move that we support Elisa's suggestion of extending the Archivist

Evan: Second that

Chris L: Any objections?

- No Objections

Chris L: Elisa thanks for that. I think that it is a good decision. So at this point, executive senator reports? Anyone? Larry, Evan, Kimberly?

Kimberly: No, nothing over here

Larry: nope

Evan: yea, I got nothing for you

Genesis: Did you guys already sign up for orientation? (Execs)

Elisa: so I'm going to be out of town for a few weeks, but I'll send out a notice every week with an updated list and volunteer for positions on Google drive, there is a column where you can put your name

Kimberly: when is the orientation?

Elisa: they start on the 13th and go until the 24th

Kimberly: So, you said that the orientation was what day?

Elisa: orientations go from the 13-24th, there are about 3-4 scheduled each day, so I tried to schedule it out so that one person could do most of them, but it'd be nice if they didn't have to do all of them. In the case that they are not available (senators) if we could bring some flyers and business cards, and we are also scheduling UW PD

Kimberly: I don't think I got any emails about signing up for the orientations

Chris L: We will check on our email lists, it's just possible the way that it's set up to the Google drive

Elisa: yea, I'll connect you to that individually

Chris E: I'll make one suggestion and because I'm making it, I volunteer to be at it for most of it, but if we can get some senators to fill in the gaps, and let them know that now is the time to be involved in committees (this is what I do as GPSS Senators)

Genesis: But this is also why we have a script right?

Chris L: Elisa, can you give me the days that you're out of town?

Elisa: from tomorrow to the 11th

Chris L: In that case, should we move to officer reports?

Chris E: So since the last time we met, I met with Michael Kutz, and we went over transportation aside from getting in touch with palette and making sure we're still in touch with the fee based program, and also the liquor control thing and why that came through. Because there is another thing regardless of cost, so cost for a case of beer is like 6 bucks, but other thing that gets me is that we used to be able to get a party permit, so now it says that we need to do it in advance 45 days. Still looking over policy and technology stuff with Evan, I hope to be talking with you for the most part, and help Kimberly on the bill, and other things that people are interested in.

Genesis: I offered position and hired, an incoming Evans, events coordinator position is up, so please share it, we need applicants. I'm finalizing all the topics it covers for events. That's the only update I have

Elisa: I went over most of the stuff earlier, as far as orientation goes, we did like 100 orientations in 2009 and now we're only doing like 60 orientations, so I'm not sure what's going on. I'd like to send out mailers that are not having GPSS orientations. Still waiting to hear from housing and services whether or not we can use these Seattle maps. We got our new brochures, 500 of them, so make sure to spread them out over campus.

Chris L: ok, so first thing; very good news, GPSS president moves the money around 20,000 for our events (food) so one thing that is not clear for me from budget from last year, is small events, and how much of that is made from SAF funding, and how much it is food and drinks, so I don't know how much the break down is, and what proportion had been budgeted for permissible uses, just to know how much we have to spend. On the alcohol policy, I had a conversation with Lincoln, at cost means what we pay for it, it means what WE would have paid for it if we got it for full price, so at retail essentially. The other thing, the 45 day permitting is that it is only if you get discounted or free alcohol, so basically we are buying the alcohol at regular price throughout the year. However, one thing that will happen, Lincoln told me that they are revising their policy on Kegs, but they are more economical, and so we can at least save some money and not buy everything in bottles or cans. I went on a tour for HUB stadium, and it is pretty impressive space. If anyone has a good candidate to serve in committee for physical accessibility issues, any graduate student, please do so. I emailed Ryan Madayag over at athletics, and told him that we were willing to put down payments for the 4 days, so the zone is going to be cost prohibited, we're going to get enough space to accommodate 40-50 people, and I was also talking to Renee about this, and she suggested that so we reduce our liability, if a department like the Evan school brings a pony keg, then hey, if a student organization wants to bring it...

Genesis: We would still be liable, because it's our event, so it's better if we have no alcohol or if we plan to have alcohol

Alice: I was going to say about the policy though, I think it said that BYOB was ok; it's just a matter of serving it

Chris L: are you referring to the liquor control policy?

Alice: yea

Chris L: My initial impression is that BYOB we're largely released from responsibility of managing it, but we should get more information. The essential thing is that we're going to reserve the spot and do our best to get people out there

Kimberly: if it was an unofficial tailgating and GPSS isn't contributing any money, then we would not be liable, but if GPSS does contribute funds then we are liable, but I think it would be best to speak to Renee

Chris L: well the parking space costs money, so we can't get around that

Kimberly: How much does it cost?

Chris L: 100-200 for each parking spot

Genesis: do we have confirmation from the Evans school and Foster school?

Chris E: Evans school meeting is this week

Chris L: So just to clarify, there is no money that has been spent yet, the games are 9/28, 10/12, 10/26, 11/9. So the last thing is that there was a meeting, kind of a forum on the criminal background questions, and it was held primarily by UW Bothell, they requested a meeting because they had felt left out. So what everyone needs to know is that the question is a done deal. Tacoma and Bothell have rolling admissions that start really soon, they will not be excluding anyone because of the affirmative response to that question, until they have clarification. UW Seattle is not that big of a deal because we don't have admission notifications until March 15-31, so I would say that the meeting was a little antagonistic

Alice: can you just clarify the question for me, the policy?

Kimberly: there are two questions; one asks if they are registered as a sex offender and the second question is if you've ever been convicted with a violent offence.

Chris L:

First question: "Have you ever been convicted of a violent felony offence, are such charges pending against you at this time, or have you been required to register as a sex offender by any legal authority of the U.S. or any other country?"

Second question: if you answered yes, tell us why this should not be a concern for campus safety

Kimberly: you said the meeting was antagonistic, can you go back? The administration didn't take the Bothell people seriously?

Chris L: The two sides just didn't see eye to eye. The administration for them to administer the question really the number one reason is for the perception of safety, and they just didn't really make that clear, and get across. I think Ana Mari, was open to hearing all of this

Kimberly: I think it's a liability issue

Chris L: I think Ana Mari was kind of explaining the issue was more because of the parents, how the parents would be concerned that the school doesn't know the type of people they have on campus

Alice: is this the type of thing that GPSS would take a position on?

Chris L: We certainly can

Alice: how often do we take a position on it, because I think either way we're shooting ourselves in the foot

Chris L: Well, if there is interest it will percolate up essentially, but if there is enough interest and desire on our part we can bring it up to the senate. But one thing I will say is that this does not involve graduate students, but that's a peripheral impact

Evan: wasn't it the big thing that a TA had an issue

Chris L: I think it was a faculty member. One thing I will say is that the administration will send out information on how many people they will reject because of this question; they will release that data, aggregate data, to see if it is having a disproportionate impact. So I would say again, if we want to bring it up as exec to have an opinion on it, we can

Alice: well I think it's getting a lot of attention, but I think that it is something we need to mention in the first meeting with the senate

Kimberly: so was it a group of Bothell or?

Chris L: So it was a group of faculty from Bothell. The last thing I'll say is that at meetings like this, I am given the responsibility to bring up the graduate school opinions on this, but I don't really have the opinions right now, so it might be useful to see where people are at, so I can say that this is how graduate students feel about the matter.

Genesis: are there future meetings of this?

Chris L: I haven't heard of any

Elisa: Kimberly, isn't there a town hall meeting about this subject?

Kimberly: yes, I don't know when it is scheduled to meet, but I can look that up

Chris L: I don't have that on my calendar

Elisa: I'll send it to you

Chris L: Alright, so any other announcements?

Genesis: please have your friends apply for our jobs

Chris L: next exec meeting is September 4, is it at 5:30 or 5:00

Genesis: our meeting says 5:30 on September 4

Chris L: ok, so we'll just make it 5:30

Kimberly: what are the dates for the tailgating?

Chris L: 9/28, 10/12, 10/26, 11/9

Kimberly: and can you send me the minutes from last meeting as well, so I can know the dates of the meetings

Elisa: Yea, of course. I'll send everyone an email with the minutes

Chris L: so I know that the exec meetings have been a little bumpy, so I thank everyone for being flexible

Genesis: for the September 4th meeting, who will be calling in and who will be present?

Elisa: I won't be present, but I can call in

Kimberly: I will be present

Evan: I will be present

Alice: I will be skyping in

Larry: I think I will possibly be around

Chris L: so if you are physically here, then please meet here

Alice: also if you can please send emails of the agenda to those who are calling in for next time

Chris L: ok, if there are no other announcements I will entertain motion to adjourn?

Genesis: motion

Elisa: second

Evan: second

Chris L: anyone opposed?

■ None Opposed

Meeting adjourned: 6:11 PM

September 4, 2013
GPSS Committee Executive Minutes
HUB 303

Attendees:

Chris Lizotte – GPSS President

Chris Erickson – GPSS Vice President

Genesis Gavino – GPSS Treasurer

Evan Firth – Executive Senator

Kimberly Schertz – Executive Senator

Minutes called to order: 5:31

Chris L: Entertain motion to amend Agenda. It should say information not action.

Chris E: So moved

Chris L: Any opposed?

- None Opposed

Chris L: Entertain motion to approve minutes?

Kimberly: Move to approve

Genesis: Second

Chris L: Entertain motion to approve minutes from August 7,

Kimberly: Move to approve

Genesis: Second

Chris L: Entertain motion to approve minutes from August 21

Kimberly: Move to approve

Genesis: Second

Chris L: So this is the official travel grant application?

Genesis: Yep

Chris L: so the reason that we are talking about this is because we had one request, so for now I think we are completely legitimate in exercising the power of evaluating the application. But we'll do that next meeting because I thought it would be best if we just figure out if anyone has any questions

Kimberly: I have a question out of curiosity, how was it decided that the applicants need a 3.2 GPA?

Genesis: It wasn't us, so like the whole first page that F&B changed was the domestic and international amount awarded, and otherwise it was just from the committee and their report

Chris L: I don't know why that GPA

Genesis: there is a rubric that goes with this, and asked on the answers that the applicants take, and then we go by the score. You review it before they come, and then the applicants come and present to the exec committee

Chris L: Genesis do you know when Louis is hoping to travel?

Genesis: all I know is that it's in October

Chris E: Could a school apply for one? Say this is the actual thing and we don't know who the student's name is, but we do know we'll be sending someone

Evan: well that will be difficult in the long run

Genesis: and you can't cover a group, it has to be one specific person

Chris E: well it will be one specific person; they might not have the name yet. So, another question is that it says once every 3 years with a maximum of 2?

Evan: I think it's mainly like a onetime deal, so I think the whole idea is to give one person (PHD STUDENT) a travel grant

Kimberly: is there a way to change the wording for "conference" in case a student is going to a competition, or paid internship?

Chris L: So I know this came up last year, because there are a lot of professional advancing events that are not quote on quote conference, so I'm actually surprised to see this language of "conference" because it was discussed. So this is something that this year's travel grant committee can improve on

Evan: Well a lot of these are still open, even if you are applying to the event

Chris L: The only thing I can see is that when will we get to process this on a short timeline

Genesis: let's say we're looking for winter quarter approval for them to travel on the winter quarter, and we're not sure whose going but that they are going to the conference, and so we cut someone else out who could use that funding in order to save those 300 dollars for a student whose name we don't know.

Chris E: So it's probably easier if we say that there is a limited amount of funds and you have to fit these criteria; that you have to go to a conference and you have to make sure that you are going.

Chris L: We have to make the case that it's staying for the long term, and this could mean opening up to more people or more kinds of things. So I think all of these things are worth considering and making a decision on either yes or no, and maybe even have a modified application, all these things are possible but I think they all have to be considered. I believe our bylaws say that the travel grant committee needs to be formed by the end of October or something? I don't know exactly what it says, but you can look it up. This is a good discussion that we are having because we need to direct the travel grant committee because they also have to think about the process

Evan: I think overall, generalizing isn't going to be an issue for this application; I don't think any of these questions are exclusionary. The only thing that we should exclude is the timing, "if you can't make the deadline than I'm sorry"

Kimberly: so when we talk about the timing, do you mean a deadline for an application?

Genesis: I think the travel grants... we'd meet each quarter, we did think about the rolling basis, because let's say someone needs to travel to a conference over the summer, what we mean basically is just get it in by the end of the quarter, to get reviewed by

Evan: So for now, might as well make it as smooth as possible

Chris L: so we'll just have to evaluate the ones that we get, so for our purposes right now , next time we'll have the rubric, and did you say that the person needs to come?

Genesis: We wouldn't need her to come

Evan: we did try to limit it so that they wouldn't have to do too much

Genesis: so we'll send it out this week, because we need to have it approved before the 25th, before our next meeting. So she needs to get this all done in the next two weeks if she wants to travel in October.

Chris L: Any questions on the application itself?

Genesis: so our plan is to send it out this week, for her to fill it out and turn it in by the 25, and for the September 25th meeting we'll make a decision

Chris L: so that's kind of our action step

Kimberly: can I just add, if we want to open it up to people who are traveling for internships as well, we should specify that they are paid internships

Chris L: so anything else on that? So next up, I'd like to think of our first senate meeting. First we'll be having our open house mixer for current senators and those who want to be a senator, and the real goal is for those who are thinking of becoming senators to kind of get a feel for it, and just really being around as many of us as can be there to talk to people, and make it pretty informal. Now the first senate meeting itself, is critical because it sets the tone, its peoples first impression, and last year one of the things that we did in exec over the summer was that we worked really hard to settle the complains : too passive, too much talking. We've thought really hard on how we can minimize that as much as possible. So one way is to put out as much background information before the senate meeting, so that people come with as much information as possible, so that we don't have to go through that in the senate meeting. Also, pacing and when to do different kind of activities, with that in mind, there are a few things that we absolutely must do during our first meeting, one is forming the judicial committee, and the other is give a brief intro to GPSS an what it is that we're doing.

Kimberly: so I felt like I didn't become really involved until I got involved in the committee. So is there a capacity for every member to become part of the committee?

Evan: well, we've never had problem meeting the maximum, only meeting the minimum

Kimberly: so I'm totally just throwing this out, what if we required every senate member to be on a committee, I know it adds responsibility but I mean, you're supposed to be involved as a senator either way

Evan: that would be a good question to ask Renee, I'm sure this was brought up before, and it either worked or didn't work

Chris L: I think it has merit for sure

Kimberly: I think it might be too idealistic, but I don't know how successful mixers are to draw people in

Chris L: you bring up a good point because one thing we also have to do is somehow present the committees before making it intolerably long

Kimberly: what about brochures for each committee?

Chris L: that could be a good idea, and recruiting people who have been it, to kind of speak of the subject

Chris E: so the main thing is getting people involved. But here's the other problem, just because they are in a committee doesn't mean that they will show up to the meetings. But what is something that we can take away or give them as an incentive?

Genesis: but I know that if they miss more than 2 meetings, you get kicked off and you won't be on the roster

Chris L: I think that's a secretarial issue

Genesis: Shaming is also something that was talked about

Chris E: I think I would go for the incentives first before the shaming, I see the point, but I don't think that's the kind of people we want to be

Chris L: so I think one side is enforcing, and I think the incentives is a good idea

Kimberly: a drawing at the end to win, for a prize for those who have shown up to meetings?

Genesis: nope, we can't do that. We can't purchase anything with our money and give it away. Unless it's donated

Chris E: Also making students aware that their senator isn't showing up for their program

Kimberly: yea, I think that's better than kicking people off

Chris E: I really feel that there is a whole system that if you're dropped, someone is going to replace you, because they will think even if you replace me, no one in the program is going to know. So I think it's a good idea to let those in the program be aware

Chris L: I think Elisa is pretty in tune with all the sanctions that have to do with not attending and not participating

Chris E: I think that those positions are competitive; at least in Evans and Law, people want that position

Evan: I think enforcing the knowledge that you guys can enforce resolutions and that this is what you're here for. Usually what we were doing with the resolutions and this is what we are enforcing. Encouraging asking for what was going wrong, so we can learn how to deal with that

Chris E: so that can even be a push too, and I'm not opposed to sending an extra email, to talk about things that are a little more important

Genesis: also we can use our FaceBook page to get that out there, because if people are sick of emails, we use FaceBook

Evan: if we encourage and ask them, “what have you been asking your senator?”

Chris L: that brings me to another thing that is potentially good for the first meeting ,and we did this last year, where we asked people what their priorities are, at the same time we didn’t want it to seem like we were totally unprepared so we came with some of our priorities

Evan: they can do breakup groups like we did the first time, and it worked well in the first meeting. People didn’t ditch and we started using it at 90 minutes

Chris L: Sometimes the purpose was not very clear, so I think that they would work if they add a specific purpose. If there are things that we know because we have been exposed to it over the summer, and we know issues that we think we might want addressed in the senate that could work. I like to think it in 3 categories; I think GPSS is advocacy, service, and community. That seemed like a recently comprehensive division of our function, and then obviously between those buckets, we can put all the different stuff. I think there should be a very brief presentation of the structure and the way we do things, also if we want to bring up things that we came up with in the summer and that we can add so we can present those things and address them

Chris E: one of the things that I will say, I really like that idea, but if we can send them a pre-email, that would be good

Evan: yea, that’s a good way to do it

Chris L: yea, I think that will work well and also to know who our senators are before the first meeting

Chris E: it takes a while right? So maybe we can send a second one as well?

Evan: the meetings are open, and they can attend it and if they are interested at all, they can come to the official meetings even if they are not a senator

Chris L: “if you’re curious come to our info session”, I have to talk to Elisa about this too, but this is where orientations will be crucial, if you’re interested in being a senator

Evan: during the orientation I would also stress that “you are welcome in the meetings”, because for me when I went to the first meeting I felt like an outsider

Chris L: so I’m going to propose, since we are eventually going to need a list, between now and the 25th, when we have to say that this will be our agenda, we’ll do some type of Google doc, where we can collaborate and construct an agenda so that when we come back on the 25th, we’ll have things a bit more clear. Anyone want to keep plugging away at ideas?

Kimberly: when are the orientations set up?

Chris L: I think that it’s on Google drive, and Elisa is pleading for people to sign up

Kimberly: what’s the name of the document?

Genesis: I think “orientation” something

Chris E: I think also people should do their homework before coming to the meeting

Chris L: so I know in Roberts rules people are limited to speaking twice

Chris E: do we know how hard line was being held last year?

Evan: so last year, so that didn't happen, the president would say "we have 5 more minutes and we have to move on" or , "sorry, you got to read it"

Chris L: I don't know if we can officially limit

Chris E: Limit the times that people can talk

Chris L: I don't think we can actually limit, but we can definitely look and see, and I think there is a time limit. We can look into that for sure

Evan: then you also have to consider, is that contradictory to making meetings more active

Chris E: I'm not worried about debates but I'm worried about circular conversations

Kimberly: I think that's part of the reason why we created forms

Evan: Yea and we never were able to do it

Chris L: People will just go on resistance, which is not going to the form

Evan: so I think there should be someone on top of the parliamentary rules

Chris L: I will look at the rules and see if there is a limit on the times that someone can speak, but looking at bylaws, I don't think there is going to be something like that

Chris E: We are just as accountable as what we want them to do

Chris L: anything else on that? Great. So I will take responsibility of setting up. Is Google docs, an ok source for everyone?

Chris E: yea, as long as you share it

Kimberly: I have nothing, but I don't have access to that orientation Google docs

Chris L: ok, so I'll make sure everyone has access to the orientation Google doc

Chris E: so things are moving along here, there is federal: so Sage, Chris and I are signed up to go to conference in November. So there is a person from the law school, who was provost or something earlier, Alex is the name, and he sounds interested, wants to do it. But I'm holding back a little bit before making an announcement, so Matt will work with whoever that person is so we can do a succession thing. On the other hand Kianna said something about listening in on calls, and if she has more information to go on the Regents, so I'll be working with Matt on that as we get in line with Sage. On state side things have been kind of quiet, and there will be an ASUW joint effort in Bellevue. Also a thing called the 24 coroners, that's on the 16th, I think I will be going with ASUW or getting a u-car to go down there and do that. The senate majority coalition, the only thing that we really want in that bill, is the 20 dollar car tabs that helps restore funding for transit, not to say that they couldn't find it somewhere else, but id sleep better knowing that's settled. WSA is this weekend. We'll be hosting WSA this weekend, and other than that I think that is it

Chris L: Secretary Elisa, says to please sign up for orientations, so I will make that available. I know she will have materials and a script on what she wants everyone to say

Chris E: and I'm working on that as well

Genesis: event coordinator will be coming on board the week before school starts, and I will be going on mainly how you cannot spend our money, also we will have a meeting with all of the committee chairs on spending the money and how to

Chris L: committee chair handle?

Genesis: that would just be in the bylaws

Chris L: So yea, the WSA meeting will be here at the UW Seattle campus, it was supposed to be at UW Bothell but they had a little meltdown because Bothell is closed on that day, so I said yes to having it here at Seattle, and we have catering and a location.

Genesis: Do we have any news on tailgating?

Chris L: Yes, so I have reserved the sylvan theatre for the dates (up to 3 dates)

Chris E: where is that located?

Kimberly: is that by the pillars?

Chris L: yes, it's by the pillars. But I'm also thinking of honest tailgating

Kimberly: we'd have to camp out

Chris L: Well yea

Kimberly: I can volunteer for one day. Or we can make a real big banner, very visible

Chris L: well yes, it's very visible. So, if we can get people with vehicles to take the spot, then it is a possibility. What we have now is the outdoor space reserved, and my thought was we could get a net, and people could bring food, people could bring grills. Alcohol is where it gets tricky, people can't bring their own alcohol if we buy our own alcohol and sell it, then that works. So if we can get people to get spots with their vehicles then that's what we would need, also if we could guarantee adjacent spaces.

Chris E: what's the pricing?

Chris L: well the sylvan theatre is free

Chris E: this I like, my problem is where it is

Kimberly: well it's close. But that purpose is to draw people to GPSS

Genesis: So I think the first thing is to light a fire under Law and Evans to see if we can get help, because we need the money

Chris E: I just worry about liability stuff. So if it is close enough

Chris L: it's like 200 yards away

Chris E: so if it's outdoor, and not that far away, it could work

Chris L: so I plan to put an invitation, an open invitation in every grad student's email

Chris E: I think if its close enough, and we have the availability to do booze, and if we have sponsors to do food

Kimberly: I'm still on my point that I made earlier, it's not the same atmosphere.

Genesis: and also, one of the goals is to get alumni, and they are not going to leave the tailgating section to go to the theatre

Chris L: there are a lot of considerations going along

Kimberly: I'll get in touch with the law school , but we have a retreat going on the 22, so I doubt we'll be able to help for the first game, but we can I think for the others

Chris L: I do appreciate the argument of the atmosphere in the tailgating. So once you get these responses, shoot them out to me and I'll tell you guys what's going on

Genesis: keep in mind that it's only 500 that is going out to this

Chris L: yea, and I'm putting 500 in as well. I'm hiring University Affairs director, and interviews start next week. Still meeting vice provosts of various stripes, I think I've met every vice provost, so I'm pretty well traveled around campus at this point

Chris E: can you send out a list of the appointments that need to be made?

Chris L: yes because Laura and I compiled it last week, and we'll put it on the website as well. One thing I learned this week is that I have the mentality of 'I'll just do it myself' but I apologize

Chris E: when in doubt, shoot out an email

Chris L: and that's not me being possessive

Chris E: I'll be posting the two new positions soon

Chris L: I will entertain motion to adjourn

Evan: Motion

Kimberly: second

▪ None

Opposed

Meeting adjourned 6:45

GPSS Executive Committee Minutes
Wednesday, Sept 25th 2013
HUB 314

Attendees:

Chris Lizotte, President
Chris Erickson, Vice President
Alice Popejoy, Executive Senator
Elisa Law, Secretary
Genesis Gavino, Treasurer
Evelina Vaivilaite, ASUW representative
Rene Singleton, SAO Advisor
Larry Huang, Executive Senator
Kimberly Schertz, Executive Senator
Evan Firth, Executive Senator

1. Call to Order

Chris L: Calls to order at 5:35pm.

2. Approval of the agenda

Chris L: I would like to amend the agenda slightly to add in a discussion item for 10 minutes to talk about advertising for social events.

Chris E: Motion.

Elisa: Seconds.

Chris L: Any opposed. None. Motion carries.

3. Approval the minutes

Chris L: I would also entertain a motion to approve the minutes from the last agenda.

Alice: So moved.

Genesis: Seconds.

Chris L: Any opposed? Hearing none, the motion carries. Rene has requested that we take some time to talk about the way we advertise for our social events, particularly our upcoming Tailgating event.

Rene: What I forgot to do is bring up a copy of the University and State of Washington's policy from the liquor control board saying we can't advertise having alcohol there. You can have the events and that's the good news, but the way we advertise needs to change. You can give alcohol to the people who come to the event, but they have to be invited guests. That means not the general public. So when you put fliers up around campus and you write 'beer', that's what we can't do. We need to find another way to advertise. We need to figure out a way to have a guest list. Your invited guests are graduate students and there are a lot of them. I can send you all of the statutes that go with it. Typically you send a formal

invitation saying 'you are invited to this event' and then you bring that invitation. This (poster) is seen by anyone but how do we invite only grads? We can send an invite and have them bring that in or can individually invite all 9,000 grad students. Undergrads like to hang out with grads and lots of them are not over 21. Sometimes the ID cards are not clear between grads and undergrads. I know you're not supplying a ton of alcohol, but you have to think about how to comply with these policies. Everyone was in a rush but we are resetting for the rest of the year. So we need to come up with a new protocol for the rest of the social during the year. I don't want GPSS to incur the wrath of any authorities.

Larry: How would you do it?

Rene: There has to be a way for people sign up ahead of time. I don't have particular knowledge of how to do this.

Alice: Is the guest list a mandatory part of the invited guest stipulation?

Rene: In order for you to be on the guest list you have to be approved to be there.

Alice: But do you have to have a guest list to qualify as a guest? Does an email count? What if we have Senators send out a mass email to grads and each of us (Senators) are required to compile that list and then have the lists at the events. It's hard to check people off lists, maybe make it electronic.

Genesis: Chris mentioned having QR codes to posters and that's a way to RSVP and say I'm coming to this event and that way we can have an invite only.

Alice: But that's still open to the public.

Rene: You can advertise this, but you have to require an RSVP and get rid of the "Beer" and once you advertise to the public, it's open to the public.

Larry: Can't they RSVP online with student ID?

Chris L: RSVP element is not difficult either through Catalyst or some other way. Ironically we put beer on there to discourage people from bringing their own beer.

Alice: Why discourage that?

Chris L: They're not allowed to.

Rene: The state of WA liquor control board makes these rules.

Chris L: We want to be able to pull in passersby and with this system we would not be able to do that.

Alice: Wasn't part of the point of the Tailgating to mingle with undergrads?

Chris L: More for alumni. We have a facebook invite for this and have a small RSVP list.

Rene: You should not put beer on the advertising and the invited people have something to bring to the event. It means you're a grad student and you can come in.

Chris E: Can we put on the poster that invitees are grads, alumni and friends? Then you can look them up by department or online? So each guest would have to be with at least one grad student with them.

Rene: One grad student at the event that is invited.

Chris E: I would personally take it on their word. Are people really trying to game the system?

Rene: You'd be surprised. We need a reasonable protocol for how to do this, and if someone who is not ok comes through and the liquor board is monitoring, we're in trouble. We need a plan to be compliant.

Elisa: Alice mentioned having the senators come up with a list of their students, if we do that and just say that all grads are invited on the poster, they just need to be on the list.

Chris L: What if they want a guest?

Alice: Guest just needs a government ID.

Elisa: I think that a list would be better than QR codes and RSVPing, that would discourage people from coming because its too much trouble.

Chris E: We can send an email with the invite and people could either show it to us on their phone or print it out.

Elisa: That's more difficult than just a list.

Chris E: The list could be a backup and it covers us as far as having sent an invite.

Alice: It'll be more economical to have it be all electronic. Make sure you bring 21+ ID and the name should be on the list.

Chris L: Sounds like we've got a basic solution. We send out a mass email to grads and/or make a list and we can figure out the details later.

Genesis: How about privacy issues?

Rene: If you send an invitation and I respond and want to be there, there's no problem. We're not releasing their name and info or anything.

Chris L: If there's a motion to extend time.

Chris E: I would like to make a motion that by Friday we make a list as good as we can and make an all-campus email and tell them that we'll be checking the list at the tailgating.

Genesis: Some people can request not to be listed anywhere.

Chris E: The motion is to, as best we can, make a list and send an email so that we can comply for the upcoming Tailgating event.

Alice: Procedurally can I motion to extend for 5 minutes?

Genesis: Second

Alice: We've already messed up and we've already advertised. What's more important is making the protocol for the future.

Elisa: If we announce that we we'll have a list at the Tailgating. I don't think we have enough time to put together the list and invite by Saturday. But we can make an announcement on Saturday.

Chris: I'm planning on advertising through the all-graduate email that I've requested and I can add in the 'show us your invite' piece.

Rene: For this particular one, just have the graduate student ID and the 21+ ID.

Alice: People freak out when they have to print things out.

Rene: What we don't want is uninvited guests who are not grads and who are not 21 who make trouble.

Chris L: Hopefully we can avoid this by having the two IDs.

Chris E: Liking our FB page would solve this problem somewhat.

Chris L: We have quite a few RSVPed on FB as well. It might not even be a problem. For this event, we'll do everything in our power to control the people that come and based on that we will know what we have to do moving forward. Does that sound reasonable? Any comments?

Larry: What's the next event?

Chris L: We'll do it again on October 12th if this goes well. Ok, moving along.

Planning Senate Meeting

Chris L: Apologies for not being in the Board Room as we can't project this plan, but we'll work with it. Right now, all we have is the budget presentation. Genesis?

Genesis: It's probably just going over what was approved last time at Senate and then detailing all the changes from last year.

Chris L: Are we required to do this?

Genesis: Yes. Vera recommended breaking it up between meetings. Doing Administrative and Committee funds one time and others next time so people can digest it better. We're not asking for input, just orienting people to the budget. Showing them where we took money away and where we put it, like Science and Policy got bigger and the Fall and Spring Social events got smaller, we have a new staff position and the new advancement efforts line item. Just telling them those things, it's not a discussion.

Chris L: The budget that was already approved last year right? Per our bylaws we must populate the Judicial Committee the first Senate meeting.

Chris E: Fully?

Chris L: At least to achieve quorum.

Chris E: Is the chair Hutchins again?

Chris L: Good question.

Genesis: In general, the Judicial Committee must be formed.

Chris L: It's the only one that has to be formed at the first meeting.

Genesis: So anyone gets approved?

Chris L: People volunteer and if there are more people than spaces we do a quick election. I can't think of the last time that has happened. We need to see who wants to continue from Judicial last year. The number of open spaces depends on that. Any thoughts for the next Senate meeting?

Kimberly: Discussing committee and putting up posters and flyers to give them more information...

Alice: This is the 9th right? Are we talking about the mixer at all?

Chris L: We need to briefly present all the committees and do it as painlessly as possible. Maybe after that there could be a break out session for people to go around to speak to the Chairs at each station.

Genesis: So we'll have the open house next week and have the sign up sheets and at Senate meeting have the current or former chairs talk about their committees and have sign up sheets available for after the meetings. We don't want people leaving during the break out session.

Kimberly: Schedule the break out early in the meeting. It's easier to rope people in with 1 on 1 discussion.

Evan: That's how I was convinced to join.

Chris L: Is it useful to put up the organigram, the structure chart up, really quick and then have people go around and check out the stations.

Chris E: That gives a chance for people who are still on committees to speak on both the 2nd and the 9th.

Alice: Would it be better to call it a 'mixer' rather than an 'open house', to attract more people. Is there alcohol? We can invite all grads via email or something like that.

Chris E: Maybe 'happy hour'?

Chris L: One of the aims of having the pre-Senate event is to give departments more a chance to appoint someone. By the 9th hopefully we have as full a Senate as we'll have. And it's really for people who want to find out if they want to do it or not.

Alice: Are we pushing people to have elections?

Elisa: I sent out pamphlets and a letter encouraging them to appoint Senators and was going to send out an email as well before the open house but as far as outreach, that's all I've got.

Genesis: I asked them to hold elections after the first Senate meeting so that the people can come and find out if they want to do it and then have the elections.

Alice: We were frustrated in our program to not have someone elected by the first Senate meeting. We should do a really big push this week to encourage Senators to come to the mixer. Please hold your elections as soon as possible for the two upcoming meetings.

Chris L: They're both open to all grads, they just can't vote.

Genesis: I've made a point to say that at the orientations. That any grad student can come, regardless of being a Senator, they just can't vote.

Chris E: Stress that they can participate as well.

Chris L: I'm trying to send out that information to the all-student email.

Chris E: Also, almost all the orientations I went to magically never got a Powerpoint, and I know Elisa sent them. If they're not the right person to get the information to (the GPA) then we need a new contact.

Elisa: A GPA audit needs to be done. I've been trying and it's been hard.

Chris L: So far we have the call to order, committee poster session...

Kimberly: Is 10 minutes enough? Or should we do 15?

Chris L: We could put 15 and we can stop before then. Then we have the budget presentation, Judicial appointments and a summer update?

Elisa: I think so.

Rene: Are students going to be expecting to get information about Travel Grants early?

Genesis: I could do a separate thing about Travel Grants...

Elisa: It could be a part of your update.

Chris L: It has to be done by the second meeting.

Elisa: Are we doing an introduction of our staff and executive committee members as well?

Rene: We've changed administrations, student life has a new VP for example. Students might find that interesting.

Chris L: Maybe after introductions, we can include that. Then we include a brief Senator primer.

Genesis: That's included in the packets.

Elisa: Right. Along with parli pro.

Chris E: Should we do this later, when we have a full Senate? Maybe it would best to do it after?

Chris L: That's a great idea. We could do mini orientation sessions for new Senators?

Genesis: Would it be too much for the Senators?

Chris E: They should be expecting to have some requirements.

Chris L: Just briefly, 15-20 minutes. And do it before or after the Senate meetings.

Elisa: Agreed.

Chris E: We're already in a time crunch for the first two meetings. I've got to do the transportation thing.

Chris L: Do you want time in the first meeting?

Elisa: You could do it in your update.

Chris L: I'll give 20 minutes for updates.

Chris E: Yeah, we were going to bring in some people for the transportation talk, so the second meeting would be better.

Chris L: So, I met with Michael Kutz, Kiana Scott and Elise Randall Chair of PACS this year and they brought up something interesting, constituent-based caucusing. We did that last year a little but this would be like a GPSS Women's caucus or...

Genesis: LGBTQ caucus.

Chris L: How can we do it without it feeling contrived

Rene: Ask the Senators what kind of caucuses would they be interested in. They might surprise you.

Chris L: After the update we can crowd source priorities for the year and write them up. Last year we couldn't decide...we wanted to have some pre-fab priorities in case they were indecisive. There is some merit to ask people to think about it, talk to their constituents, and come back.

Elisa: I think if we did a break-out session it would be nice to have the room split up and have an officer or an exec in each session. Then present what they find. The smaller the group, the easier those ideas will come. Plus it gives a chance for the officers to meet people one on one.

Chris L: Sure.

Chris E: How are we ensuring that we are hearing everyone's opinion? Those small groups are a great idea because it would force them to voice their view, but also maybe requiring a member of each caucus to sit on a committee? I found it striking that last year during exec elections someone said "my main focus is LGBTQ" and someone said "what else?" and what is wrong with only being passionate about one thing?

Chris L: There's nothing wrong with that. That's enough.

Chris E: We could ask at least one of those caucus members sit on the committees, if we do end up with the caucus.

Chris L: I agree. We'll think more about it and introduce it as a possibility but we're not going to force them. We can give ideas but giving them the reign might let some new groups emerge. So, introductions, budget, judicial, committees, update, brainstorming, and that puts us at...

Kimberly: An hour and 18 minutes.

Chris L: Do we want to leave it at that? And have homework for them to bring back to their constituents.

Chris E: It's good to have a lot of things to think about, but at what point does it become too much for people. Is there a portal only for Senators, a page on the internet or on the email. Someone said last year that they didn't open an email because it was GPSS. We'll fall into that unless we do something

Chris L: We tried to send out the details before the Senate meetings and that worked out alright, and the forum which didn't work well. The less information-y stuff in the meetings, the better. I like time for

people to be able to mingle. And I like the idea of people being able to break into smaller groups and mingle. In terms of time, we're just over an hour and that's good.

Elisa: What if we kept the 15-minute before the meeting thing going? If discussion wants to continue we can have an actual forum before meetings. It gives them an opportunity to get together and also keeps time down.

Chris L: Yeah. Anything else to add.

Chris E: I would move to approve it as amendable.

Chris L: It can always be amended. Motion is to approve the agenda as written.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? No. Excellent. This was an important conversation and I'm glad we had it. We have a strong base and good ideas and it will work well. Executive Senator reports?

Executive Senator Reports

Larry: So, over the summer we have internships and I was in a community health organization in Seattle and they offered me a position through the school year and that requires me to be available from 5-7 from Tuesday through Thursday and unfortunately not available for GPSS.

Genesis: Sorry to lose you, thank you for your contributions.

Chris L: We are grateful, thank you.

Larry: If you have any suggestions for other members, there may be some people in my program who are interested.

Chris L: That would be great, thank you. We will have a small token of appreciation for you, should have had it.

Larry: Is it cash?

Rene: Will you be able to come to the next meeting?

Larry: I want to say yes, but schedule might not allow.

Rene: Just so we can recognize you.

Chris L: If you are able to make it, you can give a brief explanation of your post as an exec officer.

Kimberly: I have class until 5:30, but I'll be late for meetings. Over the summer, I've been on the sexual assault prevention task force and we're finalizing our report. It should be submitted and on one of the Provost's desk by the beginning of October. There are some good recommendations and the task force has met with several focus groups over the summer and we've met once or twice a month to narrow down the huge list of ideas on improving campus policies as well as actions in addressing this issue.

Alice: I don't have any updates. Glad to be back. I was all over this summer, glad to be here.

Evan: Just doing the orientation thing, someone's interested in joining both Senate and otherwise.

Officer Reports

Chris E: I closed interviews and need to make decisions for the policy analyst and organizing director. Initially I was swayed by someone with social media background, but I've found someone with a good mix. She's got event planning, social media campaigns. Policy analyst is actually a senior undergrad who is the only person with legislative office experience and the job requires google search experience and ask the right questions. Of the candidates we had, I think we have the right people who will work together well with everyone. Transportation will be a big thing. We need Senate to pass a resolution for funding not to be cut. A 1.5% motor vehicle excise tax which needs first a transportation package is passed, which we will lobby for in November. We need to free up the east side people and Eastern WA folks to assess local fees for transit. They're opposed to it right now, but I think they're afraid of taxes in any form. Another form will be a letter that supports students in relation to transportation and we can partner with ASUW with that, maybe talk to some bigger funders to see if they would support it. Some of these higher power people might turn heads in Olympia. We're working with Melanie, who's up in Olympia. An Evan's student was chosen to work in the outreach coordinator for the King County Metro position. There's a forum on the 14th of October so we can get students out at, we can take written testimony as well. People seemed really interested in the Science and Policy committee so it's important to hammer those people for committee appointments.

Alice: You should talk to me about that, since I could help.

Genesis: And Keolo Fox.

Alice: He's enthusiastic and very focused on genetics. He has a lot of experience in science, because I'm coming in science and policy side and have worked in DC for a while, the committee stuff is familiar to me.

Chris E: Definitely. And we have a ton of appointments, like SAGE too that we have had interest in and we need to get that information out.

Genesis: Funding applications go live on the 30th. I'm planning on holding the F&B meeting to approve the first wave of applications. Travel grants won't meet until next month, since we only get two meetings per quarter. Applications need to come through their advisor not from the RSOs, they check first and make sure the application is complete.

Alice: Is this for tuition?

Genesis: It's for special allocations, events and things.

Alice: How is that fair if we do that before having all the Senators or before the first meeting?

Genesis: It will be out there and it will be advertised to everyone in the UW. We have a line item to advertise for this. The people who apply first are people who know our system who know how to fill out the applications, so we want to draw in small or new RSOs that haven't been funded in the past. So that's what we're trying to do. We're kind of already trying to look for facilities for the Fall social but we're having trouble. The HUB is kind of booked and depending on what the Communications and Outreach Committee decides, we'll try to find something. The events coordinator is trying to find other options. At orientations there were a lot of people interested in Science and Policy and there was interest in the committees as well.

Alice: How are you handling interest in the Science and Policy committee members?

Genesis: Most aren't interested in being on the committee, just interested in general. But I have a list.

Alice: For chairs of the committees, how are we doing that?

Chris L: The chairs are being elected by the committees and those are overseen by the officer that oversees those committees.

Chris E: I'm open to executive senators weighing in on applications I get for my committees.

Chris L: Sure, but in terms of the committees themselves...

Alice: Do we get a chance to weigh in on hiring of staff for policy analyst or...

Chris E: I had some people sit in, but I'm sorry I didn't include executive committee

Alice: What's the process for hiring?

Chris E: It's up to the Senator, right Rene?

Chris L: Maybe it's a bigger procedural issue that we should look into. Some committee appointments need to be looked into further.

Elisa: Orientations were successful, our first partnership with UWPd to do safety orientations were successful and we could continue the partnership. I sent out some cards to the Senators who participated, including you Evan. I'm still working on the NFT guide, if I could send out some of the sections to you all to edit, that would be really helpful. Chris has the coffee section, I took the dating section.

Alice: You used an acronym...

Elisa: Not for Tourist guide, it was a partnership with Not for Tourists and we made a book, but instead of that which was not cost effective, we're just publishing an updated pdf version that will be available on the website and that people could update. There's also undergraduate information that's in there that I'll be sending out to ASUW. The welcome packets and Senator handbook I'm working on that and getting my committees together. I also am hiring for Communications Specialist and Claire is applying for that job (taking minutes). I have a schedule conflict with the ASUW Board meetings this quarter so I need to find someone to proxy for me, maybe the University Affairs Director? It could be anyone, is that right?

Chris L: We may nominate anyone, it could be any graduate student.

Alice: To do what?

Elisa: To act as a voting member on the ASUW Board every other Thursday from 5:30-7:30.

Rene: Every week.

Elisa: Oh, every week. Do we usually go to every meeting? Ok, that's going to be a challenge.

Evelina: Topics we discussed at the summer meetings, we're doing Husky Leadership Retreat to bring RSO leaders together and collaborate their programming on November 23rd. Burgess has been reevaluating the Husky Pride Fund and forming a new committee in Fall quarter. We approved a

Communications, Financial and Employee evaluation policy and we'll be working on a volunteer policy as well.

Chris L: Ok, tailgating. I'm crossing all my fingers that it will be a success. I think it will be and we have several 'yes's on facebook. If it's a small crowd the first time, that's ok, it will be casual and if you're serving beer you shouldn't be drinking. We'll be renting a U-Car. We need lawn games and if you have them, please bring them.

Kimberly: Where did we get the cornhole from last year?

Chris L: We rented it.

Chris E: There's a crappy one floating around Evans, we can get one for sure.

Chris L: We also need a boombox, ideally with MP3 input. I'll send another email.

Kimberly: Which parking lot?

Genesis: No, Sylvan Grove.

Chris L: It turns out all the parking lots, like E1, are managed by Athletics. You have to be a season pass holder. So there was an option to do W-28 over by Portage Bay near the Transportation Center. People do tailgate there but it would be even further away, we would have to go through the whole thing of having people there early to get us a spot and it was looking more and more like trying out Sylvan Grove. We'll see how it goes. The Sylvan Theater and Commons is a really beautiful space and close to the stadium.

Larry: What if it rains?

Chris L: We have two canopies, and the weather is looking slightly rainy. We have provision for that and hopefully it will be enough. I'd like to thank Genesis and Sana to help out with the food and the beer and general things, so thank you. Following up on the sexual assault task force, it will be a top priority for us.

Kimberly: We're still talking about how to keep involved after it's submitted.

Chris L: I have to make a decision by tomorrow on the University Affairs Director. I went to Convocation on Saturday and wore a robe and sat up on stage with the president et al. There is something about the pomp and circumstance of that ceremony that makes you feel connected to the University. It would be nice to have a ceremony like that for grads to feel more connected. Alumni, I've been laying groundwork with Joey our Development director. One we'll be looking at the general alumni population, events, and we'll look at capacity rated individuals, alumnis who have money to throw around. There are several in the area and we're figuring out how to get them involved. I have a National Science Foundation graduate research fellowship and was on a panel with other graduate research fellows and we talked about our research, the future of science and policy, the other seven people are doing really cool work and are great about talking about it. They'd be great for Science and Policy this year.

Alice: I'm a fellow too, and would like to get involved in getting the science and policy workshops going. Some of those workshops are focused specifically on legislative things, I'd be happy to get the ball rolling with Genesis and connect the dots. Science communication is one, science and policy is another. I want to get FOSEP, Kelly Edwards Assistant Dean of the Graduate School, other science comm and science policy people on campus together and be the point person connecting them on campus.

Chris L: We have that communication from a Professor from one of the new courses.

Alice: Forward the science and policy stuff to me and I'll go through it.

Chris L: I'd like to say that I'm looking forward to a good year, that the officers have come together and have a good relationship. We're all on board now and we'll do great with a lot of energy and ideas. I'm taking my general exams the week of October 21st and obviously GPSS will be a top priority but if I seem frazzled that's why. Afterward, I will be free at last. Any announcements?

Chris E: I'd like to continue to do the informal after Senate meetings, like karaoke and such. It's nice to meet everyone on an informal level.

Elisa: Speaking of which...

Chris L: We're going to Kate's for karaoke after, it starts at 9.

Alice: Is it 21+? I have a friend who's twenty.

Chris L: I think so.

Rene: We have a new staff member in SAO her name is Jessie Larson, she's our officer support supervisor and we're going through transition so thanks for your patience.

Kimberly: She's replacing?

Rene: Patrick Emrocks.

Chris L: I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Genesis: Seconds.

Chris L: Any opposed?

Meeting adjourns at 7:02pm.

Executive Meeting Minutes
Oct. 16, 2013
HUB 314

Chris Lizotte (President): I call this meeting to order at 5:45pm. I will entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Motion

Elisa Law (Secretary): Second

Chris L: Any objections? I will now entertain a motion to approve minutes from the previous meeting.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): Motion

Elisa: Second

Chris L: Any objections? Great, so now I'm giving you all two things. One is a committee application and the other is a resume. These applications are from two people that Austin and I are recommending that we appoint to csf on behalf of gpss. We had 4 people to interview. We felt all four had the technical skills but these two had a level of thoughtfulness and commitment to serving students that put them above and beyond. I'm happy to answer questions that you guys might have. Otherwise i will entertain a motion to confirm chris clark and Kayla schick as our new appointees to the csf committee.

Genesis: Motion

Elisa: Second

Kimberly Schertz (Law): I trust your judgment.

Chris L: Any objections? So Kiana Scott, our student regent, has asked to come to this meeting so i've allowed you 10 minutes but you can take longer if needed.

Kiana Scott: I just wanted to come by and say hello and introduce myself. I want to make sure that you guys as individuals and such and a government entity know that my role here is not to be a student representative on the board but to bring a student perspective to help that information when we make big decisions. I want to make sure that I'm open in my communication and I'm accessible at all the time and also to let you know that i'll be calling on you throughout the year. We're doing a big push this year to bring students into regent meetings whenever there's issues that students should be concerned about such as fee based programs and differential tuition. This year a big topic will be graduate education and the different forms of

funding for professional and academic programs. For things like that I'll be reaching out to you guys and see if this is something you heard about and if there are any students that you know about that have been impacted by this. I want to see if we can talk to them and bring them to a meeting and have them tell their story. I think its really important for reagents to hear the hardships that graduate students and undergrads experience. So my appointment was effective July 2nd and will go until June 30. I'm 3 months into year long term. I'm working closely with Chris and Michael, the ASUW president, to figure out some priorities for the year. My two largest priorities are looking at college councils and making sure we don't lose momentum on it and pushing that forward. We are also looking at sexual assault. Awareness, education and prevention on campus. That's part of a much larger conversation. The president is convening a task force that will release a report in about a week or so about this issues. So this is a conversation that's been happening on a lot of levels across the 3 campuses and will be presented to the board the reagents this year. That's something that Chris, Michael and I are interested in and we're figuring out where to go since there's been a lot of work done already. We want to take a look at that report and make sure that everything that needs to be done is being done and that there aren't any holes left. So I'm also going to be active as possible in legislative outreach this year and will be doing that with the university. So there may be a few things that i'll have to step back from because of my role as a student reagent but I'm planning on working with you guys as much as possible. I think there are a lot of possibility for collaboration. I'm also looking to be as open and transparent with the position of student reagent as much as possible. Over the past couple of years the number of applicants for the role of student reagent has been dropping. I think a large reason is that people don't know that you just apply for and its a long, arduous process but it starts with an application on campus and that's a really small initial barrier. So I want students to know that it's a position that they can apply for and develop leadership within them. I'm happy to meet with anyone that's interested. Please let me know if you want to apply or know someone that would like to or should be interested. So I'm just here to sit in today. Any questions about the board of reagents or anything related?

Alice: Is it a paid position?

Kiana: i receive a per diem from the state for everyday that I do work and it is funded so I was able to turn down my departmental funding.

Alice: So is tuition covered and they pay you a stipend on top of that? Is it similar to how the GPSS officers get paid?

Kiana: Yeah, there's a lot of perks that come with the job and also a lot of work that comes along with it but the funding is not an issue of concern.

Chris L: Any questions for kiana? I pledge the full faith and credit of GPSS for the sexual assault task force in whatever format it takes. Michael and I received an email from Ellen Taylor today letting us know that the initial final report will be released soon at which point we'll have a clear idea of what we can do as students governments on the things they report on.

Kiana: So please be in touch. Chris has my email. It's stureag@uw.edu and you guys might have my personal email. Feel free to get in touch and let me know what's happening. Thanks

Chris L: Thanks Kiana. Okay, travel grants. Hopefully you all had a chance to look at that.

Genesis: So committee hasn't met yet so in lieu of the committee, the executive committee can approve and because this person is traveling on November 1st, I thought we could approve it ahead of time. Did everybody score and read it?

Chris L: Who gave the application a score?

Alice: When did this come through?

Genesis: It came yesterday after the minutes and agenda email.

Kimberly: I didn't get that.

Alice: Me neither.

Genesis: I used the same list that Chris sent me.

Alice: I didn't get anything from either of you.

Chris L: It's possible that it's an outdated one.

Genesis: Did you get Elisa's email of today's meeting?

Kimberly & Alice: No.

Chris L: Its very possible that its an outdated list.

Genesis: Well, its in the back of your folders if you want to look at it quickly. Here's the thing. He's a dual degree student and is with the Evans School and Jackson School. He will be presenting at the Texas Asia conference at the University of Texas. He'll be presenting on a panel for his degree and capstone project for both the Jackson school and Evans.

Kimberly: does this need to be approved tonight?

Genesis: Yes because the committee's not going to meet until the second or third week of November and he travels the first weekend of November.

Chris L: I know at least the 3 of us scored it and I know everyone gave approximately the same score. The 3 people that scored the application did it independently came to a similar

conclusion.

Genesis: We used the grading rubric that the travel grants ad hoc committee came up with last year and that the finance and budget committee refined further. The grading rubric is also in the back of the application. There's two other UW students presenting at this conference but they didn't apply for funding and I'm assuming that they already have funding. His senator has been in contact with me as well as his department. They have been very proactive in trying to get him funding. That's one of our big features is that they talk to their senator about this funding.

Chris L: My question about this is what's the highest possible score?

Genesis: I do not know off the top of my head.

Chris L: If this were a normal process, how would we know how it compares to other applications?

Genesis: I think we rank it against everything that came in and we go down the list based on their score ranking and hash it out between the committee and talk about why we gave our scores.

Chris L: Seeing as we have nothing to compare it to, how do you think we should proceed? My guess is that the maximum is in the 50-60 range. What did you give him?

Elisa: I gave him 35.

Genesis: I gave him 34.

Chris L: I gave him 35 as well. So we all came to a very similar place.

Genesis: He's not solely dependent upon this funding but it would help. He'd still go and present.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): That's kind of what my question is. In the finance and budget stuff, what is their total cost and what their participation is after they get the money. Is that in here?

Chris L: He hasn't gotten any other funding source. FLAS is virtually equivalent to a tier one graduate segment.

Alice: So I have 2 concerns. First is that we don't have anything to compare his application to. The 2nd is that most departments to my knowledge have not elected a senator or have not come to a meeting. I know we had pretty good attendance at the last meeting but I feel uncomfortable awarding anything before we advertised this to everyone else. How much is in the travel grant?

Genesis: \$20,000.

Alice: So this is coming up on 5% of the total allocation.

Genesis: We only give \$300 for domestic and \$500 for international.

Alice: So we don't cover all these costs?

Genesis: No we cap it at \$300 for domestic.

Chris: That's just an idea to get the total cost. In other words, something that has a higher total cost gets higher priority according to the rubric.

Elisa: Last year, did we allocate all that funding?

Genesis: We didn't have this last year.

Elisa: When was the last time we had this?

Genesis: Two years ago.

Chris E: Is there a record of what the general scores were on those?

Genesis: It was a different grading rubric then.

Chris L: For what its worth, I thought it was generally strong. It wasn't so compelling but my one concern is that one thing we're trying to encourage with the travel grants is to people to come back and present their work and he has no mention of it even though we specifically asked him.

Kimberly: Where is that question?

Genesis: That's only part of our rubric. That's not in their questions.

Chris E: That's not a requirement?

Genesis: Its not clear that he'll present his work but he has said that he has participated and presented in some aspect on campus.

Chris L: There was a similar conference at uw that he presented at.

Alice: It doesn't sit right with me that we haven't advertised it or announced that it was open.

Elisa: We sent out an email and announced it in all of the orientations.

Genesis: Its on our website and facebook. Ive also been getting a steady stream of applications. This one is just being read right now because he's traveling on Nov. 1st.

Alice: To be fully transparent and fair because his travel date is before, i don't see if that puts him on an unfair advantage against everyone else. Couldn't we evaluate them all together and reimburse him if he's awarded?

Genesis: We can't do retroactive funding.

Chris E: We have to start giving money and this could be the benefit of the doubt that he gets for being the first application. We're not in any danger of not being able to fund all the other applications we have. Unless its an access issue, i don't see a problem. At some point, until you start getting a bunch, you won't know so in some aspects it might get harder to receive funding but he might just get the benefit of doubt from me.

Chris L: One thing we discussed earlier is that this would have been applied for in summer quarter if the program had been running but that's not the case. This is an exceptional application in an exceptional period of the travel grants.

Genesis: We would've had to read elisa's application as well. In the absence of a travel grants committee the executive committee approves and eventually we would've had to approve or deny Elisa's application.

Chris L: Which she withdrew. So we are at time so I will entertain a motion to extend time on this or take action on this application.

Kimberly: Extend time for 5 mins.

Chris L: Second?

Chris E: I'll second that.

Chris L: Any opposed?

Alice: Yes, I think we should just approve it because I don't see any more things to discuss about it.

Kimberly: I had a question.

Chris L: Motion passes so yes, 5 mins.

Kimberly: Procedurally when we're reviewing this, do we need to have all scored it? So if we hadn't had a chance to score it does that affect the decision? I mean i briefly skimmed through it

but there's no way I can give a score right now.

Genesis: Tru. We can give you guys tonight to read and score it and we can do an email vote. What's the parli-pro on that?

Chris E: I rather just call for vote if we have the votes to just carry it.

Kimberly: That's what I was wondering. Procedurally, must we make sure we all scored it before we bring it to a vote?

Alice: I think its really important to be sticklers on the procedure. I know its annoying but for example, I don't understand how I objected and how the motion passed. Not that I actually care about the content of that motion but how did that just happen?

Chris L: I took it as one nay and the rest yays.

Alice: I feel like we should call for that in the future. Just to be perfectly clear on the rules. Obviously I don't want to spend any more time reading, scoring this and voting through email but I think its really important for transparency reasons to be really clear about how we're conducting business especially since right now its the beginning of the year and its important to set a precedent for being really good about all that kind of stuff.

Kiana: I went to an ASUW meeting last week and they had a 5 minute presentation on procedure and how to do that kind of stuff and gave a handout. I don't know if you guys did something like that already but they had a really easy handout about the 3 things you need to do and tracked it and made it really easy to see how things actually play out in conversation. So that might be a good thing to grab so everyone understand the rules of the game that you guys are operating under.

Alice: Could you send us that?

Elisa: I'll grab it.

Chris L: Someone would have to check the bylaws to see if it says anything about how votes can't be taken remotely.

Elisa: I don't think so.

Chris E: Adding to this idea that everyone needing to score it, I don't know if I'm comfortable with that because it sets a precedent that we'll have to put things off if not all of us got the email. I'm comfortable with people that weren't able to score or see it to abstain from a vote on it.

Kimberly: That's why i asked because i'm fine with abstaining.

Chris L: Im pretty sure the executive list is outdated.

Elisa: I just updated it.

Chris L: That was an error on our part but I certainly see the point. I'm not sure how to proceed from here.

Elisa: So it says here that recipients are selected by a simple majority vote so even now if the four of us voted yay and you guys said nay or abstained, it would still pass.

Chris E: We can record if you abstained or rejected because I think that's what we're protecting. That you didn't feel comfortable in voting without reading it through.

Alice: I'm trying to protect the integrity of our procedure and our integrity as a position of leadership.

Chris E: I understand that but in the other end of it, this is money that's here to be given away. So I'd like the board or anyone to test me and look at the application and say it didn't merit.

Alice: Absolutely, I think we're having two different conversations though. I think you're focusing on the objective but I'm focusing on the process. We're all on the same page of the objective. If this guy wants \$300 to go to a conference it's cool but if it wasn't that issue and was some other bigger issues and we're cutting corners on procedure then it becomes ethically questionable? No, it becomes ethically questionable regardless of the objective. We have to be careful of how we do things and making sure we do things in the right way no matter what we're trying to accomplish.

Chris L: We are at time. I'll need an motion to extend time or take action.

Alice: I move to vote on this travel grant despite not all of us having read and scored it.

Elisa: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Chris E: This is to approve the \$300 grant?

Chris L: No this is to approve to vote on this application. Any objections to bring this to a vote? Seeing none, please show of hands of favor of awarding this grant. Opposed? Abstentions?

In Favor: 4 (Chris L, Chris E, Elisa, Genesis)

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 2 (Alice and Kimberly)

Chris L: Thank you. We will take action to give Kevin Johnson \$300 for his trip to Texas. That was a good necessary conversation because that is true that we need to take a look at our procedures and make sure that we're following them better. I think that was a good thing to talk about. Next step is the second senate meeting agenda which if you are online there is a document called 2013-2014 template for planning senate meetings. At the bottom are the dates. So far we have a request for the student tech fee committee to come and present.

Alice: Where is this?

Elisa: Its in google drive. Do you want it on a different one?

Alice: Could you share it to abpopejoy@gmail.com?

Elisa: Done.

Chris L: The only thing I can think of that I would rather have this come through one of the committees before we bring it to the whole senate is that there are changes being proposed in the way in which parking fees are allocated to the faculty and staff of the UPass programs. Eventually this should come before the senate but I don't think the conversation is at the point yet to come to the full senate. I want the student life committee to see it before as well. Anything else?

Genesis: Do we want to go over our priorities from last meeting?

Chris L: Yes. And also the senators were suppose to go back and talk to their constituents so maybe we should crowdsource that.

Kimberly: Maybe we should send a reminder email tonight and one more time at the beginning of next week.

Chris L: Yes, we'll do that when we send the agenda out.

Alice: So are we just working together on the template where we just go through it and revise it every week?

Chris L: Yes

Alice: Could we see a list of the priorities? I wrote the ones I thought were interesting but could we see what those are before they're presented?

Elisa: There's a google doc I'll send out really quick.

Chris L: A lot of the priorities people mentioned were interesting because i was expecting people to talk about priorities related to student life and most of the priorities were internal things. So its probably worth actually looking at some of those and deciding if we want to do at this meeting. Alice, you have any written down that strike you?

Alice: Yeah, one is the invited presentation from different departments and schools. Maybe building it in the agenda and having somebody from each school or department sign up to give a presentation for no other reason than to get more information on where they're coming from and what their school's about just to start the conversation about knowing who's on campus and having at least the senators have an idea of what they're working on or what their schools do. Because I have no idea. It'd be cool to have someone to volunteer and it could be official. Like I could give a presentation on the school of public health genetics or give an introduction about it. Or we could have the lady that runs our student council come in and have that as the focus or on another particular topic. We can have somebody volunteer each meeting for the next meeting to present to mix it up a little.

Chris L: I think that's a fantastic idea. So at this coming meeting, would something be giving a full presentation or are we just giving a forum to start think about that.

Alice: I think maybe next week is a little too soon but maybe we can have a vote or a general consensus next week from everyone and have a 10 min discussion based on this idea they brought up on presenting and having an obligatory time in the agenda for it. If its favorable we can build it into for the following week and i can do it then as well. I can have the lady from my department come in to talk as well if everyone thinks its a good idea. Unless anyone else has a burning desire to present.

Chris L: I think its a good idea. And the executive vacancy position which we desperately need to recruit someone for. I think if we couple it with a mini presentation, and I'm willing to do that since I brought it up, to give an example of what it might be like. That might help to set the tone. Whoever wants to do that but i will if no one else has the time or wants to. So what do we want to call that?

Kimberly: Exploring our Departments.

Chris L: Meet the _____ department.

Alice: I think we should leave it a little more open ended. Just in case its a presentation for somebody's student council or somebody's travel. Maybe "Hearing from the gps community" or something like that where it doesn't even have to be a senator. It could be someone from a department to talk about their research. It could be an open forum where for example, someone that received a travel grant from us could come in and talk about what they did. Something more broad that we hope to fill with senators but also have people from the community come and talk to us about it.

Kimberly: Something soapbox.

Elisa: spotlight.

Alice: I like spotlight.

Chris L: Yes, GPS spotlight on....

Alice: Love it. Like right after approval of minutes?

Elisa: Yeah, why not?

Genesis: Let's get the student tech fee people out first. So can we get them to present their information so they can leave and then we can have students do their presentations?

Alice: We can just have the discussion for next week because we're just talking about it right? Not actually having one?

Chris L: I think it'll be good to have a mini-presentation and I'm willing to do that. Just to give an example and make it a little more exciting.

Genesis: What do you think about inviting Kevin after his conference and presenting on what he did since we gave him money?

Chris L: I think that was one of the goals was that to make sure there's some connection back to campus so that'll be good.

Genesis: This would be at our Nov. 6th meeting.

Chris L: Yes, or a little bit afterwards. Another idea that we had discussed earlier is this notion of caucusing. I'm not entirely sure how to pull it off without it being contrived because the idea is that it should be natural.

Elisa: Just say it's an option. Plant the idea and see if anyone latches on.

Chris L: I guess it's not something we would necessarily put time in the agenda for. At least not until it actually happens.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): You can set some primer caucuses to set an example.

Kimberly: Yeah, I was going to say that if one of us has time, we can spearhead of caucus. I would volunteer but I've hit my limit.

Chris L: I can think of one thing in particular is the school of nursing since they're really interested in putting together a college council and hear would like to hear from successful councils like public health. So that's one idea. We did that last year where we broke up into schools and that was moderately successful but people didn't see the point in having one.

Evan: Can we start a transportation caucus? That way people can see an example but I don't know if that intersect with chris's plans.

Chris E: No

Elisa: When would that be?

Chris L: Well I mean the idea is that it would be a breakout time during the senate meetings but it could be something else.

Alice: Last year, there was some backlash against that because no one was interested in caucusing so we put it at the end which didn't work because no one stayed to caucus. But I think the message from the senate last year could be different from this year but maybe the returning senators might not be as interested in caucusing but I don't know.

Kimberly: We could open the floor and see what the other senators think.

Genesis: Yes, I was thinking the same thing. Just put it out there and ask them "Do you guys want a caucus?"

Chris L: One thing that made it not entirely successful is that it was not set up in a way, and I say this with the utmost admiration for Adam and not putting any fault on him, so people could understand why they were forced into groups together. It seems like something to eat up time. The goal was to actually talk about the idea of college councils but it didn't really work. Also we're not the only players so it didn't add up in the way it was envisioned. One thing to make it of more interest is to move away from college based unless they want to do that. Maybe just a brief discussion of what it could be and emphasize that it could be based on anything academic, identity, etc. The idea is that you get a group together who have a similar set of interests and concerns.

Evan: Perhaps an alternative to having it in the meeting is to open this room like we do for the mixer after the meetings as caucus area.

Chris L: That's not bad idea at all. To say that this is a possibility and we'll provide a space for you to do it and its fine if you don't and it won't be awkward during meetings.

Kimberly: How about moving something like that before the meeting? Because it's the end of the day.

Chris L: We can give both option. We'll be definitely be here before and after so it doesn't matter when. Why don't we put it in the agenda?

Alice: I'm doing it.

Chris L: Just use 5 minutes to say that this is something we're providing a space for to people who want to take advantage of it or not.

Genesis: Do we want to put something on there like a refresher of what we did in the previous meeting? Like to remind people.

Chris L: Yes, good idea. What did everyone think of the temperature reading? Was that useful?

Alice: I think people did.

Evan: I don't know if anything came from the temperature reading but I think enough people said something during that to prompt people to say something later. Having the multiple opportunities to say something finally prompted people to do that.

Chris L: Yes, so maybe its more of a matter of providing the space than saying something.

Evan: It's also nice to have since it gives us a buffer time for the rest of the meeting since people complain if its too long.

Genesis: We'll go over welcoming the senators and how they're suppose to participate parli-pro really quickly. Like how to speak or how to speak when you make a motion.

Chris L: We had talked about this idea of an orientation before or after/ is that something we still want to do?

Elisa: I think that'll be fine.

Chris L: So maybe we should say the next two meetings, we'll set up a time before and after and you need to make one of them.

Evan: Maybe after this meeting or before the next one. Unless you guys don't mind hosting 4 different meetings.

Genesis: I think its easier if it's the same day.

Chris L: Just 10 mins.

Elisa: Are we just gonna say that they have to be there and are we going to track who was there and who was not?

Evan: I think if you say they'll have to be there, you'll get 60% at least which is good.

Chris L: I don't think its too onerous to ask someone to come since a lot of people come early anyways.

Evan: We're only asking the new people right?

Chris L: Yes, so why don't we move this before the student tech fee?

Kimberly: I was going to do that.

Chris L: I'll do sum and its 68 mins. Anything else we want to put in there?

Chris E: I want to do a resolution for transportation.

Genesis: That's suppose to come through us before the senate.

Evan: Don't you announce the intention to make a resolution first?

Alice: Resolutions have to be present to all senators two weeks before they vote on it so you can present it at the next meeting if we talk about it here and approve it and it wouldn't be voted on until two weeks after you presented it.

Chris L: Technically that's not the case. I think the only statutory thing is that the text has to be emailed out before the meeting.

Alice: I thought it was 2 weeks before.

Chris L: Maybe but no that the executive committee has to approve resolutions.

Evan: It has to come through us but we don't have to approve it.

Chris E: All it is, is a list of things that were advocating for whether its a letter to the governor or legislature but there's language we need to approve and I guess I overlooked that when we were planning our first meeting.

Chris L: If its not a resolution, that's totally fine.

Alice: According to section E, which pertains to this, we have to vote because the resolution is suppose to be submitted to secretary. Sorry, its in page 4. First it has to be submitted to the

secretary 2 weeks before bringing it to gpss. If you didn't submit it before, then we'd have to vote as a full gpss to suspend these clauses of the bylaws in order to even hear at that meeting.

Chris L: Unless its not a full resolution. I think it's just a letter or petition.

Genesis: So you want to put forth a letter or petition that the senators are going to sign?

Chris E: Right, or something we approve of as GPSS so it's not just me. Sorry for overlooking that and not bringing it up in the first meeting. I didn't think it would be prudent to do it at that time with all the stuff we had to do.

Chris L: Right, you did mention that though.

Alice: What do you mean by a letter?

Chris E: So it would go to the legislators or the governor. So it says that we the gpss want these certain things and other thing is that it will be different from Moving King County Now to deal specifically with student interest. So we can say things like we have buying power by subsidizing King County Metro that if they don't have that, we can just pull out our money and do it privately.

Genesis: Can we even threaten that?

Chris E: If they cut routes, they're in breach of our upass contract. Let's not get into specifics but its just a call of action that we need a special session and a transportation package needs to include these things. Pretty much, its understanding that when you say you want to support students, this is part of it. The reason we want to go this route is that if we can get alumni and/or funders that want to sign on as well, under the idea that it support students and not some transportation thing. That's the global idea.

Chris L: So this would be somewhat equivalent to when gpss approves a state legislative agenda?

Chris E: Something like that.

Chris L: So its not in the form of a resolution. It just requires a simple majority vote to approve.

Alice: But isn't that something that's in the bylaws of the state legislative steering committee for example? That the senate will just approve the agenda or the directive of that committee but this is a novel thing that's asking for action and support by GPSS which by definition will be a motions, which has to be presented in the form of a resolution. That's how we do things right? We vote as a senate to approve resolutions to say we're in support of something. In my opinion, if we wanted to do this next week rather than wait, I don't see why we can't just suspend the

bylaws to do the right way because its not as strong. I think we should do it following the procedure.

Chris E: Even so, if we pass a resolution I don't know if i would send that to legislators.

Genesis: Aren't we going to say that it's to pass the resolution for the senate to sign letter?

Alice: Exactly.

Genesis: The resolution is to have the senate sign this letter or that the letter is coming from behalf of the senate.

Alice: And the letter is an appendix to the resolution.

Genesis: So that's what the resolution will have to say. We the senate want to say this and this is what's going to say on the letter.

Chris L: Is this feasible for Nov. 6? Can it wait til then?

Chris E: Yes.

Elisa: Can you send me the language and I can put it in the form of a resolution?

Alice: And at next week's meeting we can vote to suspend bylaws so he can present.

Genesis: He's presenting Nov. 6.

Elisa: So I'll send out the resolution 2 weeks before the meeting which would be next Wednesday.

Alice: And then you can talk about it.

Chris L: So you want time to talk about it?

Chris E: Yeah, that'll be fine.

Evan: I can imagine it be sent through execs any point at that process because I think the bylaws says it has to go through execs but execs don't have to vote on it.

Chris E: I don't see why I can't just do that through my officer reports.

Chris L: We don't have time for officer reports. We just did summer updates for last meeting. You sure you don't want more time?

Kimberly: I think we did have officer reports last year.

Evan: We did and it took a long time. The VP specifically had a huge amount to talk about in most meetings especially during legislative season.

Genesis: But I think if it's a specific issue, you should have your own agenda item.

Evan: Yes.

Alice: I agree. In the update it should be like "Here's what I'm working on and what's going on" but if there's a resolution coming up that they're going to get as an email, it should be a separate agenda item that they can look to that is recorded as part of our procedure. Again its annoying procedural parliamentary stuff but that's why were here.

Evan: I think its important in case people want to discuss it so it doesn't eat time from anything else. I say from 10 to 15 mins because people like to talk about resolutions.

Kimberly: Maybe a powerpoint might be helpful.

Evan: Maybe we didn't have officer updates. Maybe it was just legislative but I'm not remembering Adam or anyone else having to talk. It was just a legislative update which is chris's update.

Chris L: It's been 78 mins and we're nearing the end of our time. Is there anything else?

Kimberly: Just a question. So the gpss spotlight discussion is not caucus thing?

Chris L: No.

Genesis: Is that different from the geography presentation? We're going to have two different ones?

Chris L: I think its fine because thats the the kind of thing we could do.

Alice: But could we just take that out? Like could you do it next week because i feel like if we're giving them an opportunity to talk about the type of thing we would build in the agenda every week and if you gave a presentation especially in the same meeting where we discuss if we want it, I feel like it's a little directive even if we explicitly say it can be anything we want. I think it'd be cool to see what kind of ideas they come up with and how they prioritize.

Evan: I would agree with that if we were the driving force for that but it came from the senate as a whole and they already have an idea of what they want to do. Chris is taking the initiative and

start doing it now. It'd be cool and I think the senate would like to see it done the next meeting.

Genesis: Is this just limited to senators or should we invite people?

Chris L: Could be anyone.

Genesis: Do they have to notify us ahead of time if they want more time?

Evan: Yes.

Genesis: I think it should be made clear that they have to let us know so that we can adjust the agenda and the timeline.

Chris L: They have to let us know before the executive meeting.

Alice: I feel like we should just have a set time, like 10 or 5 mins. sort of a flash in the pan. If we're building it in the agenda and we want to do it for the whole year. Just for it to be our set amount of time to talk about whatever and whoever wants to fill the space can.

Chris L: We are out of time so I will entertain a motion to either extend time or to take action on this agenda.

Kimberly: I move to approve the agenda.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Alice: Yes, just 2 more minutes. 1 more thing. Do you want 5 minutes on yours?

Chris L: It's on there.

Alice: Sorry, I withdraw my objection.

Chris L: Any more? Great, we have our agenda.

Alice: Don't we have to vote on it?

Evan: It's the no objection vote.

Chris L: When you object you have the opportunity to voice your objection and explain why you're objecting. Moving on to scheduling for winter and spring quarter.

Genesis: Scheduling for winter and spring. If you pull up your calendars were starting senate meeting on the 15th. Exec will be on the 8th. Then every other week. It's the same schedule we're on now.

Evan: What day does the quarter start?

Genesis: It starts on January 6.

Genesis: So then our winter schedule is going to be for exec: Jan. 8th, Jan. 22nd, Feb. 5th, Feb. 19th, and Mar. 5th. Senate will begin on Jan. 15th, Jan. 29th, Feb. 12th, Feb. 26th, and Mar 12th.

Evan: Do we need to leave it open for more budget meetings?

Genesis: I think it fills up every quarter.

Evan: Last year, exec had to meet for lots of other sessions.

Chris: Based on our experience with the budgeting process, there's a lot of things we could do to make it less painful.

Genesis: That's winter. We're only doing this since we need the rooms. Spring quarter. Exec is going to meet on Apr. 2nd and every other week until may 28th. Senate will meet on Apr. 9th, Apr. 23rd, may 7th and may 21st. We can publish these dates ahead of time as well. Same time, 530 for each one.

Chris L: That's something i want to bring up. Is there a need or a desire to change our executive committee meeting time from 530 to 545? Are the kinds of thing you have Evan something that'll happen every time?

Evan: That was the class for this quarter. I'm just balancing between the two.

Kimberly: I have the same scheduling this quarter. I don't get done with class until 530.

Chris L: Does it make sense to push the meeting for this quarter to 545? Because if we don't have quorum we can't start so if we can get quorum earlier we can do that.

Alice: It was just today that I had that lecture but we had a special thing that was just today so I should be here on time.

Evan: If no one is opposed to starting later that would be cool because I could miss less class and attend more senate.

Chris L: Okay. I'm just talking for executive.

Alice: So you want us to wait to do approval of minutes?

Evan: You'll have quorum without me.

Genesis: Well Kimberly won't be here until 545 right?

Chris L: I guess Evelina's not here either. I also like the idea of having many people here as we start. I'll entertain a motion to move all executive meetings for fall quarter to 545.

Evan: So moved

Kimberly: So seconded.

Chris L: Any opposed? So for the remainder of fall quarter our meetings will start at 545. Where did we leave off on scheduling?

Alice: She went through all of them.

Chris L: I'll entertain a motion to approve winter and spring scheduling.

Alice: Moved

Kimberly: Seconded.

Chris L: Executive senator reports. Anyone have anything?

Alice: Yes. I was going to talk about priorities because I really liked them, including better publicity, marketing and branding of gpss so it could be more known. Also the departmental outreach. I know it's pretty difficult and I know secretaries from the past have been talking tirelessly to get people appointed but I think maybe if we do it through a peer pressure process to remind everyone to talk to their friends and maybe if we come up with a list of departments that we don't have representation from that could be useful. We could go start hounding people.

Chris L: We don't have a negative list.

Genesis: Obviously we could count against the departments we have on campus and see through that.

Alice: Could we do that? Is there a list of departments that we don't have representation from that we could provide to all the senators?

Elisa: Kristin did an audit of all the departments last year. So she'll be able to do that fairly easily.

Chris L: Obviously we have communication and outreach committee that is partially tasked with that but this might be a kind of thing that could become a working group for recruitment.

Alice: Yes, and providing a list to that committee and to all the senators will be a good resource for them. I really like the idea of using gpss as a place to facilitate departmental collaboration. It goes along with spotlight idea that we already talked about. The other thing is the association for women in science. Full disclosure, I worked for them in DC. They have an institutional membership program where if an institution pays a fee then all the grad students from that institution become free awss members. They get access to networking and mentoring and the awss magazine which is a news source for science and policy and for professional development. I wasn't even sure if gpss would bring this to administrators or what the avenue would be but just thought I should bring up with you guys. It's all grad students as well, not just women.

Kimberly: That's cool

Chris L: The whole campus becomes a member?

Alice: All the graduates of the university that becomes an institutional partner with awss, and they'll get promoted as a partner as well, will automatically have all grad students become free members. We would get free resources by the university coming up with this. I don't know if we do a joint thing for the fee with administration but its a yearly fee. Or do one year as a trial run if people can benefit from it.

Chris L: What's the fee?

Alice: \$2000.

Chris L: I think one thing to do is to make the rounds on campus of all departments that are doing similar work to get all the relevant stakeholders on board but obviously administration will be key. That would be a resolution directing me to make this ask. That's a good idea. So we're out of time for executive reports so can I entertain a motion to extend time?

Kimberly: Moved to extend.

Evan: Second. I was thinking that \$2000 is a little outside GPSS funding but I think its a drop in the bucket for any of the colleges so I think the difficulty is who bears that cost because the sciences are spread out between 4 different colleges and also this is something to send to college councils since they work primarily on budgets. I know right now they're reviewing budgets but why not have them propose a small thing?

Alice: Why not have gpss be the central liaison for the professional development center for the graduate and professional students and get contributions from all the colleges? It would be negligible for all of them.

Evan: GPSS would have to be the one who organizes and get everyone on board with that because no one college will want to shoulder the burden for everyone else.

Chris L: Let's do it.

Evan: So that also advertises uw as a supporter of women as science?

Alice: Exactly.

Evan: Then UW would look highly upon that.

Alice: Uw is also an advanced institution which means they have a grant from the national institution to broaden groups of underrepresented people in STEM fields so its in line with what our university goes for. Also the office of the provost would be interested in doing it but its just a matter of making those connections. We could also promote them and help them and be beneficial. But what would i do next?

Chris L: I think the next step would be presenting it as a project to the senate. If gpss is going to be the central node for this the senate needs to take it on as project.

Evan: One thing to anticipate is competitor groups that do similar things and why aren't we subscribed to them?

Genesis: Right, we'll have more senators coming up saying "subscribe to this and that". We should anticipate others coming up with other subscriptions

Evan: I think there are more women in science groups so I think it'll be important to say why we're choosing one.

Alice: There's small regional one, only this one is on a national level. There's the society of women engineering but I don't think they do a partnership.

Chris L: In addition to this, would you be willing to help drive the discussion of priorities next week? And highlight a few of those things and generate some more thinking from the senate.

Alice: I'd be happy to. Ill wait on this aws partnership to have more time to talk about it, to not change the agenda.

Chris E: Do they do political advocacy?

Alice: They advocate but they don't lobby because they're a 501c3.

Chris E: So they should be safe. Because I know Rene might say that you can't spend money on a lobby group.

Genesis: Wait, 501c3 so they're technically a non-profit organization? we might not be able to give them money but gpss can't use state money to give to charity. Colleges could so we can just spearhead the project.

Alice: So we can have the office of the provost flipping a coin in their bank account and have all the graduate students benefit from it. id be happy to spearhead that and bring up the priorities.

Chris L: A lot of them are institutional strengthening things that are really important and we should follow up on this and task the people that brought up to do the work. Then they'll get kicked into a committee to work more in depth or create a working group. I think the thing to convey through this is that the possibilities are limitless. Senators can take ideas as far as they want. Anyone else?

Kimberly: First update, you mentioned earlier. The sexual assault prevention task force. We submitted our first report to the president. My other report, has Shawn Callahan from the Law school has been in contact with you about tailgating?

Chris L: No.

Kimberly: I just wanted to check because I have to talk to him. I heard somebody else that had talked to him said that he wasn't a fan of the idea but I think he was under the impression that this was for every game not just one game. He's the one that's been a beast and taking care of all these tailgates. I will talk to him then and you're coming to meeting tomorrow?

Chris L: SPA meeting? yes. What time is it?

Kimberly: It's at 1230. I think Shawn is invited but I'll just remind him again and we can talk about it.

Chris L: I'll say more on my update but I talked to Andrea about this too. Evan?

Evan: Not much, just feelers going up in my department to possibly add in a marine bio major instead of minor. What concerned me is that it might just shift the population fairly heavily towards undergrad from grads. I don't think it'll be a huge problem since our funding is from federal funding so we don't rely too much on state funding but if this happened to a more purely state funded college, that might be an unfortunate thing happening to them as the grad students will take less priority because there's less grads.

Chris L: Officer reports. Chris?

Chris E: I was at the transportation thing the other night. We talked to representatives afterwards so it was kinda interesting. We got applications out to people who signed up for committee sign ups. Nothing back yet so I have to crack a whip on that. Transportation. Chris will talk about this for the higher ed summit. We know that asuw will have legislative reception on the 18th so were gonna do some of our panels that day and possibly a Tues. event as well. 3 topics we're going to cover are healthcare as for students, pay it forward which is a funding option, and new online education stuff that's coming forward. That's it in a nutshell. I'm working on transportation stuff and just get a bit of a feeler of some things. Its interesting. uw or students have a pretty interesting seat at the table where access is high but at the end of the day i don't think theres any teeth in what we do. We're patronized to be included but we don't have any power or clout in decisions. Were limited by what we can do. Obviously business interests can donate and things like that. This is just a commentary of things i'm thinking about of how we want to do things. On a certain level students are knowledgeable of this which makes them apathetic but it makes it a lot harder to get support. This is just what I'm thinking and if they are relevant and see if we can address them.

Evan: Do you have suggestions to give us teeth?

Chris E: That's what i need to work on and I'm open to ideas. in some aspects it's the nature of the beast. on the other end, its one of those things, do we need to have importance to get people involved or get people involved to have importance? people like us getting involved. we have some great opportunities to do that. These are slowly growing ideas but maybe we just need to start being tough and start saying things. Were just used saying that we want to lower tuition they're raising it on us anyway. Or if we can't get get bus routes we need we'll use our money on other things. In reality we want to do things that good for everybody. On the other end, we're just being nice so do we change that? can we change that? how do we do that? i don't want to make enemies either. i'm sensitive to that but if its just to start calling people out. Personally li would say the admin is part of that as well.

Alice: I came from a non-profit organization advocating at the national level. I started with adding my name to listservs and the mantra i went by is advocacy is not an immediate gratification. its a commitment to long-term progress. its about relationship building. youre coming from the staff side of it so you can see from the inside so its easier to see the impact because you're making the decision but advocody its hard and grueling. you don't get what you want but the fact that you're there is to make a good relationship and to make a statement. Something that we talked about is last year is political capital. where do you want to spend your time and political capital and where do you think it'll be best spent?

Chris E: I feel really good about what I'm working on and I don't want to take away from that. I think its beneficial and it's a slow process but on the other end, we put stuff out and get 4 people to respond. I need to figure out how to rally people but i feel that were at a disadvantage to get people to care. so that's where I'm coming from because and i can go do the things and have a lot of wins. i don't want that mindset i want people to come with us.

Evan: I agree especially on this transport thing where economically we comprise a lot of interests but we don't hold that much power. I don't think they've seen what they fought for going the right way and they say why bother.

Chris E: Maybe were too busy because in reality if they're going to cut routes for uw, we can pay more money for it. It might be better if we cut all the routes to uw cause that's the only way to ensure people will get involved. I'm not trying to be a Debbie downer, just thinking out loud.

Chris L: Great, Genesis.

Genesis: Very quick. My committees are formed except for science and policy because we need to trim it. Rene and I are figuring out a process to see who really wants to be on it and who just signed up and doesn't have the time commitment. Were trying to get a meeting next week. Finance and Budget committee meets this week and travel grants meets next week for an orientation then will meet after applications close. Science and policy is planning with fosep an educational panel on labeling gmo foods. I think we're a go for that event. That's oct. 28th at 5:30 in hub 322. Our poster will be printed tomorrow. For committees, that's it. Our financial state is so far so good. We haven't been spending that much money.

Chris: Elisa?

Elisa: Diversity's meeting on friday. Judicial is meeting next week. Meeting with communication and outreach next week as well. My committees are all getting together so that is all i'm working on is figuring out the annual reports from last year and making plans for this committee. I have a couple questions for the minutes from senate last week. we missed couple names. can we just strike that?

Chris L: we can't strike that but we can amend the minutes or ask whoever said that.

Alice: Then we can just remind people at that time to say their name. The majority of the time people didn't identify names so can you just interrupt and ask for names so they can get practice as well.

Elisa: Who represented the state legislative committee?

Chris L: I can't remember his name but I'll ask at next meeting to identify themselves. asuw is not here so president. this weekend i'm taking my general exams so consider me unavailable from 5pm Friday to 9am Monday. Tailgating is going well with evans. The problem is getting non-evans people to come out. It's set up right in front of the columns so it's a nice place. The next game's kickoff is at 8 so we'll be running a social from 2 to 4 on the 26th. I think we learned enough about advertising so we had a good turnout and it looks like its going to be sunny. second thing is next week, W day is coming up in conjunction with homecoming. There's a

university-wide fundraising effort called love purple raise gold. Joey and I want to make sure we wet our beaks on that with alumni newsletters and links to various funds we have set up. Austin and I are still working on the university committees. I sent out another email where I begged or encouraged senators to apply for university committees. we also need 3 appointees to the student technology fee committees and student activities fee committee. please encourage people to look at the website. for my internal committees, i'll pull together before i disappear into the ether. college councils is an ongoing conversation. something that will be done along with elise, the chair at pacs, kiana, and Michael. that's something were working on. Budgeting, talking a lot of faculty salary. there's a plan to bring faculty salaries up to the peer level over the next several years assuming the money can be found. It's Jack Lee's plan. That would be great if it actually happens.

Evan: Did we discuss this last year? It sounds familiar.

Alice: No, that was lifting faculty salary fees.

Chris L: Faculty salaries are 12% below the peer medium on average. for professor's that's been here longer, the average is pushing 30% so it gets worse if you're here longer but its something that's being worked on. chris mentioned the higher ed summit so we're planning for that. if you're interested in helping out, do let me know. I had laura do research on various topics and putting together a short list of panels and talking to asuw in integrating again with their legislative banquet so that we can synergize on that. i think that's all i have. i had lunch with John Vincent, the police chief, and i think it went very well. We talked about the safety presentation and was extremely grateful to elisa in particular and thought it was a huge success. it was an important collaboration with uwspd. We talked about further opportunities about expanding the conversation on campus safety and also about the sexual assault taskforce. at one point, he had a lot of questions about gpss. I said, i think over the history of gpss it started out as an offshoot of asuw because grads and professional students had concerns that were different from undergrads. Over the years, I think we're really moving and in a transition period between addressing the more prosaic concerns of grad students like child care, student life and that kind of student government-y stuff and we're really moving into a more mature phase and defining our self as a community of grad students and doing collaborative projects and establishing a voice for ourselves. a lot of the conversations we have now is reflective of that. these discussions are difficult or frustrating but i think it's indicative of process.

Elisa: one more thing. Claire was working with us to make promotional videos about the 3 things we do to advocate and serve the community. i was going to get Keolu and Alice to give the science and policy piece and joey hunziker to get diversity and service piece and maybe michelle Dylan from last year to talk about fee based programs and lobbying. Unfortunately, Claire had to back out but i want to take it on myself because I think its a cool idea and I love making promotional videos. You'll see one that I'm about to post about the north of ave mural which gpss was a part of with community affairs. So look forward to that.

Chris L: Any other announcements? Officers meet briefly after meeting. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Evan: Moved

Genesis: Second

Executive Meeting
October 30, 2013
HUB 314

Chris Lizotte (President): I will now call this meeting to order at 5:47pm. I know that we have a change made to the agenda so I will not entertain a motion to amend that.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): I will make a motion to add the student tech fee as an action item to number 4. Right before first senate meeting agenda.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): And this is to replace the presentation that was going to happen at the senate meeting?

Genesis: They didn't understand they had to do it in front of exec. Not the whole senate. So we're going to add them to our agenda today.

Chris L: How much time?

Alton (Student Technology Fee Committee Presenter): 10 minutes.

Chris L: We'll leave some time for questions so let's make it 15. So second?

Elisa Law (Secretary): Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Chris E: Point of information. I don't want to go against this but after we do this do you also want to add an info item and action separately? I would think there's going to be discussion beyond it.

Chris L: The action is to approve their item correct? I think we can add extra time and then we can have it rolled in. Any other objections? Now I'll entertain a motion to approve minutes from the previous meeting.

Genesis: Motion

Elisa: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Sorry what was your name again?

Alton: My name's Alton. I'm basically the coordinator. So this is the student technology fee. This is basically an overview. There's a technology fee on campus. Everyone pays about 40 dollars to this fee. It funds non-essential technology. So things that aren't explicitly needed for classrooms such as the computer labs at odegard or machinery for aerospace and technology of that

matter. The committee doesn't select what to fund. The campus creates proposals and the committee votes which of these to fund. These are the categories that we try to fund. There's collaborative computer labs, remote computing, machinery and software. Computer labs for example, we have a set budget to fund and we don't go over that budget. For frontier computing, we have a set budget and categories we try to move our money into. These are the anticipated administrative expenses that we have. For 2013, we're basing it off 2013 results. So you can see, most interesting one is the labstat and key server program. Key server is a software consolidation we have on campus. We just started this 2 years ago. We didn't have this but SDR started funding this this year. Employee wages may be a bit higher this year because we hired a compliance officer. There have been moments in the past where proposal authors haven't been spending money the way they should have so we're trying to crack down on that. This is our tentative schedule for STF. The only date you need to watch for is October 25th. That's suppose to be October 30th, for this meeting. December 15 is our deadline for proposals. We send out something called the request for proposals which is essentially the outline for how people will write their requests. We'll be voting on it until about April. Then we finalize those things and then in July we actually fund the proposals. So any proposal that gets approved this year will be funded and will begin spending money next year.

Genesis: So they're applying for the following year and not this year?

Alton: Yes. 2013, the previous year, they're spending their money this year. Now we've had these sorts of categories we fund and this is how the committee pushes its vision for how we want technology to be on campus. We used to spend about 22% of our budget on computer labs but we understand that most people have laptops now so there's not much need for computer labs so we're reducing the amount we are spending on computer labs this year. Also, we just refreshed the Odegaard Library this year so there isn't a much of a need for a centralized computer lab. We are increasing our mobile computing, so remote computing and collaborative. We want people to be able to have power and access to UW resources whenever they need it and wherever they are. We've funding something called Vida, which is remote computing. We have U Drive, a sort of cloud computing that students are able to access on whatever computer they're on. And collaborative is basically things they can take out on the field. For example, we have a loan program and basically just collaboration between departments to cut down on redundancy on campus

Chris L: So that's the stuff you check out on the bottom floor of Kane?

Alton: Yes. For future tech, we're increasing. This is technology that is not fully fleshed out called bleeding edge where we want UW to be seen as leading the pack for technology. We want to have access to the newest technology even if it's not completely reliable yet. We want the university to have first access to these sorts of things. For example, with machinery and research, we're increasing because we had a lot of proposals in the past where we need to replace machines in the departments but we haven't been able to fully fund what we wanted and we're at a point in time where a lot of machinery and hardware that departments have on

campus are reaching its end life so were seeking to fund those replacements this year. We are decreasing software. It was 10% of the budget before but not many departments have requested money for software, partly because of the addition of the key server which helps to reduce software costs. Committee members have a metric which is basically a guideline for how we vote. We have student access at 40%. So we value student access very highly for computer labs. For example, if we have a department in CS wanted a computer lab but they would only give access to CS majors, we would be tentative about that because not that many students would have access to it. For example with machinery and research and student access, this sort of thing for machines are for department students and people studying in that major so we don't value highly the student access for that. These are just the sorts of way that the committee measures and we'll vote on it. This is the key server software. It's a centralized host. For example, there's Photoshop which requires a registration key to activate it but to buy Photoshop for every computer is extremely costly. What it does is that it holds all the licences in one place and if a computer in Suzzallo wants Photoshop, they would be able to pull off the code from the key server for that computer and once its done, it goes back and would be available for other students. This allows software to be used anywhere on campus and is a lot more fluid and more cost effective.

Chris L: Has this been implemented? I know last year still in the early stages.

Alton: We're moving into it. Student awareness is the biggest problem but it is downloadable now.

Chris L: Is it downloadable through anyone with a UW netid?

Alton: Yes, we have to figure out how to get the page available to all students. The problem we have right now is with the administrative aspect but our key server team is working it.

Chris L: So I can do it on my computer?

Alton: Yes.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Can you tell us how to do it right now just to test it?

Alton: I don't have access to it since the key server team is going through some rough transitions but I can show you in two weeks if you like.

Alice: I was just curious if any computer can use it? It doesn't have to be on campus?

Alton: Yes, you should just be able to login with your UW netID.

Alice: I know that some departments have a thing where you can log in to Linux through the terminal and have access to the department, or would you have to download it?

Alton: I can't say that right now. I'm not really sure.

Chris L: I know what you're talking about. I do that through CSE. I use their stuff sometimes. I think that's different.

Alice: I know for a lot of departments that have software that their students need to use, they provide access already.

Alton: This isn't for specific departments. I don't know if you need special software for computer science but if this isn't something that all students will need, or if this isn't something that has wide access to or generally in that department they already provide access, it won't be on the key server. It's for Photoshop or some mathematica software that is needed on a wide basis.

Alice: Do you guys have a plan on how you would raise awareness?

Alton: That is on the key server team but it's just getting it on to website that we're having trouble with right now.

Chris E: I know there's issues with the portal last year for SPSF through Vida. So you say you can get it off campus but you really had to be on campus. Will this be an upgrade from that?

Alton: Yes. Any more questions about key server? I can give you guys more information in a few weeks if you guys still need it. This is finding of consumables. When we've been funding some equipment, there have been a lot of proposals that have been requesting to charge money for certain items that are one time use. Our policy is that we will fund these but they can't be used for profit for the department. They would have to be sold at cost so they can't exploit students.

Chris L: Can you give us an example? What would a consumable be?

Alton: No examples come to mind but this has been an apparent problem in previous committees. We just want to clarify our position that we don't want departments to profit from students.

Chris L: Like rewritable CDs?

Alton: Yeah, I guess so.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Something like departmental NMR machines that charges in-department and out-department rates. This is not the same thing correct?

Alton: Correct, and I think that is it.

Chris L: So for clarification, we would need to approve your budget?

Alton: No, you approve the yearly funding plan.

Genesis: Which slide was that?

Alton: The entire thing is in that document I sent you.

Genesis: Yes, I sent that to everyone. Is this right here? The budget?

Alton: This presentation is an overview of the important points of the actual document. We just need you to approve the document.

Chris L: Are these changes in the funding levels all changes from last year?

Alton: Yes. With the percentages we try to keep them solid but last year we didn't spend as much in software so we moved some of that money over but we need to request to asuw and gpss to make any changes in funding levels.

Chris L: In that sense everything that you say makes sense.

Evans: I have a question. Does electronic journal access fall under any of these categories? Like UW students can't access any Springerlink articles. It might be under the libraries' duties but I wasn't sure if there is anyway that STF has any say in the matter.

Alton: I'm not sure what that is but if that's something that can be accessed from your apartment or something where you don't have to be in a certain location to do it, that can go under remote computing. They have a lot of leeway in the way they're described. For example, we had a couple computers that were being requested, like laptops that were intended for a certain use but during the summer, they just loaned them to a summer program instead. So in one way they were collaboration but they also were used for remote computing. They're fluid guidelines for the committee.

Chris L: One question I have is the reduction in software budget. Is that sufficient to fund the key server program?

Alton: We fund the key server program from our administrative budget but most departments don't request that much software and whatever is left over from that budget is used for the key server. We had a really small number of requests last year.

Chris L: I just asked because I think the key server is one of the most exciting things and I agree that the first thing to make sure is that people know about it but once it is up and running, I want to make sure that you have what you need to keep it going.

Alice: I just have one more question about the key server. How does that not violate copyright

laws?

Alton: Most companies that we request will allow it but we have to pay a small fee every year to keep those and that includes upgrade fees. For example, Adobe has moved to the creative cloud where it's hosted online so they're being extremely difficult in the way they implement it. For example, newer Adobe software can't work in the key server situation because Adobe has requested that we buy a licensing code for every computer on campus if we want to key server it. We still have the Creative Suite 6 so you can still use it offline or download it directly on to your computer but it depends on the company.

Chris L: We're at time so I will either entertain a motion to extend time or vote to approve the funding levels of each budget category.

Evan: I move to approve the funding levels and the document as a whole.

Alice: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Seeing none we approve your plan.

Alton: Thank you. I was kind of worried that you wouldn't. Just in a worst case scenario. I also have another thing. We need our appointees and we need 3 but that number is set because grad students can be busy with their schedules. If it comes down to it that we can't get enough appointees we were hoping that someone on the executive board could stand in while we find someone.

Genesis: I think as treasurer, that will be me.

Chris L: Can you do me a favor and make sure that no one from last year will want to serve again? Or you can give me their name and I can contact them.

Alton: I only know one but I think he might have graduated.

Chris L: We just want to make sure that we don't have that issue where we double booked a committee. But if you say there are 3 open positions then we'll do 3.

Alton: Thank you.

Genesis: Congratulations.

Evan: How often does STF meet?

Genesis: I think they meet more in the spring quarter when they're actually approving funding requests but now it might be just an orientation of committee members. Kind of the same thing

that SAF is doing.

Evan: It's just that winter and spring quarter, I'm going to be gone for 3 week chunks.

Chris L: So, I'm adding in the typical stuff.

Genesis: Approval of 10/23/2013 minutes. Previously on GPSS, would we want to do that again?

Chris L: We can get a sense of people are finding that...i think it's a good thing. Until people start saying please stop.

Elisa: Especially since were still getting new senators.

Evan: Just helps us to get back into the mindset.

Chris L: Has anyone said they'll do a spotlight? So I have gotten some interest however with 2 people regarding caucusing. There's someone in pharmacy actually, that is interested collaboration across the health sciences and they want to do this outside the senate as well. I told them that could be done inside the senate. Another one is a law student that was not sure if she was going to be elected as 2nd senator from the law school and was interested in doing a women's leadership caucus. Her name is Chrissy Elles. So although we had talk about setting aside time not during meeting for that correct?

Genesis: For caucusing?

Evan: Yeah, for afterwards.

Chris E: If we want to do a spotlight, and there isn't anybody, we can put transportation there instead. Maybe that doesn't work? But they'll be there and it'll separate nicely from the actual resolution.

Chris L: Who?

Chris E: Two people from King County will be there.

Genesis: You want them to just talk about the issue?

Alice: I think that we should keep them separate. Keep the spotlight separate from a relevant action items. The idea of the spotlight is to bring some information that we wouldn't otherwise hear about in the graduate school or the community but this is pertinent to something we're moving on.

Chris L: If no one comes up, we can strike it from the agenda.

Alice: I mean, I can do it. I think it be cool since you want to start with the college councils to see if someone from the public health council would come in but I would've needed to ask her already. There were so many people that were potentially interested.

Chris L: Chris, you know how much time King County would like?

Chris E: I'd like to give them at least 10 to 15 minutes for the presentation plus discussion.

Genesis: How much time would you like for your presentation?

Chris E: I would love 10.

Genesis: Should we just make it 20?

Chris E: Yes. I'd be happy if it was shorter.

Evan: I haven't seen this resolution yet but I think it has to have been sent out already.

Elisa: It's suppose to be sent today. It's going to be with the email that goes out with the agenda.

Alice: It wasn't last week? I thought it has to be sent 2 weeks before.

Elisa: It has to be to me 2 weeks before but 1 week for everybody else.

Alice: I didn't add anything but we didn't set a time tonight to talk about it?

Chris L: Talk about what?

Alice: The resolution.

Chris E: We can.

Chris L: We can suspend the bylaws and add it.

Alice: Can we do that? Can we move to suspend bylaws and add a 10 minute discussion of transit resolution?

Chris L: Motion to suspend bylaws.

Evan: Second

Chris L: Any objections to that?

Alice: I move to add a 10 minute discussion of the transit resolution.

Chris L: After the senate meeting planning?

Chris E: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? So it is so.

Evan: So we have that. What usually comes next? I feel like there's a couple things between it.

Genesis: It's kind of actually what we did last week except there's no tech fee presentation. We need to do something about the executive senator vacancy.

Chris L: Eddie Schwieterman was interested but said he didn't have time.

Alice: No one has time.

Chris E: I have someone from the 1st year from Evans. I can't be sure if he was confused.

Genesis: Doug Taber?

Chris E: Yes.

Genesis: I think he actually is interested in being an exec senator but then he wants to be slsc flsc and a bunch of other stuff.

Chris E: I also think that amongst other things, both the 2 people I know from the law school running for the open position are interested in some capacity for being on exec plus others.

Evan: We can ask Colin to do it. He might not say no. He would be good on exec.

Genesis: He would. He's an amazing leader on FMB.

Alice: Who's that?

Evan: Colin Bateson. He's a 3rd year mechanical engineering i think

Chris E: Is there any inclination from last year folks like Michael?

Evan: Colin is the FMB guy.

Genesis: Allen-Michael Weatherford?

Chris E: Yes, he had run in spring as well.

Genesis: You're talking about people who ran last year?

Evan: That would be worth doing.

Chris L: Chris do you want to do a brief thing on the higher ed summit?

Chris E: Can we do that during announcements? Or I can do that as part of my update or yours.

Genesis: We don't do updates so you would have to have your own agenda item.

Chris E: I'm comfortable doing it during announcements but do we need a little more? At that point we're two weeks up. We need volunteers.

Alice: What is this for?

Chris L: The Higher Ed summit.

Alice: I think we should do it separately.

Chris E: Is anybody else gonna do some stuff?

Genesis: I have nothing. Travel grants have met and all my other committees are good.

Evan: I think its good to have Chris's own update section too because I remember Melanie giving a lot of updates last year especially because this is what is actually going on.

Chris L: Do you need time for a legislative update?

Chris E: Not so much going on right now but I think at the next meeting we can start that because then both committees will be up and running.

Alice: Rather than having presentation of transit resolution, why don't we have that as the legislative update? That way you have your own space.

Chris E: Sure.

Evan: I disagree because it's its own action item and we have to keep that separate anyway.

Chris E: Are you talking about the King County one?

Evan: No, the resolution.

Chris E: Yeah, that has to be its own. I want to do the King County before the resolution because I think it would be important to have people understanding why.

Evan: Then President Chris can do an update if you have anything too.

Chris L: Do I have anything?

Evan: I feel like Adam having these big goals and coming back to the senate and saying this is the progress I made.

Chris L: By then I'll have some things to report on the sexual assault task force and my peer mentoring thing and an idea that Davy is going to request.

Evan: Also do we have anything to report on Starbucks? Or anything on sponsorships?

Chris E: Adidas?

Evan: Is there anything more to report to the senate as a whole?

Chris L: No, not on Starbucks. There's not really much news right now. Maybe what I'll try to do is for the GPSS spotlight I'll try to get either Davy or Adam Sherman who works for Davy who works for Davy and have him talk about their project that they are requesting provost reinvestment funds for. It would be a mentorship program for both graduate students to mentor undergraduates and they would start with at risk and underserved minorities who are academically struggling and are wanting to apply to grad school. And it could also be a senior graduate student to a more junior graduate student program. Dove tells a lot with what I'm thinking about. Another thing that's just starting up is that's actually really exciting is that HR is starting a campuswide wellness campaign. It's really comprehensive and it'll probably be more down the road but I just heard it for the first time in the senate meeting on budget and planning committee one day. It sounds cool and will affect grad students. But for the GPSS Spotlight, I'll try to get Dave or Adam to talk about that.

Alice: It's funny because our entire agenda is all Chris.

Chris E: Do you want to do an update or talk about the events that we've done? Like a recap of who showed up and stuff.

Chris L: Show some photos?

Genesis: Sure, I'll put that at the end.

Chris E: Maybe put a spotlight on the biggest turnout for non-Evans.

Alice: Is that on previously on gpss?

Chris L: I think on Previously on gpss is specific for what we talked about in our meetings but we can do photos from the tailgates and the 522 panel.

Evan: Maybe even for tomorrow's social.

Chris L: There's actually a lot to show.

Genesis: We could call it events update or whatever.

Elisa: I can do that with Genesis.

Chris E: Keeping up with the GPSSians?

Genesis: Let's say 10?

Evan: 5.

Chris L: You can take 10.

Genesis: We have so many events that I just want to give them some light.

Chris L: I'll make sure I'll time everything really well but for the executive senator vacancy information, we should try to think about what we want to say instead of just saying we need another executive senator.

Evan: Also that might be for us individually talking to people. If no one's come forward in the last 3 meetings we've advertised it, we might have to do that.

Alice: Also, in the meetings, we haven't been saying 'Is anyone interested in being an executive senator?' We've just been saying 'Hey, there's this position that's open.' We haven't posed it in a way to actually invite people to say that they're interested. I think we should put in an action item, elect executive senator, and say at the meetings that we need an exec senator. Who is interested? I guarantee someone will raise their hand and come up. We need to elect someone today. Is there a bylaw to not allow that?

Chris L: So the bylaws are actually vague on this. Four executive senators shall be nominated by a committee consisting of the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer and approved by the gpss after all senators have been advised on duties and responsibilities of executive senators. Further nominations may be made from the floor.

Evan: So we can do that.

Genesis: So we can say I nominate _____ for executive senator.

Evan: I think that's where the difficulty is. They can nominate themselves but they have to be approved by one of the standing exec because that would be in my mind, a further nomination by the officers.

Chris L: Actually that's not the way.

Alice: Where is it?

Chris L: It's in article 6, section A, clause 1.

Evan: Also the officers needs to interview the nominees.

Chris E: It doesn't feel like what happened last year.

Chris L: Yeah, so the way I read this is that we can nominate by saying that we would like to put them forward as a candidate and tell them before the meeting. We can reach out to people that we think would be great. People, additionally, can then from the floor nominate themselves. That doesn't require our approval. It says all interested senators all have the opportunity and the opportunity has been given. No one has come forward. We can exercise our executive duty in identifying people and letting them know and of course they can refuse. We can say that we're going to do this next week. If you want to run, contact us or run from the floor. In fact Dawn from EO is interested in doing this but EO has a scheduling conflict since they have late classes but I think it would be great to have someone from EO. That is educational outreach so like a fee based program, not a converted continual education type.

Alice: I know that when there were 3 of us interested last year we all came I said that this is a conflict and I just stepped down and there were only 2. But when I was elected last year, there were a few people interested ahead of time but somebody just nominated me from the floor. I know we can do that but I feel like at this point, couldn't we just we can interview them on the floor. Just ask them questions. I think we should do this. We don't need to waste two weeks interviewing people. We can just say executive senator appointment. We just ask them who in this room is interested? We know there's someone. Someone will raise their hand, we can record name and departments, ask them to stand up and talk for a minute about why they want to do it and give the officers the opportunity to ask questions in the senate and have a vote so we can just be done.

Elisa: Should we put that in email? Also say that they would need to be prepared to give a minute speech?

Chris L: Yes, definitely. We don't have to do this right now but do we have a list of who we can nominate?

Genesis: No.

Alice: I think individually, if you think someone can be good, you should encourage them. People can nominate themselves?

Chris L: They can nominate themselves. This is what I propose. If everyone can reach out to those people and say I'm going to nominate you for the executive senator position, unless they say no.

Chris E: If you're gonna do it that way, I would prefer that none of us do it. You can nominate yourself or have someone else nominate you. If we do this open call, I don't like the connotation of us nominating them. We're opening it up for a fair trial. If we say this is our nominee that either puts them in a huge advantage or disadvantage.

Chris L: But that is our prerogative. It says in the bylaws.

Genesis: But it also shows that they expressed interested to us and done research on the committee.

Alice: Let's clarify. If someone is nominated is by the officers, if we followed the whole process you have all decided before the meeting who you want to bring forth and nominate. This is just an open call. We'll be asking for any nominations from the floor so you wouldn't be doing any nominating.

Chris E: I feel better on that.

Alice: That's the process.

Chris E: I felt that the last year's election for officers was very much skewed and too much involved by the officers of that time.

Evan: Alice, what you're saying now is that the nominations is open from the floor and we've already made our nominees and they'll follow into the next step that's the elections?

Alice: Yes, so this is a call for executive senator nominations right? And that includes the interview process or should we make them separate?

Chris L: No, that's the speech part. That's why I gave them 15 minutes.

Genesis: Then 10 minutes will be for passing out ballots?

Chris L: Yes, so we'll need to prepare that.

Evan: We should just say that the people we nominate have the chance to speak too.

Chris L: It is okay for us to say that the 4 officers have nominated XYZ. That is clearly spelled out in our role.

Evan: Or say that they're previously nominated and can open the ballot to anyone else.

Elisa: I don't want to give an unfair advantage to anyone on the floor though.

Chris L: But isn't that the idea? If you expressed interested in advance and you've talked with the current officers you should have an advantage over someone that decides then and there.

Evan: Maybe step 1 is we have a ballot with the names that you guys nominated.

Alice: Do you guys have a ballot?

Evan: Hopefully by that time.

Genesis: But if we're opening it to the floor, how would we have it ahead of time?

Evan: Then step 2 is other/write in.

Alice: So you do have people you want to nominate?

Evan: I was under the impression that they were going to come forward.

Chris E: We can have four names by next Monday.

Elisa: 4 people that are interested?

Chris L: It doesn't have to be four.

Alice: The reason it says 4 in here is because there's 4 positions. So in this case we would have 1.

Chris L: We can nominate 99 but only 1 will be elected.

Evan: They can already be on the ballot and then have space on the ballot for anyone else that want to come forward who are then interviewed and then give a chance for people on the ballot to talk on ballot and then vote.

Alice: I just think if the four of you haven't met and decided and somebody has shown interest and have gone through the process in what someone would normally do to be nominated

including attending an executive meeting, then that's the process for nominating people. I think you can have people write in. Since its last minutes and you don't have anybody ready to go, I don't think you should nominate anyone. It's either or. Extend this for 2 weeks and do it right and officially nominate them or not at all. It's a more legitimate process that way.

Chris E: So we're now back to the original way we were thinking?

Elisa: Yes. Just the call.

Chris L: Our choices are purely open from floor or extend this another 2 weeks and say at the next meeting, 'If you want to do this, you must come to an executive meeting or at least you need to touch base with us.' Then we have a slate of officer nominated people and that would happen on November 20th.

Chris E: You don't have to be there. Melanie read Kimberly's statement for her.

Evan: We can do both. We can fully open it in the meeting and if no one comes forward, in the next senate meeting, we come with officer nominated names.

Alice: I think if you have people you want, it's okay to encourage them to run from the floor. They'll be the groomed candidates but I don't think that without the vetting process coming to the meeting and knowing who the people are it's be better to leave it open to the floor.

Chris E: One, I need to know what the final decision is since the original plan was to do an information section. I know 3 or 4 people that want to do that but we have larger fish to fry in my book like filling committee chairs and SAGE delegates and the people I know who would be doing that would be candidates for this. Unless we're in a super rush, then I think it's worth it to wait than have some random person throw their hat in. At that point, we'll know who's going to be there because with the 2 people at law, we don't even know who the actual senator is going to be. So there's a disadvantage of time but are we back at 'Let's make another announcement and the decision is going to be made by our group in the next executive senator meeting or go straight to the floor next Wednesday?

Elisa: I think we should go straight to the floor. They had plenty of time to figure out if they're interested.

Alice: We have a room full of veteran senators who know the process and we had two meetings already. It says in our bylaws that we're suppose to have 4 executive senators so we're not in a rush but it's our obligation to have 4 executive senators.

Chris L: So the question is are we comfortable accepting nominations and potentially and having someone who may not have a significant amount of experience?

Alice: I trust the senators to vote on that. There's a room full of vocal veteran senators that will ask the right questions to vote on it. I'm just worried about nepotism. The four of you decide who your nominations are then have gpss vote. It feels like that process would advantage someone more on our end whereas the executive senator is to be a representative of gpss. Even though it does say that you can have nominations from officers but because we don't already have a slate of people who the officers want to nominate, its up to gpss to decide who they want to be representing them.

Chris E: You misunderstand what I'm saying. Because in the fact if I find someone I want to nominate, I would find someone else to do it. I personally don't feel comfortable nominating anybody because of the advantage or disadvantage that would give to them from how people feel about me. I feel that it's not our place. I've been vocal in this meeting how our executive officers implanted themselves in the election last spring. I'm one to stay away from that entirely

Alice: Which election?

Chris E: The officer election. There was a room full of senior senators but in a situation where there was only 2 questions to each candidate, an executive officers took one of these from two of the candidates. That's the kind of thing I want to stay away from. I much rather not be involved in any of that. I rather have people nominate themselves and do that. I'm apprehensive to where we do it right now. If its only one person that stands up, are they it? Decision or not, we have to wait for some of the things to happen. At least I'm not going to involved myself in it but the people I've talked to I think will be good and I'll voice that to you guys but that conversation hasn't been appropriated yet.

Evan: Can we take nominations twice? This meeting we can say we're holding a vote next senate meeting and take more nominations then, so we have two pools of candidates. We're pushing them to stand up instead of just an information thing but we're also open about it.

Chris E: My thought would be this week, we talk to whoever we want to nominate and say you better be at the next meeting and if we have their names before time, say that these are the people who talked to us and are nominated. If there was anybody else who wasn't aware or didn't know we'll add their name to the list.

Chris L: These are my thoughts. First of all, this is written extremely confusingly for electing executive senators. For a position that's relatively important we should strongly consider rewriting the bylaws but that's for later. Second thing is that last year the elections, that whole process, was not done well. When we formed the elections committee we should encourage to be mindful of that. This is my preference for what we do and I take responsibility for not having thought this through this process carefully. At the next meeting, we put out the last and final call for executive senators. We get one of the current senators to describe what it involves. In this time the interested people have to in order to be officially nominated, they must contact one of us, talk to the officer about their interest, come to the following executive committee meeting or

do something equivalent if they can't come, and on the 20th, we'll say that these are the official nominees. If anyone would like to run from the floor we will allow that. I'm open to suggestions.

Genesis: I like that

Alice: That seems like the most in line with how it is intended.

Chris L: I agree that there's a time element but I would rather have a quality candidate especially someone who is serving for more than one year than have it another way.

Elisa: So instead of an open call, we're saying that if you're interested in the position, contact one of the officers and convince us that you'd be a good candidate so we can nominate you in the following meeting so you can be voted on.

Chris L: The process is contact one or more of the officers.

Alice: Could we ask the floor, not more nominations but if we could see a show of hands of any interested senators? Then take down their names and departments and we can also contact them. Some people are sitting there are interested but they just forget about it. I that was done last year.

Chris L: We'll say more than just contact the officers. We'll say that this is the final call and if you want to be nominated by the officers you must take these steps.

Alice: I'm willing to do a little explanation since last meeting I did something like that. I'm happy to stand up and do that part of it. Executive senator vacancy final call and talk about what it means and ask people to raise their hands.

Chris L: And outline the process clearly. Is everyone comfortable with this process? Alright, make it final call like this is happening.

Chris E: Is this someone we need to move or something that's just a general consensus?

Chris L: We have to approve whole agenda but if we feel comfortable collectively on that then we can approve it through the agenda.

Chris E: I ask that because I feel like we just laid out a whole policy on how to do this.

Chris L: Yes we did and part of it is the confusing bylaw. I think what I just laid out is in the spirit.

Evan: It's better than what is written because it opens it up and with what Chris was talking about, which favors introduction or disfavors it by the committee, it opens it up to the senate as a whole but we still get quality candidate.

Chris L: It will advantage the people that take the time to go through the process as it should and we can say that the officers will not ask any of the questions.

Chris E: I think I really like that because we're not exactly saying that we approve of this person. Anybody who does these things can get our nomination.

Chris L: It's not an endorsement. It's like running for officer nominations. If you turned in your stuff you got on the ballot.

Chris E: An other indication of that is that by us putting your name on the ballot, you showed some initiative.

Chris L: Right. We're not endorsing people. We're nominating them.

Elisa: So what I have is final call for nominations for the open executive senator seat. This means that we'll be taking names of interested senators and will be scheduling interview for the following week and will be taking a vote on the following meeting.

Genesis: We're not scheduling interviews. We're requiring them to contact us and they need to come to an executive committee meeting.

Alice: I don't know if we should require it.

Evan: We can say we require it and if they can they can't, we can ask them to do XYZ.

Chris L: Maybe we can say that we strongly recommend the meeting or require some kind of interaction with one of the officers.

Genesis: If they can't come to this executive senator meeting how would they be able to come to other exec meetings?

Alice: Maybe they just had something for this next week.

Evan: Then they can contact the officers individually.

Chris L: Anything else? I will now entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Evan: So moved.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? It was a circular discussion but I think it's good that we went through that. A lot of these procedures are things we're all learning and for this particular thing, there's

not a lot of good guidelines.

Alice: That might've been done intentionally.

Chris L: Sure, because the executive senator is more likely to leave than an officer. So the next thing is discussion of the resolution.

Elisa: I haven't edited the language quite yet but it looks pretty good but if you have any edits you'd like to make let me know.

Chris L: My only thing is that typically a resolution be therefore, or after the therefore.

Chris E: Does that say be it resolved that?

Chris L: Yes, I don't know. It should say be it resolved. Resolutions typically involve an action instead of just a recommendation.

Chris E: We can make that language stronger.

Chris L: There's nothing substantively that I have an issues with but that 'therefore be resolved that' or it could be 'therefore be it resolved that gpss strongly...'

Chris E: So should we say that gpss requests that a transit package be passed during the special session in November?

Chris L: No, that GPSS requests.

Chris E: So you want it to say GPSS requests.

Chris L: Or recommends.

Genesis: Not recommends. That's not an action.

Evan: Or a formal recommendation is an action.

Chris L: So each 'that' clause should have an action.

Chris E: Sure, and this might be an older version. We changed the word recommendation to a charge or a call to action.

Alice: We didn't have the chance to read it before this meeting and I was wondering if we could agree on a version because that's what they did last year. The executive committee would go through and make our revisions and have that sent out. I know Trong would go through and have

a list of edits but this isn't the most recent version so I would like to see it because this has a lot of punctuation situations.

Chris E: Matt Portwood brought up the online forum idea from last year and I know they weren't heavily used but maybe we can bring that up again and get the help of other senators to get the conversation started for us. That would give an opportunity to see resolutions out in public and see what is going on.

Evan: The primary goal is to conserve senate meeting time. I know from previous years, that was the case if the executive senators were split on it then that would escalate to incredibly long meetings and not passing resolutions.

Chris L: If we send out the most recent copy and ask them to go through this and make your edits and come prepared to propose the amendments.

Alice: Chris, you said you'd be open to a online editing process. What would be the procedure of elisa sending out the most recent version of this and put it in a Google doc or the online forum where its up there and make changes during the week. We can send out an email with the link and say you can see this document as its being edited. We don't want people proposing the same change.

Chris E: Where did this version come from?

Elisa: That was from my email.

Chris E: If we can find the one that was sent to you and the slides for last week, this is the one we need to go off because this was done before we edited it.

Chris L: So the one from last week?

Chris E: Yes.

Tina White (Communication Specialist): Jake sent me a email with the document but he also made some changes while I was putting it on the Powerpoint. So we can look at the slides. They're in the public drive under Communication Specialist.

Chris L: This is the thing. Whatever goes out tonight is the final version that can be amended but it has to be amended at the meeting. We can't collaboratively edit it and it can't be different from this.

Evan: My interpretation of that would be proposed amendments that would be coming to this meeting.

Alice: Anyone can sponsor the collective amendments that senators have access to. Then we can bring up the amendments from the Google Doc as they are and any substantial changes we can go through and everything else can be friendly amendments.

Chris L: We can do some of those corrections right now. Until we send it out its not the final version.

Evan: I think it's fine as far as I can tell. I think this is not the document but this is a collection of amendments that would be sponsored and proposed and we can say in advance who will be sponsoring them and proposing this.

Chris L: Let's figure that out not right now. I don't know what committee would do that but let's concentrate on this for the moment.

Evan: One thing that's not strictly language is I don't recall having an actual copy of the resolution word for word going out of house. That was always in house and the actions coming from that resolution going out of house. The very last clause, that's what we would send to Washington state senators.

Alice: I don't think its smart to send this. If someone came to me with this, I want to see a few talking points. Maybe if they're interested in seeing the resolution we can send it to them.

Evan: We can instruct the Vice President to speak broadly on our behalf. At which point you don't need to have specific language vetted by the GPSS because GPSS vets you as a whole. If you want names and people attached to it then we can have a petition.

Chris E: I was hoping this would have more people aligned. I agree but I didn't a resolution to get your guy's approval to write a resolution to work on transit. I don't think this is something people would read. I think as a body we want to be on record that we made a statement about this. I'll send it to everybody but for the purposes of us, being on record or sitting on press release or whatever we do, as we work in this vein that we do have a general record statement. If you want to know where we stand, here it is. We voted on it. I personally want to share that with the governor at least. Especially if we can get asuw to do something similar or sign on to this and us be leading the way on that. Or we can have other student organizations point to our resolutions saying we agree with that. I don't want to do a lot of this stuff and letter writing can fall on deaf ears but I think this is a unique situation. We can keep it in house if that's the decision we make but I would also make the argument that if we don't send these to anybody, if these are just guiding documents for us, I will personally say that i don't really understand why we go through the time to go through that.

Chris L: Typically that last clause will instruct, usually the President to deliver the resolution to administrators because they typically have to do with university policy.

Evan: That would explain why this feels a lot different. I do have question though. I wouldn't know but would it be more effective to send the resolution from gpss the entity or a petition with possibly more signatures than GPSS.

Chris E: This is dual. We have our own legislative document. Now we can use this to craft a letter/petition for people to sign on to. I think its interesting or good to have a separate document. For example, the King County Now group has a petition of all these groups but we speak specifically for students which the plan all along was to say there are all these possible funders that are business people and who people in Olympia might listen to more that wouldn't sign on from a business or political aspect but in the light of saying they want to promote students, they might be more open to that. That's the angle on that and I do agree that if we're out talking to people or promoting that that list of names is what we're talking about. In the end, we don't need to send this list to anybody. The governor's is good enough.

Evan: Also additionally, is it more effective to send this to you in this resolution format or would it be more effective to pass a resolution to instruct you to send your own letter?

Chris E: I think it's one and the same. I don't think it's bad to have both.

Chris L: What about a compromise of a copy of this resolution and an accompanying cover letter that will be written by the GPSS Vice President.

Chris E: I don't want to seem not open to these ideas and I need to take a second to say yes. I don't think it's a bad thing to do both or have this as guiding document. This is the idea of go to put on a special session and do it. The likelihood is thin but at the time, at our follow up, this time now and after the committee days in November when that special session could happen, that is our time to also get that stuff from King County that define what exactly those cuts are and at that time, we can take this document and create our letter of what we really want. Maybe that's the second step.

Chris L: That second step should be defined in the resolution.

Evan: I'm not inherently against sending it to Washington state senators but it feels more far reaching than we've ever done before which means I think that we need to go through this with a fine tooth comb and make sure its of the highest quality and that the senate has ample time for them to go through it. Giving them a week seems quick and giving them a shorter amount of time in senate seems quick as well. If we do succeed in stressing that this is going to state legislatures to make sure its perfect and no one has an opinion, that's that but I think we should plan for the possibility of it taking one more session to get it passed just in case people are active about it. I think every single thing is fact checked and perfect as an exec committee.

Chris E: This then becomes our ideas of meetings and timing of things. If there is a special session it'll be November 22nd-23rd. It doesn't allow another full senate meeting for it to be done.

Genesis: Yes it does. We meet on the 20th

Chris L: Let's go through this. Are you able to put footnotes or citations?

Chris E: We can. All of this was taken off of the UW transportation website or Move King County Now. The other thing is, now that I have an updated copy, Michelle Zeeman from UW transportation, I can run it by her as well.

Chris L: I think just putting some footnotes to cite sources will be good but otherwise, can we first look at the whereas clauses?

Alice: The document we have here it doesn't start with this title part. So this version were looking at doesn't have any title. It just starts with Article 1.1. Is that what is suppose to have?

Elisa: It was just the way it was copied. I can add it in.

Alice: Also I have a suggestion. I'm drafting this right now because I've sent so many of cover letters and bullet points and I'm happy to draft this and send this to you a very brief cover letter that says the University of Washington Graduate and Professional Student Senators representing almost 14,000 strongly encourage the Washington state legislature to call a special session to pass a transit package for November 2013. See attached for the resolution and undersigned have all the senators automatically undersign. So we include in this resolution to direct Chris Erickson to lobby the Washington state legislature to call a special session and forward this cover letter with all senators undersigned and with this copy of the resolution to all these people. Have them see this cover letter at the meeting and tell them that all their names are listed because that accomplishes everything. You don't have to do more work on a petition and if they vote and approve it they are approving to automatically have all their names added. So we'll have a long list of students and their departmental affiliations and the resolution so we satisfy what you want and its legislatively effective because its a very small thing. This is what they're asking me to do. These are all these constituents.

Evan: All their names means all the senators?

Alice: Yes.

Evan: And we can offer them the opportunity to abstain from being on the list and that would be fine?

Alice: No, it would be all the senators names.

Chris E: Everybody who voted for it.

Evan: If we don't have an unanimous vote, we have to give them the opportunity to not be on it.

Chris E: We're only talking about the people who approved the resolution.

Evan: It's just a minor detail.

Alice: Would you be open to that idea?

Chris E: Of course.

Chris L: All the same names can go next to co-sponsor.

Chris E: I like the idea of to use everyone's name in the cosponsor. Well maybe not there. Maybe the executive senators would be the cosponsor to sign on to the letter. I say we use everybody's address and or district. If they're from out of state, we can use their Seattle address but if they're from other districts, we should do that.

Genesis: Do we have access to that?

Chris E: I'm willing to take that on once we cross that bridge.

Chris L: But let's remember that we're doing this resolution right now. I'm going down to that clause and Chris you can decide who you want but they have a between now and next wed.

Alice: No, sorry. That GPSS directs because it's an action item.

Chris L: The GPSS directs the Vice President to forward a copy of this resolution with the accompanying cover letter to the officers of....and then you can amend it and I'm going to take out whoever. Also I'd like to put therefore be it resolved the Graduate and Professional Students Senate: and for each of these items we can put 'formally recommends.'

Chris E: What's the word I used in the beginning there? I thought we changed it to something different like a call to action or a charge to the Washington state.

Evan: At the very least a formal recommendation sounds nice.

Chris E: So this is wrong too. I don't know why that is but we had one that the right stuff. So this needs to say that it's a recommendation to Washington state governor James Enslee that a special session be called and the Washington state senate passes a transportation package.

Alice: Do we have the right version?

Evan: While he's looking for the right version, do we need to do the traditional gpss in parenthesis after the full name somewhere? The title is also a place to do that but the title is

also a weird place to do that so if we drop that in the introduction that would be ideal. So 'a recommendation by the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS)'.

Chris E: We'll track this down but the one we had had lines and numbers in it as well.

Chris L: I don't think we need article 1.1 or 1.2. I don't think its ever been done.

Evan: It doesn't seem completely unfamiliar.

Alice: Who has the authority to call a special session? Is it just the governor?

Chris E: Yes, it's only the governor.

Alice: Then why are we sending this resolution to the state legislature?

Chris E: Because there's a special charge to come up with transportation budget during the session.

Alice: But if there isn't a special session?

Chris E: Then we won't.

Evan: We're also just trying to get the word out.

Chris E: Here's the old U-pass one that has some of the language in it.

Alice: It also needs to have the numbered lines. How many people do we have paid by the gpss to do public policy?

Chris L: 2. Policy Analyst and Chris. Why?

Alice: I just don't think it's a good use of our time or your position as a GPSS President to add numbers and lines to this resolution. I feel like it should be in its near and final form and the fact that we can't even find a recent draft of this to approve tonight to send out to senators is concerning to me on the record.

Chris E: On the record, there is a version with numbers and lines and this was an added agenda item at the last minute.

Alice: But this is suppose to be sent out to all the senators tonight and we haven't been able to locate this recent version with the numbers. Does anybody else share my concern?

Evan: I get where you're coming from and that it should be a more finished version sent out but I also understand that it's a rush job for the explicit reason because it loses its potency after a little

while. Although it's not the best use of everyone's time, it's something we have to work with. I remember we had a 3 hour exec meeting last year. Although it would be nice to have it more done and completed, we can't stop working. Do we want to go further line by line and start editing?

Chris L: I changed the language 'Therefore be it resolved that the Graduate and Professional Student Senate formally recommends to the governor that a special legislative session be called that a special option for local funding for transit be included in the approved transportation package that gpss urges state legislators take into consideration that the gpss directs the Vice President to forward a copy of this resolution with an accompanying cover letter to the office of so and so and so on. That's a major change I made down there. Just so that every that clause has an action item in it.

Evan: Can we go top down on this and start addressing anything that comes up?

Chris L: Whereas representatives, whereas transportation, whereas transit provides... A lot of this we saw at the meeting too.

Evan: So the GPSS views transit as a vital service that serves the student as well as the economy prosperity of the surrounding region and the common good. That last half seems broad and reaching. Do we want that as our lead-off statement, something that is not backed by facts necessarily?

Chris L: That says GPSS views. It's an opinion.

Evan: Do we want an opinion as the first statement?

Chris L: It's my opinion. I share the opinion.

Evan: Do we want to back it with data first or just say an opinion as our first lead off?

Genesis: I think we should lead off with data because I think it strengthens our resolution. Because here are the facts and this is what we think of it.

Chris E: I'll say that the idea behind that is to go broad first and to more specifics.

Evan: Can we still achieve that if we start with broad facts to back an opinions?

Chris E: I'll also say that the reason we modeled it like that was to make an overarching King County specific to UW specific, student specific.

Evan: Anyone else's thoughts on this?

Chris L: I don't have a strong opinion on what comes first.

Alice: Can I ask about local funding of transit? What does that mean?

Chris L: That is the motor vehicle excise tax.

Evan: Could we put a footnote there?

Alice: Can i say and option for local funding?

Evan: Do we want to put a footnote even as a suggestion?

Chris L: I don't think that's necessary for us because that's on King County council to decide what the local option to be.

Evan: So, the first whereas statement is still broad. Do want to leave it broad and start with an opinion or broad data that leads to an opinion. We currently have one vote from Chris which is no opinion.

Genesis: I have no opinion.

Evan: That's something we have to tackle right now if we want to send it to the senate as a whole.

Alice: Do we have a list of all senators and their department affiliations?

Chris L: Yes, but we don't need to do that right now.

Evan: That would be in our roster. Leaving that for now. King County Metro faces a 17% budget cut beginning of September 2014. Do we need to cite that?

Chris L: Chris and his people can do that later.

Evan: Can we put a note to cite? With a \$75 million shortfall, 600,000 hours of service cuts?

Genesis: You want a citation on that?

Evan: Is it plural cuts? I'm not actually sure. And up to 65 routes deleted?

Elisa: Hours should just be cut.

Genesis: No, singular because you're making one cut, not making several.

Evan: I don't like deleted. Do we have a better word for deleted?

Alice: Eliminated.

Evan: Whereas the current level of transportation services is currently underserving the region's demand by approximately 10%. Assume there's a citation for that? The word is not a contended citation? Is that a well accepted fact?

Chris L: These data have been gathered but there could be a citation.

Evan: I guess I'm not familiar with Move King County but they are a group that would be under contention with people who want to cut transit funding.

Chris L: I think King County Metro have also done that. I can put a note for citation.

Evan: King County Metro services almost up to 65 million rides per academic year?

Genesis: That's probably a fact that's verified by UW transportation.

Evan: I'm sure that's verifiable. I'm not sure I like rides.

Chris L: We usually use trips.

Evan: Many routes serve in the U-district area including the 48, 65, 67, 68....

Alice: Can I say which provide transportation rather than which our trips? Or just 55 of which are

Evan: Are to and from our school? So you're getting rid of trips.

Elisa: Alice are you using your gmail?

Alice: Yes, I don't have editing capabilities.

Genesis: I don't have editing capabilities either. I don't care.

Alice: I just don't like that. Can we do which are professional?

Evan: That is an awkward line. I agree.

Chris L: Which one?

Evan: This is 'whereas King County Metro services with an economic priority to the state' that's fine. 'With over a 150 million trips per year and 55% which are to and from school and work.

Alice: Do we even need that in there? I would look at it as a skeptic and say what are the other half doing? Can we take that out?

Evan: It may make a stronger statement to say that its an economic priority to the state.

Alice: Yes, with over 150 million trips per year.

Evan: I'm okay with taking that out. So, Chris right now we are considering taking out that 55% of the rides are to and from school from work.

Chris E: That's total number. That's the entire King County and that school counts for over half of the rides. That's not appealing?

Evan: Her argument is that it's only half. Does it make a stronger point to say that King County Metro services economic priority to the state?

Chris E: Sure.

Alice: With over a 150 million trips to school per year. That sounds like a lot to me. That's convincing.

Chris E: You could also say that 65 million trips from school to work per year?

Evan: That sounds better to me.

Chris E: We're talking about something that people won't really dig into that much. Like very specific things that nobody looks into.

Evan: I'm just saying, if this is going to be our public face, we have to do it the best way we can. and its our first public face as well. Ordinarily we would spend more time on this but we do have a deadline set by the legislative session. Cuts facing King County Metro will put 25,000 cars in traffic congestion slowing transportation services.

Elisa: You're reading the wrong thing.

Evan: Transit rides provides benefits for the common good saving King County Metro riders 305 million annually in fuel savings while taking approximately 75,000 cars out of traffic congestion. Can we get rid of 'provides benefits for the common good' and give data?

Chris L: Whereas public transit saves King County Metro riders.

Evan: Yes.

Elisa: Do we need to cite that?

Alice: It doesn't save in fuel saving. It saves in fuel costs.

Evan: Yes, that makes it sound a lot better. Whereas King County Metro cuts will add approximately 25,000 cars to traffic congestion everyday inhibiting the fluidity of the state's economy.

Alice: Can we substitute productivity for time? Because that's not the statistics.

Chris L: Is it time in terms of opportunity costs?

Evan: I've heard of statistics cited in terms with taking in the fact of opportunity costs so time does get cited in statistics so I'm not innately questioning that if it's cited as a sentence.

Chris L: That would be productivity wouldn't it?

Alice: I think time is different from productivity, right?

Chris E: Can we look at the top of this? Do you know which change you made? Can we take the change you made and mesh them with the official version which I sent to Elisa's inbox?

Evan: Nope, can't actually see all of them. Maybe I can. Yes, I can. It's just one click at a time.

Chris E: Which computer is that?

Evan: It's just this one attached to gpsspres I believe.

Alice: Is there anything in the budget for exec committee snacks?

Chris L: Nope.

Evan: Did you send this to gpss? Chris, can I access your email? I think its still sending.

Chris L: Sometimes it takes awhile. What are you trying to do?

Evan: Pull up Chris's latest version.

Chris E: It should've sent to everyone.

Elisa: You and Chris Lizotte has seen it?

Evan: If it's on the drive we can all access it. Just pull up the new one, one of you.

Chris L: I have it on my phone now so it should be there on the email.

Evan: Now we can all edit it at the same time. So we can try to not go through it with a fine tooth comb but we kind of have to. I know in science papers I write we put parenthesis in the body and not in the title. We have to do it the first time we say GPSS so can we say it in intro? So the title of the resolution, I don't think it can go there but if you guys don't see gpss fitting in well in the introduction we can put in the whereas clause.

Chris E: Go back to the original where instead of a recommendation, its changed to an appeal to the governor.

Alice: So is that a new version were looking at?

Chris E: This the version that's submitted and gone over.

Chris L: This is the one we looked at during the senate meeting.

Alice: So the one we've been editing is old?

Evan: Correct.

Elisa: I can mesh the new one we're looking at and the one we've been editing. Just go from where we stopped last.

Evan: So we stopped at the cuts facing King County Metro at approximately 25,000 cars in traffic congestion everyday inhibiting the fluidity of the state's economy.

Alice: Do we all have access to this document?

Evan: It's just gone up there so keep refreshing your Google Docs.

Alice: Is this title already there?

Evan: Go down to the fluidity thing because Elisa is meshing it right now up until that point and were just gonna pick up editing from the fluidity on the new one.

Alice: Where?

Evan: So 'cuts facing King County Metro facing approximately 25,000 cars in traffic congestion.'

Alice: Above that, did we change the first one up here?

Evan: We're going to get rid of transit saves King County Metro riders approximately \$305 million

dollars. Were still on the time vs. productivity discussion?

Chris L: Yes.

Evan: I suppose if you're saving money, you're not saving money on time but make the jump to productivity.

Alice: Can I go back to this one? Current level of transit service is currently under serving..

Evan: Has that one been edited yet?

Alice: I'm looking at the old version. Whereas the current level of transit service is currently underserving the region's demand by approximately 10%, suffering educational opportunities.

Chris E: There shouldn't be two 'alreadies' in that.

Alice: I'm looking at the one that's been revised already. I just feel like saying that the current level of transit service is already even though its under serving, it's like it's already doing something. Whereas I think it would be stronger if the current level of transit is stifling educational opportunities of the University of Washington by under serving the region's demand by 10%.

Chris E: Sure.

Alice: Okay, I'll change that in the old version and Elisa, you can mesh that together in the new one so you don't get lost.

Chris E: I just want to make a comment about this. I don't mind you changing the language of them, but where there was some concern about keeping true to what is factual. This is all taken from the UW transportation website or King County. So on this current level of transit is already under serving the region's demand, that's actually the stat we pulled and stifling educational opportunities is an opinion to that. When you move those does it change the intent or validity of what were citing?

Chris L: I'm just going to point out that normally we would not be doing this level of editing on any resolution. I think there are probably some things that could still be changed and I think those could be changed in the senate meeting as long they are given the resolution and are explicitly told to bring whatever amendments they have to senate meeting. My recommendation is that instead of continuing to do each line item, we decide either to submit it or actually the executive committee does not take action on this. If it were submitted to Elisa 2 weeks before the meeting and Elisa submits it 1 week before the senate meeting, it's gone through the process.

Alice: Actually, doesn't she have to send senators the version they've seen before?

Evan: No.

Chris L: Her job is to format and edit it.

Alice: So I move to stop doing this right now and move on to next agenda item and have Elisa send whatever version gets done before midnight to all the senators.

Elisa: We're still okay sending in the Google Doc?

Alice: No.

Evan: Which one are we sending?

Alice: Whatever Elisa sends tonight after she edits it with Chris. With the version we all get sent with the senators, we all can make a slew of amendments and we can get them to you, Chris, ahead of time so they're friendly and propose these amendments at the meeting.

Evan: That's fine but I would contend that normally we do have a line by line item section. I recall Trong doing a line by line item section. The difference being that everyone had done their own line by line edits previously.

Alice: Because we had a version to look at before the meeting.

Evan: Yes, so while it's not an official thing that the GPSS voted on but usually the attempt was that the exec committee would be in full agreement of a finalized version that got sent to the senate. This is happening because anecdotal stories that I've heard from previous years is that if you let this go to senate it will go on even longer since instead of 6 people wanting to go as fast as possible, you have a senate as a whole. But in this case, I agree. Everyone has things to do so we can do things a little differently and communicate out of the normal sign of time.

Chris L: Any objections to that? I'll now entertain a motion to suspend the bylaws and delete the remaining agenda items from it. That would be executive senator reports and officer reports.

Alice: To immediately adjourn?

Chris L: Yes.

Alice: I move to suspend the bylaws.

Elisa: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Genesis: I know its going late and no one intended this to go this long but we have an agenda. Do you guys have a lot to say? Do you have anything to say?

Alice: Fair enough. I withdraw my motion.

Genesis: Because let's just get it over with. Let's put it on the record that we're going to have our updates and everything. Just because this went long, we can't get rid of the rest of our agenda.

Alice: That's a good point.

Evan: This has only been a 2 hour meeting and I say only because legends have it that past executive meetings have gone even longer.

Chris L: Withdrawn. Then we'll move on to executive senator reports.

Evan: I don't have anything to bring.

Chris L: Alice?

Alice: The only question I have is that came up from the last meeting is the Night at the Museum. Are we going to have alcohol there?

Genesis: Yes, but its only 21 and over.

Alice: But there are posters right?

Genesis: Yes, and it says that on our posters.

Alice: I thought it had to be invite only if there was alcohol being served.

Genesis: Our student email is our invite and your Husky card is your invite.

Alice: The posters haven't been printed yet or posted anywhere?

Genesis: No, they have.

Alice: But Rene said if posters have been put up on campus, its not an invite only event. It's open to the public.

Genesis: But we said in the poster that it's 21 and over and you need a Husky card so it's not open to the public.

Alice: I thought they had to an invitation.

Genesis: The email serves as the invitation.

Evan: Did your way get vetted by Rene?

Genesis: This is Rene's method of getting around the invitation method. This is not my method.

Chris L: Anything else? Okay, officer reports. Chris?

Chris E: Got the group coming next week and we're finishing up on committee assignments. That will be done next week so we'll have some people starting leg committees next week. Did meet in the last week with Matt, Kiana, and Chris about SAGE so we're ready to go tomorrow to the fall summit in North Carolina. Also working on the Higher Education Summit. That will be on the 18th. There will be one panel before the asuw legislative reception and there will be 2 other sessions on Tuesday. Those 3 will be on Monday, Pay it Forward which is a funding model for education. The Tuesday ones will be E-learning and healthcare as it relates to students so ECA and some of those things. Chris and I are working that with our people so its taking shape. That's good for me.

Evan: Earlier you said you were having trouble appointing SAGE delegates. So you haven't done it yet but you have candidates lined up?

Chris E: On that fact that there's been people who have specifically come to me to want to be involved or want to get involved with SAGE and/or led to me by people like Kiana. Kimberly also had a person she had talked to me about. There was another person that came through Patricia Atwater.

Evan: That's good to know. I just wanted to make sure there wasn't a dearth of applicants.

Chris E: There's this expectation too that since two of the people are 1st year law students, we have to wait and see who. It's more important for me that everyone is involved in some way so that might be different depending on who gets the elected seat because I think they're both people that we don't want to lose out on. The benefit of having them involved because I'm antsy to fill a position.

Chris L: Genesis?

Genesis: We funded our first RSO this quarter. It's a grad student RSO. They're putting on a career networking day or career fair for physics and astronomy. Travel grants will close on Friday at midnight. The committee has already met and we have our rubric and metric down. We will meet probably on the 15th to review those applications and we have gotten a flood of travel grant applications. The I-522 panel was a hit. Budget for fall social, we are at budget. I think we just have a few hundred dollars extra.

Chris L: Elisa?

Elisa: I don't have anything except diversity is opening up our funding on Friday for our potential partnering with a group at Evans to do something with a race exhibit but it's kind of up in the air right now.

Chris E: Is that PDC or the actual diversity committee?

Elisa: What's PDC?

Chris E: It's a student interest group.

Elisa: I'm not sure.

Chris E: Who got in touch with you?

Elisa: Olivia Doureeves?

Chris E: So it's not the diversity committee. Good to know. I would like to talk to you about that.

Chris L: I don't have much to report. Going to SAGE tomorrow in North Carolina. Trying to get community affairs and academic and administrative affairs together. We have a lot to dig into actually so we will come together as soon as possible. Any other announcements?

Genesis: If you already haven't signed up for a volunteer spot for the fall social, please do so.

Chris L: Anyone else? I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Genesis: Motion.

Chris L: Second. Any opposed?

Executive Committee Meeting
Nov. 13, 2013
HUB 314

Chris Lizotte (President): I will now call this meeting to order at 5:46pm. I have two small things I would like to add to the agenda. One is an action item which should go after the approval of the minutes. It's just a quick reminder to officers to designate someone to be their delegates to the committee coordinating board. That would just be 5 minutes. Another brief 5 minutes for just committee discussion by me. So if I have a motion to add both of these things to the agenda.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): So moved.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): Second.

Chris L: Let's go ahead and approve the minutes. I actually have a minor change to make to the minutes. It's in the very beginning. It should read 'I will now entertain a motion...', not 'I will not...' I will entertain a motion to amend that.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): So moved.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Second.

Chris L: So now that should read 'I will now entertain...' Are there any other amendments for the last exec meeting? So we have some guests today so lets go around and introduce ourselves starting with me. I'm Chris, president.

Chris E: Chris Erickson, vice president.

Evan: Evan Firth, executive senator.

Douglass Tabor (Evans School of Public Affairs): GPSS 1st year senator for the Evans School.

Rene Singleton (SAO Advisor): Rene Singleton, SAO advisor. I have to leave early this evening so I'm telling you guys in advance so you don't think I'm rude.

Alice: Alice Popejoy, executive senator from Public Health Genetics.

Kimberly Schertz (Law): Kimberly Schertz, executive senator from Law

Elisa Law (Secretary): Elisa Law, GPSS secretary.

Jason Sanders: Jason Sanders, GPSS senator from Middle Eastern Studies from the Jackson School.

Alex Bolton (Law): Alex Bolton, senator from the Law school.

Evelina Vaisvilaite: I'm Evelina. ASUW representative.

Chris L: And what's your position on the ASUW board?

Evelina: I'm the Director of Policy and Procedures.

Genesis: Genesis Gavino, treasurer.

Tina White (Communication Specialist): And I'm Tina, communication specialist.

Chris L: So 3A, as many of you know, the last year executive committee created and the senate approved a new entity called the Committee Coordinating Board which was meant to replace the University Affairs Committee. The University Affairs Committee had four sub-committees which were Diversity, Student Life, Academic & Administrative Affairs and Community Affairs. The idea was that University Affairs at the same time would coordinate internal GPSS interaction with administration and oversee these committees. At the end of the year, it became very clear that the four sub-committees were doing substantive things while the overarching committee had a crisis of [french word]. But it was still thought to have value to have a coordinating entity so the other committees wouldn't have redundancy and communication so the compromise was instead of having a separate committee with its own Chair and Vice-Chair, basically all the other committees except Judicial would send one representative to a monthly or bi-quarterly meeting where essentially everyone would say what they were doing. So everyone would stay informed. What I would propose, is that we just quickly make a motion to direct each of the officers at their next committee meetings to designate a person or persons who are willing to be responsible or take on the role for at least the remainder of this quarter and forward those names to me. It doesn't have to be the same person any time. It can be just whoever is available since it'll be a logistical issue to coordinate 10 people from different committees getting together at the same time and place, which may not happen since the quorum for the Committee Coordinating Board is like half. So the motion would be for every officer by their next committee meeting to make sure that someone in their committee is aware that they will be contacted or someone volunteers for this and forward this information to me and I'll make sure to try and herd all of them together before the quarter ends.

Kimberly: Moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Alice: This came up in the Science & Policy meeting. It says that we have to have an Executive Committee Member for CCB. It doesn't specify if it can be doubled up as a liaison for the

committees so I'm assuming it could as long as we have one executive senator. Since I'm probably going to be the liaison for the Science & Policy committee, I can volunteer to do that if you guys are all okay with that.

Chris L: Also, if you happen to not be available it can be a rotating thing but that's totally fine.

Genesis: What do you mean?

Chris L: I mean if Alice can't make it, one of us can.

Genesis: But it would be four of the officers and one exec senator.

Alice: It's all four officers plus one executive senators from each of the 10 committee which I'll just go ahead and read off. We have Finance & Budget, Academic & Administrative Affairs, Community Affairs, Diversity, Student Life, SLSC, FLSC, Communication & Outreach, Science & Policy and Travel Grants.

Chris L: So everything except judicial and elections?

Alice: Yes, and I just want to emphasize how it seems like it could be annoying but I think it's important with all the policy stuff going on with Science & Policy, State Leg and Federal Leg. It's good to have those people talking together. I think it's a great thing and we should probably talk about it in the next meeting.

Rene: Have all the committees met yet and have they all selected their Chairs yet?

Genesis: No. For the Student Life committee, there's only two of us and it's not enough to start a meeting.

Chris L: But I don't think we need them since quorum is 50 percent?

Alice: One-third.

Chris L: So the bar is very low. I agree that it is onerous but I think it is a good idea and is something that the last year executive committee thought we should be doing.

Alice: Something else that came up in our Science & Policy meeting because we're going over our bylaws and outline our objective based on these bylaws, is this GPSS policy Wiki. Are we going to go forward and make that work?

Chris L: Yes.

Chris E: That's on my agenda for state.

Chris L: I'm glad you brought that up since I'm actually going to talk about that but for the moment, the motion from before...

Evan: I seconded and Kimberly moved.

Chris L: Great. Any objections?

Kimberly: No objections but a point of information, is there going to be a similar motion required for FLSC and SLSC because we made changes to the bylaws and made it so that someone will have to be a liaison for both of those committees?

Chris E: That will probably be taken care of since multiple people are in both committees.

Alice: Any change to the bylaws would have to be changed right? Because each committee bylaw is outlined in the GPSS bylaws so nobody can just change the bylaws.

Kimberly: No, I wasn't talking about that. The bylaws are changed last year.

Alice: Oh, so you're saying as per the changes made to the bylaws.

Kimberly: Right, I didn't know if we needed to make a motion.

Chris L: We can if you want.

Kimberly: No we don't. Just making sure it wasn't a necessity.

Chris L: This is just so we make sure we do this. So any opposition to that?

Rene: Last year at the end of the year, a lot of the bylaws got changed by you guys. You're all going forward where you all are new and the process is now new. So I think you need to just be a little flexible to yourselves to get your committee members connected and to get people involved and engaged. Don't make the mistake that the other student governments made to be too procedurally with the volunteers just to let them settle in and participate because you adjusted your committees anyway. It'll be interesting to see how it comes to fruition and how many people volunteer and how they do things. I just want you to be patient with yourselves.

Alice: Thank you for that.

Chris L: Thank you, that's very well said and that actually segways into 3b, which is more generally on our internal committees. Alice, you brought up the Policy Wiki, which has had a ghostly presence for the past year since it was a creation of the restructuring of not last year but the year before all these committees would maintain a Book of Standing Opinion which is essentially a Policy Wiki. To my knowledge, it didn't happen at all with any of the committees last

year but I think it is a good idea and given our expanded capacity with archiving with Mackensie, it's something that we now have more capacity to take on. All these things are unfunded mandates but I think that's a conversation we should have on how can we conceive a structure to make it doable for each committee to do this and also so it can be passed forward.

Chris E: Maybe Evan can speak more but who would have access to change it? There was a lot of difference of opinion from the exec board of who would have access and who would verify it so I think that's a large part of that conversation.

Chris L: There's a lot of things that weren't fully thought through.

Evan: The infrastructure is set up as a Wiki where anyone can edit it and also can be reverted back to any history if someone makes a bad edit. I'm pretty sure the infrastructure exists and only the executive officers have access to it. Last year's exec senate and few people in the exec committee did not feel comfortable giving the privileges to anyone besides the officers and the exec board but the ones who really set up the infrastructure, if I remember correctly, advocated it for at least giving it to the chairs of the committees if not all senate members on the committee. The logic being that any bad edits are easy to revert.

Chris L: That's a conversation we should have here first and bring it to the full senate to resolve this.

Chris E: One of the people that was involved with Tron was Russell Hugo. He's on state and brought this up with me so I think there's a couple other people we could loop in to increase our knowledge and capacity on what really exists out there.

Alice: We're already, in SPS, trying to do this on our own and have a Google Doc set up which our committee members have access to. But if there's already a Policy Wiki in existence are there pages for different committees or is it just a single Wiki?

Evan: I remember that they set up in categories where people could drop things in and no one except for one of the SLSC and FLSC dropped something in. I think there's categories laid out but there is no body to determine which categories should be laid out. It was left open and vague figuring that as more people put in more information, we can figure out where we needed to categorize. So in your situation, I would say keep editing the Google Doc and when the Wiki is set up, it should be easy enough to copy and paste it in.

Chris L: I agree. Definitely keep doing that kind of record keeping.

Evan: For the Wiki, we'll have to have conversations about privileges and because it falls to the exec now since GRC was in charge of editing the Wiki and GRC no longer exists. And also determine how to categorize the Wiki.

Alice: It seems that that would be a good first charge for the committee coordinating board and have each liaison from each of the committees have access to edit it.

Chris L: As long as the person stays the same, that representative.

Alice: True. It only specifies one member from each committee.

Chris L: Given that we have to bring so many people together so logistically keeping one person as the representative would be difficult.

Kimberly: I think that once we iron out the details, we might need to alter the bylaws so that one person in each committee needs to be the designated person to update the Wiki. That's a potential solution.

Evan: That idea was tossed around a lot last year to delegate an archivist of sorts.

Chris E: This might be out of place but for our visitors who are here, you can jump in.

Kimberly: Or if you need more context.

Chris L: Or if you want to comment in general.

Chris E: They can even move and second stuff right?

Alex: No, speaking privileges only.

Chris L: I'm really glad you brought this up because we shall address it later. Possibly even in our next exec meeting. The second thing I want to mention is I think this may be a recent addition from last year's revamping of all the committee bylaws that every committee is charged with being with contact with its analogous university wide committees. So for example, the Diversity committee should have relations with the Student Life Board and the Office of Minority Affairs to the Diversity Council to the Faculty Council of Multicultural Affairs. Each committee is also responsible for recruiting GPSS appointees to these committees. For the moment Austin, our Director of University Affairs, is doing a tremendous effort of getting appointees for some of the obscure committees that I thought would not been able to happen but he has and he's doing a lot of work keeping contact with these people and keeping a system in place so we have a continuity with those committees too. Eventually, and this is something to think about and we can spell out the mechanics later, but if you oversee a committee that has this line in the bylaws which not all committees might not have such as Finance & Budget, maybe start thinking of how that can be part of your committee's work too. That is the last thing I would add.

Alice: One more question about the chairs in each committee, it says they have to go through the chair training. What's that about?

Chris L: It's one of those things that we definitely need to do. The chair training was born from a concern that because committee chairs were elected at large by the senate and not their committees, there was a lack of accountability and a cavalier attitude toward certain privileges such as spending money so the idea was that chairs know what their privileges and responsibilities are. So that is also something that we haven't thought through and implemented yet but we definitely need to.

Alice: So I'm a committee chair. Where do I start?

Evan: Was that suppose to be the separate booklet?

Alice: It says the orientation/committee handbook.

Evan: Which I don't think exists yet.

Chris L: We got as far as the employee handbook which is a big advance but we haven't gotten to the committees yet.

Evan: One of the things was spending money because the idea that only the executive officer and knows the correct channels to, it can be challenging for that and for those people who were managing the channels like the Student Activities Officers.

Rene: You've expanded your world and we have the exact same number of staff so you have to route everything to your exec. So we have committee members coming in to deal with it so if you can route it through your exec officers, you're fine.

Evan: The two things that we're addressed were the chair, if they were trying to spend money, talk to your overseeing officers first and go to your own meetings.

Chris L: And we had a couple chairs that never materialized.

Alice: Whose job is that to write the orientation handbook?

Chris L: It's another unfunded mandate.

Elisa: I can work on that.

Chris L: Yes, it is certainly something we need to address.

Evan: I think it falls at large to exec committee if it's undefined.

Elisa: I can get an outline on what we want in our book and we can go over in the next exec meeting.

Chris L: Yes. In the next exec meeting, I'll put a couple of these things in the agenda like the handbook and Wiki. So time for everyone's favorite activity, to create the senate meeting agenda and guests, please feel free to jump in if you would like to see.

Chris E: Can I ask a question while Rene is still here?

Chris L: Yes.

Chris E: For legislative agendas, we need to have those passed?

Rene: The way it works is that you need to have your legislative agendas made before you start lobbying on the official level. I don't think the special sessions count but for the regular season you need the agenda approved that's where you have your very narrow or broad focus of what you have in your pocket and your overarching way that you're going to do your lobby.

Chris E: So that's next week. So my main question is, for the state one, we need to have for sure or we wouldn't be able to pass it until after January 15th which will be after the session has started.

Chris L: Why not at the December 4th meeting?

Chris E: We don't have one.

Chris L: Yes we do.

Genesis: No, that's the mixer with alumni.

Chris L: Yes, but we'll have a short meeting followed by a social or I thought that was the idea.

Chris E: Is it mostly for people to look at? Not something that people would add to?

Rene: It was a protocol because the only people who have the ability to lobby are the president and VP of GPSS and the president and the Director of OGR in ASUW. You guys are lobbyist to go to Olympia or to DC on an official level. Rather than you going to do whatever you want, you had an agenda that was approved by your peers that was your base guideline. Doesn't say how you talk to people but it is a guideline that everyone agrees on that this is what your focus is. So you use it every year. If you don't have one you use the one from the prior year but the leg session start in January. Sometimes they're short or long but the perspective of what you guys have of what items are important for graduate students in terms of lobbying with the legislature.

Chris L: Has SLSC created one yet?

Chris E: I know what it will look like or what will be presented but we also want the state

committee to think about what those parameters are. It's more about how specific we get. Do we want to talk on a theoretical level or be specific on what we name on that.

Evan: I think for last year's SLSC, all we did was re-edit the one from before, shorten it to 2 pages and adjusted priorities and strengths of argument. We changed the stop reducing funding to increase funding to advocate for stronger language.

Chris E: I just remember it was quick and Melanie said it was passed.

Evan: It was only one or two sessions since it was basically a reorganization of priorities.

Chris L: The merit of it being broad is that we don't have bill numbers to work with.

Alice: Same thing for FLSC last year is that we just passed a two page white paper. The agenda is internal and the white paper was external but it says the same thing except the white paper is more specific. The actual document, the agenda itself, was a very broad 'We support funding for higher education and lowering tuition'. It was also in the wake of how they hadn't passed a budget so it can be amended with what was going on currently.

Chris L: Would a legislative agenda have to go through the process of a resolution?

Rene: You can do it as a resolution or an action item but your senate blesses it.

Evan: Last year, we had a lot of confusion if it's an in-house or a document that was going to be sent out as a whole but it was meant to be an in-house document

Chris E: That's my biggest question especially since if it had to be next week but if I can do it on the fourth, I have no qualms.

Chris L: I think it's a two stage process. The agenda which is the guiding principles and when the session starts, Chris will come back with house bills and specific guidance on that.

Alice: So Chris, FLSC hasn't met yet this year?

Chris E: Correct.

Alice: How does that work if we don't have chairs since Matt and Kiana were the chairs last year?

Chris E: So Matt's the chair last year and the other SAGE delegate will automatically be the other co-chair.

Alice: And who are the other SAGE delegates?

Chris E: The SAGE delegate is Matt and other is still pending.

Alice: So according to the bylaws, they have to be approved by the exec committee and none of us approved Matt.

Chris E: I would say that he was there last year and the idea that if people are still sitting on the committees they would stay. Maybe this is a discussion we need to have when people are elected into that, whether people need to reapply every year but we have these talks about institutional knowledge or having people with experience who know what they're doing. That's the idea that I followed in having Matt stay on without reapplying.

Chris L: The equivalent is having a GPSS appointee to a university committee and typically if they have served the previous year, they are welcome to serve without reapplying.

Evan: I don't see anything about a chair being reelected. There has to be a chair elected but nothing on reelection.

Alice: So we have a chair?

Evan: One chairs unless its FLSC. Then it's two.

Alice: Then was Matt a SAGE delegate last year?

Chris L: Yes, he's been in it for awhile right?

Alice: So there's one vacancy that you'll bring to our attention.

Chris E: Yes and I've already done that but I didn't receive any feedback.

Evan: I thought we were discussing it at this meeting. I might've misread that.

Alice: And we're voting on it?

Chris L: Chris makes the appointment and we confirm it.

Alice: And how does that work?

Chris L: Like when I brought the two names for today for STF and SAF and say this is my choice and executive committee is free to vote up or down.

Evan: So did you end up choosing one?

Chris E: I haven't yet but I'm close. I've talked to one person but I'd like to have your guys' input

on that and I'm sticking to that.

Evan: It's a November 6 email if anyone is looking for it.

Chris L: If you have feelings, give your feedback to Chris.

Evan: 1L students?

Chris E: First year Law.

Genesis: Your email only has one attachment.

Chris E: That's right. The other one is the posting of the correspondents that I received.

Chris L: Any other questions on legislative stuff before we move on to agenda time? So at the moment, we have the home game. The file name is 2013-2014 Template for planning senate meetings. At the bottom there's a tab, Nov. 20th and that's where we were working on. We have the usual stuff like Call to Order and Approval of the Minutes/Agenda and Previously on GPSS. Then we have the executive senator election and GPSS spotlight. Has there been any calls for someone who wanted to present?

Chris E: Should we be actively recruiting for that? As one of our things to do during the week to get ready?

Chris L: We might have to be a little more aggressive if people are not jumping out of their seats to do it. Last week, we had Kiana which I think was a good use of their time.

Alex: Your's was good as well.

Chris E: Maybe another idea is to have a committee presentation to talk about what they do.

Chris L: That could be something. I think that Community Affairs only has 2 members who are actively involved and yet it's a committee that can take on two very important projects. One related to task force on sexual assault recommendation and second, related to understanding the international graduate student experience better. I can certainly put in a plug there and do recruiting. Any of the officers think that would be a useful thing?

Genesis: To spotlight committees?

Chris L: Yes.

Genesis: I was thinking of doing an actual agenda item for committee recruitment and do the same thing we did for the executive senator call and ask who here is actually interested so we

have names.

Chris L: Who has committees which need people on them?

Elisa: Communication & Outreach.

Genesis: Student Life.

Chris L: Community Affairs.

Genesis: I think it would be worthwhile to do an actual agenda item.

Chris L: I'll have something to say this is actually what were going to do so we can show the senate specifically.

Douglass: To join these committees, you don't have to be a senator right?

Chris L: Right.

Douglass: I know in the Evans School with the SIGs, they do a lot of similar things and I'm sure these people would be interested in joining these senate committees but they don't know they exists. So finding a way to tie these together would bring in more participants.

Chris L: So maybe we can ask the senators there and tell them to tell their constituents.

Genesis: Point of information, Communication & Outreach requires you to be a senator. So Community Affairs and Student Life doesn't need to be senator.

Chris L: I think that's very well taken. So in addition to asking them, we'll make sure we prepare something so they can forward to their constituents. So back to GPSS Spotlight on.

Genesis: Maybe we can do one on the sexual assault task force?

Chris L: That has not made public yet.

Kimberly: When it is made public.

Genesis: When will it be? It's been finalized though right?

Kimberly: They presented to the president a couple days ago. They did a formal presentation and meeting with him. We're meeting again soon. I don't know when it'll be made public. We haven't solidified a date.

Chris L: When it is public, would you be willing to do a spotlight on that?

Kimberly: Sure. It might be after winter break though.

Chris L: That's fine.

Elisa: Yasmeen Hussain and Ragan Hart wanted to do a brief presentation on a survey that was done on the use and placement of the designated smoking sites on campus. We could put it in that slot.

Chris L: I'll use the spotlight if no one has any objections and put that as a separate item.

Genesis: What are you going to use it for?

Chris L: I'm going to use it for a presentation of mental health resources on campus and use that as a platform for recruiting for my other pet project.

Chris E: I'm for it.

Genesis: So Yasmeen and Ragan Hart are going to be presenting on designated smoking sites on campus survey?

Chris L: Can you say a little bit more about the survey?

Elisa: So they're going to be talking about demographics like people who took the survey and how does tobacco use affect you and which sites are problematic and what sites are getting used and what the incentives are for it getting used and anonymity.

Chris L: Do they have a time?

Elisa: 5 minutes.

Rene: Is this the same group of people that did the survey last year?

Evan: I think the one last year was Health and previous but not alum.

Kimberly: They weren't current senators last year.

Evan: Also, wasn't there a lot of blowback on that one?

Chris L: Largely yes. Last year we did the temperature reading. Do want to bring that back?

Genesis: I thought we talked about the spotlight taking it's place or if some had an update.

Kimberly: But we have the Previously on GPSS.

Genesis: Right, we have that.

Elisa: One more thing. So I had an email about bringing something to the senate. A bunch of people we're locked out of their UW netID for under 24 hours but there was a phishing email sent out to all the UW netID and how IT dealt with it was just to disable all the addresses that received it without notification. So people couldn't get on to their Canvas and submit assignments. But it was only disabled for like 16 hours. The girl that emailed me at 8:50pm that my UW netID was disabled this evening and at 10am the next morning said it was back up. So someone was interested in having it brought to the senate and how can it be dealt in the future. Does GPSS want to get involved? Is it a big enough issue for us to be involved? It might be a one time mistake.

Rene: Do you want to invite IT to talk about it?

Genesis: Is it a senator?

Elisa: It was sent to a senator, Dawn.

Evan: It would be nice to have IT come talk about it.

Elisa: Alright, I will find someone who can talk. I don't know if we should put on the agenda for next week or the next one.

Alice: Question. Is 10 minutes enough time for the executive senator election? If we have 3 people here who want to give short speeches and have people ask questions and vote.

Chris L: Maybe we can bump it up to 20. Good point.

Elisa: So I'm going to find someone from IT for next week?

Evan: Do we want them next week? Or December 4th? As long as it doesn't conflict with Chris's legislative agenda.

Kimberly: Is it possible for next week? And if they doesn't come, we can amend the agenda?

Alice: I agree. For clarification, we said it was a party for December 4th. We can invite everyone to the party and do some leg stuff.

Chris L: I can call a meeting and do the one thing and say we're done.

Alice: Technically, we have to notify senators 7 days in advance of the meeting where its going to

be in the agenda especially if we're approving the legislative agenda.

Chris L: If we need to do that, we can do that.

Alice: I don't know if this is relevant to the senate meeting next week but would it be possible to approve the legislative agenda next week?

Chris E: Sure. The one thing I wouldn't be able to do is to get it to people before hand and on this line of sending people the information beforehand will help it to make it go quickly. My thought is that you put it up and approve it and not have it be a process but that's wishful thinking.

Kimberly: You underestimate the senate. Some people might nitpick each line.

Chris L: It's broad principles.

Alice: And FLSC hasn't had a chance to meet so I was wondering if you feel comfortable to operate from last year's federal legislative agenda?

Chris E: Federal, I'm not worried about since we can pass that in January since Our Day on the Hill in in April but the state one needs changes. Namely transportation will be high on our list which it wasn't last year and what I hope it would be is that we would look at the WSA agenda and the ASUW agenda and say these are good guiding principle which we will act on and advocate while we are there but also transportation is big for us. Also we want to focus on things that are important to students and tie that into things that aren't necessary funding or tuition to really get some push behind things that are important to students. Having them work on that to go to Olympia and work on that. I think it's more of a scope thing, like say no more than 4 different items that we would look at.

Alice: Has SLSC met yet?

Chris E: We're meeting on Friday.

Alice: So all this agenda building is coming from you and the Policy Analyst?

Chris E: Correct so that is why we need to meet to be able to get input. I think largely we have other things out there since these are literally all the stuff that's been done for 10 years but its one of those things that the WSA and ASUW has been around for long time. We know their issues, the legislatures know their issues but we will have a focus on some other things and whatever the items we choose to deal with that are student specific, I believe, will come from what the State Legislative committee want to deal with.

Alice: But you're not going to be able to pass an agenda before the session start.

Chris E: How's that?

Alice: Unless we have an official meeting on Dec. 4th.

Chris L: We'll have a brief official meeting.

Kimberly: Maybe next Wednesday, you should announce that the next meeting will be used to approve the legislative agenda and open up the floor for suggestions for what people think should happen.

Chris L: Maybe one thing to do is to present the one from last year and talk about some of the ways you're expecting the focus to change. Especially since by then the Washington Student Association will have their finalize in one horrible long day.

Chris E: And ASUW is through the senate and just needs the board approval?

Evelina: Yes, it'll go to the board tomorrow but it's been approved by our student senate.

Chris L: One suggestion is to show them what we had last year and say this is some way we could continue and these are ways we're going to change.

Evan: It gets most of the discussion out of the way and will keep the meeting short.

Alex: How did it go last year?

Evan: Everyone was confused of it being an internal document.

Alex: But it was quick?

Evan: No. it could've been much quicker since we had to reassure everyone like 5 times that it was an internal document.

Chris L: So we are at 68 minutes.

Evan: We're going to have to give Chris some time for that.

Chris L: That's in there. Then add announcements for 7 minutes. Anything else?

Evan: Is the IT presentation 5 mins?

Genesis: Yes, 5.

Evan: Might want to give them 10.

Genesis: Okay, so we should do announcements at 2 or 3 minutes?

Chris L: Yes, then adjourn. So we have 74 minutes. So if you don't have in front of you, Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Previously on GPSS, Executive senator election, GPSS Spotlight presentation, GPSS Spotlight discussion, committee recruitment, on-campus smoking designated area survey, IT presentation on student netIDs, legislative agenda overview, announcements, adjourn.

Elisa: Should IT come a little earlier so they don't have to wait around?

Chris L: Maybe we can put them right after Previously on GPSS. That's a good policy to get guest presenters in and out.

Evan: How much time for the smoking survey?

Genesis: We gave them 10.

Evan: Should we get them more like 15? Since last year, it generated a lot of discussion.

Chris L: But they're just presenting the results.

Kimberly: This isn't a resolution.

Chris L: Right and they don't have to use all the time.

Genesis: 15?

Evan: Yes, it's better to plan for more time than to have the senate rebel that you've gone 5 minutes over.

Genesis: Now we're at 81 minutes.

Chris L: We've estimated generously so we probably won't use all that time.

Chris E: I was thinking with the election, are we doing the voting right then as well?

Chris L: Yes.

Genesis: Then we'll do results after. We'll put ballots in nametag and since we don't have an election committee who will do it?

Chris L: In fact it's not designated.

Kimberly: How did you do it last year?

Evan: We only had two spots. So the two people that went for it, got it. There was no election or voting needed to be done.

Chris E: Yes there was. At the one at the end of year.

Evan: Sorry, I was thinking of beginning of the year.

Chris L: In the bylaws, no one is designated as counter.

Genesis: Rene, are you going to be there? I can count with Rene.

Rene: I can help you guys count.

Chris L: One thing Chris brought this up that at the last year when we did officers elections. the question and answer was weird since essentially everyone was asked 2 questions by an existing officer. My suggestion is, unless its crickets, none of us actually ask questions of the candidates. If it is crickets, then the executive senators ask and then the officers can ask questions. It should be coming from senate as much as possible.

Alice: This is next week?

Chris L: Yes.

Chris E: Another way that I like is how WSA does it where they have pre set of questions where everyone responds to same ones so they get a breadth of responses. So you can have one or two of those and have an ad hoc. Also I think it's okay if you have a burning question to find a senator to ask for you.

Chris L: Or just ask it. I think your suggestion is good and elections committee will work on this for the officer election but it seems ambitious to put in place for next week. Officers can ask questions but defer. Is everyone understanding what the agenda is looking like?

Alice: Do we have Spotlight?

Chris L: Yes, mental health. I'm hogging the spotlight until someone wants it. I think in between, if you know someone with a cool research project or something to encourage them actively.

Chris E: I'm going to propose one thing. 3 to 5 mins to wrap up Higher Ed Summit.

Chris L: Yes.

Genesis: Do you want that after or before announcements.

Chris E: Probably before announcements.

Chris L: Like what Elisa and you did for the social.

Genesis: 5?

Chris E: Sure.

Chris L: Can I have a motion to approve this agenda?

Evan: So moved.

Kimberly: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Great. So I made a large emission on an item to approve appointees for STF and SAF so I would like to entertain a motion to suspend the bylaws and stick that in now.

Alice: Could we add, just because its two weeks late, could I put pressure to pick a SAGE delegate so we can approve it right now so we don't have to wait for another 2 weeks?

Chris E: I appreciate that but I'm going to say no at this time

Alice: Alex, are you one of them?

Alex: Yes.

Alice: So are you waiting until after the election to see to who will be appointed and then appoint the SAGE delegate?

Chris E: That's not necessarily a consideration. That's not something that I personally feel comfortable talking about since a candidate is sitting at the table.

Alice: That's fine. I just wanted to see that that wasn't the reason that the appointment is two weeks late.

Chris E: That is not the reason.

Chris L: I think were still trying to work out like Rene said. But could I entertain a motion to do what I said before?

Kimberly: I so move.

Alice: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Now I need a motion to add a two minutes action item to approve committee appointments.

Evan: So moved.

Kimberly: Point of information, did you send these out before 2:30pm today?

Chris L: No, that is an oversight on my part.

Kimberly: I trust your judgement.

Chris L: It is certainly within exec purview to force me to defer appointment.

Kimberly: Can I have two minute to look over this?

Chris L: Yes. So you have in your information section. They were the only applicant we had for each position. That is not to say that we're just sticking anyone in these positions since both of them were extremely qualified. Colin was a finalist for the Campus Sustainability Fund and if you look at his resume, he has an impressive set of professional and academic experience. He was very well spoken and had a clear idea of how to articulate graduate student interest on the CSF committee so we asked him if he would apply for the Services and Activities Fee committee and he accepted and we feel very highly about him. Jen Huff also has a staggering set of experience. Not to mention that she is in Anthropology. It's not a deciding factor but it's nice to have someone from the humanities and social sciences on these committees which tend to attract from the more technical and science schools. If you look, she's been successful in writing a couple of STF grants. One for \$97,000 for Anthropology for a GIS computer lab and another one for \$45,000 for GPS date field equipment so she has some experience with that. She's also academically top-notch.

Genesis: To provide context for everyone on what STF and SAF is. STF grants funds for on campus departments to give them money to pay for lab or equipment that the university already doesn't provides or have an agreement with some companies or other. It would be in our best interest to do that and they have been waiting for us to appoint somebody. For Services and Activities Fee, they would be the people who approve our budget each year. I actually gave up my seat to our University Affairs Director. The issue was that having two GPSS staff on that, we will lose two votes when our budget is presented. I made Austin our representative and then we will have 3 additional seats so we don't lose a vote when I have to abstain from that.

Chris L: Austin is our ex officio. So Colin is SAF and Jen is STF. Any questions on that?

Evan: On Colin's resume, I don't see anything with dealing with finance. Does he seem willing and capable to deal with large budgets? If I remember correctly, SAF has like a 1.5 million dollar budget.

Chris L: Absolutely. It was the same with csf. They aren't as large but they are a major on-campus granting organization.

Genesis: On that note, SAF will train people on their committees and what is going to be in their budgeting process.

Kimberly: I move to appoint them.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Okay, executive senator reports.

Kimberly: I have nothing to report.

Alice: I pretty much covered it with the Science & Policy stuff.

Evan: I don't have anything. Although can we take time to put on Wiki discussion in the next exec meeting?

Chris L: Yes. Okay, officer reports. Chris?

Chris E: We got the resolution passed. Only one person decided they didn't want their name on it. So we ended up sending it with 130 names. I'm starting to get some things rolling. I'll be meeting with Jerry Pollet next week and Margaret Shepard who is the External Affairs Liaison.

Chris L: She was on maternity leave.

Genesis: For uw?

Chris L: She's UW's state lobbyist.

Chris E: A lot of work right now on the Higher Ed Summit and really cool things are coming with that. Chris will cover that but that's been taking up a lot of time to set that up and thought out and getting people there but everything looks good. Looks like we'll put it off. On the other end, committees will meet in the next week and we talked about what our agenda purposes are at least for me. And that's it.

Genesis: Travel grants closed on the first. We got a total of 26 travel grants. All but 5 were disqualified. So we're going to meet this Friday and vote on who gets funded. The Science &

Policy Steering committee is good. We're getting together our bylaws and revamping our website. For Finance & Budget, we didn't meet this week because we were not getting application. We have two applications for the next week but not for the previous week.

Kimberly: Point of information, is a vending machine with first aid supplies and Tylenol, is that something you guys would fund?

Genesis: The request can be made. I don't know if that would be allowed for the distribution of drugs. We told departments that you can't hand out Tylenol since you'd be assuming the risk for handing out medicine.

Chris L: Also, vending machines are expensive too. Way more than what they can give.

Elisa: I have a question on that note too. So someone from the Diversity committee from the Evans School contacted our committee for funding for an event that they're doing which we can't fund since it's not open to the campus. It's just open to their group and for them to go to the race exhibit and take a part in workshops but could they get departmental funding?

Genesis: No because it's just them so it's not an open event.

Evan: Because it's based on the arm of the department, not the whole department.

Elisa: It's open to everyone in Evans.

Douglass: Point of information, how long ago did you get this email?

Elisa: Awhile ago.

Douglass: We already took care of this in ESO since they also asked us for funding and we granted it to them.

Chris L: What about the one for the retreat?

Genesis: It would be through the department but if it's a SIG which is an RSO, it's two different funding streams.

Evan: If the department is okay with using money for that, they would have to ask and show proof that they asked.

Elisa: But they weren't asking for funding. They were just wondering if it's something they could do.

Genesis: Then that's all for now. Also for Communications & Outreach, we met with our sole committee member and hashed out some things for the winter quarter.

Chris E: Can I ask something about the travel grants? Was it disqualified because they didn't meet standard or did they mess up something up? That seems like a high number.

Genesis: We don't fund retroactively. So some were asking to pay them back. The other two applications that were disqualified, they didn't get faculty assessment and another one was vice versa.

Chris L: Elisa?

Elisa: So this Monday there is a Donuts for the Dean event where I will be presenting a GPA award since they didn't have and an award ceremony in the fall last year. The Diversity committee met as well. We are planning our first forum for the first week of December. The focus is on international students. Tina is now at 15 hours instead of 10 hours a week. That's all I have.

Chris L: ASUW.

Evelina: So homecoming which was a couple weeks ago, took a lot of our work. Mike Kutz is working with a student reduction group. I would give more information but I would also advise you to talk to him since they've been doing a lot of work on that. Aida is working on this Elect Her program so it's going to be a program potentially happening on February which encourages more women leadership involvement in ASUW elections. We had our last all campus video which featured SARVA and highlighted sexual violence resources that students can access. The legislative agenda passed through favorably through the senate and going to the board for approval. We have two big events coming up. On November 23rd, we have our Husky Leadership Retreat for RSO leaders to get together to strengthen their programming and get to know each other. Then we have a community service project at our local YMCA.

Genesis: Point of information, is that part of MLK?

Evelina: The YMCA thing is in November. It's our quarterly day of service.

Chris E: Could you make a plug in the board meeting tomorrow and bring up the idea of how GPSS can work with you with the Elect Her program? We would like to advance on as well.

Evelina: I'll let Aida know. The temporary date is February 1st. She has a four month plan and is trying to squeeze it to a month or 2 months thing. But I'll be sure to let her know.

Elisa: I have one more thing. We've been getting a lot of emails asking to put events on our GPSS calendar. I think we need to come up with some kind of framework with what we put and

not put on our calendar. Since at this point, we're overwhelmed with events and connections and our calendar would be a mess. And also, who would be putting those things on and who would be decide what GPSS will put on.

Genesis: From my experience last year, Kristin's brainchild was that we would be the first stop for grad students that are looking for things to do. That's why there's this flood of emails which would then be forwarded to the office manager. That's a lot of emails coming through and keeping track of all these calendars and events is tough.

Evan: I have a suggestion to subordinate those in other labels instead of GPSS sponsor events. So they can see they're not official but it's still there.

Elisa: We also have a different calendar for Diversity related events. We're putting diversity type things on that instead of the GPSS calendar. I think that Science & Policy should also have its own calendar too if we can divide the events.

Evan: I'm thinking of the google calendar where it's all on one calendar but there's different labels for each calendar.

Chris L: That's a conversation we should have amongst ourselves and at the next exec meeting of a policy for it.. There should be a few minimum requirements such as it's open to anyone and it's for grad students, etc. We can talk about that and have policy for it. Another unfunded mandate.

Chris E: Is there a way to set that up? So people can put in the events themselves and we can just approve the events or not?

Kimberly: That's what I was thinking about. The Law school does that. People submit events and Margaret decides.

Chris E: Then you can save time of having to put it in.

Elisa: The majority of the emails are coming from people who add us in their massive lists and I don't know what to do with it. I usually delete it if it's not pertinent but if we get specific emails that ask if we could put it on our calendar, it would be nice to have them directed to our master calendar and come up with some requirements.

Chris L: Okay, my turn. So Chris said the Higher Ed Summit is coming together. He and his team is doing a lot of work on this. We got a great panel for pay it forward which will immediately precede the legislative reception which will be a great synergy for that. We're still pulling together our panels for online learning at UW, specifically for Early Childhood Sciences and Integrated Social Science and Leadership and on student health care. Laura informed me that she emailed 28 people for that so we should get 3 or 4. We have an ad in The Stranger, the

online version of it. It's designed by Tina and it looks great. Also beyond the online edition of the Daily, we'll have UW-TV taping the first day of the summit. I'll have to double check for second day but it should be great. We experimented with the format this year and made it two days rather than a wall of panels in one day. I think this is another thing going forward that our Higher Ed Summit has been passed off disjointedly but this is something that I would like to see some continuity on. So after we do it, I'm going to be convening with the staff and how we can have a definitive plan rather than reinventing it every year. Two weekends ago Chris and I went to North Carolina and made our flight into a perfect rectangle. We went to UNC for the SAGE Fall Summit. That is where we do the sharing of best practices. It's more focused on internal university affairs stuff and less focused on legislative lobbying stuff. So we didn't bring any delegates. The SAGE division of labor me, university affairs, vice president and legislative affairs. It was fantastic. Leaders from UCLA, UC Berkeley, UT Austin, Texas A&M, University of Michigan, UC San Diego, UNC and some other schools came together and was really energizing. We also got a lot of ideas for moving forward. Austin and I have also been meeting with a lot of the professional schools. We've been meeting with business school and the leadership so we're going to do this administratively and with students. The kind of places where GPSS need to broaden and deepen their relationships with so that's been my priority this quarter. Also we talked about the international student experience and how we can help to integrate that into a more welcoming and supportive environment. I think that is it for me.

Chris E: Do you want to talk about WSA?

Chris L: I'll just mention that briefly. Chris and I plus some people from ASUW will be going to the Washington Student Association. We will be going to the general assembly to come up with WSA legislative agenda. It'll be complicated. The outcome is good but there's a lot of schools and voices and opinions. We'll be there for like 12 hours. That's all I have for activities. I did want to briefly talk about the issues and concerns that's been coming up recently with protocol and procedure. I've been thinking about this a lot and a couple things I would like to say. First of all, as the official spokesperson for GPSS at UW, our reputation is extremely important to me. Not only for us but for everyone who is coming after us. This organization has been around since 1967 and has become stronger and more effective over time particularly over the last 5 to 10 years. That is a strong testament to officers before us who were able to forge ties with administrations and convince them that we are a legitimate organization and not just operating in the shadow of ASUW. That really has been built on the trust that has been established. A lot of that trust rests on our word. Our word is laid out in our bylaws. So us as the executive committee and particularly the officers are charged to upholding the bylaws. We have certainly slipped and every year there's always sometime that goes by the wayside. That's fine as long as we realize and ask ourselves what happened and does it make sense to change these since they are onerous. For example, the committee coordinating board section. It says that the travel grants committee should be made in the first senate meeting of the year. Clearly something that needs to be changed. And also some typos. Clearly the letter and the spirit of the law are two things. I would say that one thing that's unique about our leadership is that none of the officers from this year was not an officer last year. That hasn't been happen in the last 5 years. There's

definitely been a learning curve and a lot of us have been involved in our own projects to the extent that I have forgotten what my primary responsibility is to lead the senate and uphold the responsibilities. The message I want to leave us with is hold ourselves accountable. We need to make sure that when something does happen where we didn't follow the law, we know the context and know why this is happening and make a promise to ourselves to correct it by adhering more closely to what's laid out or thinking of a plan for changing what's there so it makes sense in the context of what we're trying to do which is to ultimately serve the graduate and professional students regardless of the bylaws. Everyone's number 1 mission is to serve graduate and professional students and we need to keep that in mind when we execute what has been entrusted to us. That's my report. I will now open for announcements.

Elisa: I have one more thing. The last meeting of the quarter is the next one and we have a long list of senators that have not been to any meetings this quarter. They were given a warning that this is in the bylaws and they'll just be removed. If they're new senators, they'll be given a warning and then next quarter will be removed. Any thoughts on the process?

Chris L: I think if you given them due warning.

Elisa: I mean they shouldn't need a warning since it's clearly written.

Chris L: Given the bylaws speel, I think there is a procedure and it includes a warning.

Elisa: Do we then recruit new people? Do we announce it to their GPA and say that your senator has now been removed?

Genesis: Wouldn't you also be in contact with their GPA though to see why their senator is not coming?

Elisa: We're not in constant contact with the GPA about their senator.

Genesis: Wouldn't it be the GPA's duty to appoint someone? That's our point of contact so they should know what's going on with the senator. Maybe the GPA knows something. I think another warning should go to the GPA showing them that the senator had not performed adequately so then you should be aware to be ready to appoint someone new if the senator gets removed.

Evan: I agree with that.

Elisa: So future warnings to GPA as well and the ones from the summer will be removed.

Chris L: I think they should have the opportunity to recommit if they want. They shouldn't be precluded from coming back.

Elisa: It affects quorum and if we have a list of senators that aren't showing up, then it's a big

problem.

Chris L: They can be appointed through their GPA. Any other announcements? Then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Genesis: Motion.

Evan: Second.

Executive Meeting
Jan. 8th, 2013
HUB Board Room

Chris Lizotte (President): I will now call this meeting to order at 6:35pm. I'll entertain a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): Motion.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Second.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Do we have winter meetings scheduled? We should put that as part of the agenda.

Evan: We should do that.

Genesis: Motion to amend the agenda to add a discussion to change the time of future meetings to after the approval of the minutes.

Chris L: So that would be adding an action item of 5 minutes. So that'll be 3a, 5 minutes, winter quarter meeting time. Dates we already have.

Evan: so moved.

Kimberly Schertz (Law): Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

Kimberly: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Fantastic. I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

Kimberly: So moved.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? So 3a: meeting times for winter quarter. So Kimberly, your conflict is that your class ends at what time?

Kimberly: At 6:20. It's scheduled every other Wednesday with the exception of a week from today. There was a switch since she's going out of the country. It doesn't conflict with senate

meetings and she's letting me leave early at 6 so I don't miss as much of the meeting but it'll conflict with the executive senate meeting with the exceptions of two weeks from today. I don't know if it's easier to pick one new time for the rest of the quarter or to keep two weeks from today but change the rest of the time.

Genesis: It helps me if we did it at 6:30 since I have a class that ends at 5:50 so I would miss the earlier parts of exec and senate no matter what.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): To make things easy, I'll make a motion to move the executive committee meetings to 6:30 but keep the same day.

Chris L: Any major objections to that? So it's the same Wednesdays we're already having but we'd just be moving everything behind one hour.

Alice: Can you reiterate the dates of our exec meeting for the quarter or are they on website?

Genesis: They should be on the website.

Kimberly: They aren't.

Evan: I may have to miss exec meetings in March since I'll be in Greenland. That'll just be the end of March.

Genesis: Our meeting dates are online. If you go under senate, then committees and then executive committee.

Chris L: We have Wednesday, January 8th, Wednesday, the 22nd, Wednesday, February 5th, Wednesday, the 19th, and March 5th since the quarter ends in the middle.

Evan: Then I can make that. Unless we have one during late March for the start of spring quarter.

Genesis: We have no other March dates.

Chris E: Point of information, can these votes be proxy? Can these votes be made by someone else in their absence to a meeting?

Chris L: I don't know. Genesis will find out for us. In the meantime, if you're calling in remotely, you can just vote but you're saying that you give that to someone else?

Chris E: Right. So someone comes in and that needs to be a senator? I don't know. I look at it in the aspect of I think there's considerations when people miss meetings. I don't think that's been held against anybody. If you did want to give your vote or if we wanted to quorum. That's a

possible concern. Kind of less important that if everyone's busy and there's going to be times when people can't make meetings but instead of looking to change the schedule, we can find another solution that helps make sure we get quorum.

Evan: So for the general senate meetings, senators may use a proxy of a current graduate and professional student from the same school, college or program. Other senators are eligible. So that might help limit the options.

Genesis: The bylaws doesn't say anything about proxy for the exec committee.

Chris L: My sense would be whatever we can do to get as many people in the room as we can is probably the best.

Evan: Oh, it says, "Proxy shall not be allowed except for the ASUW board member who shall use their own processes."

Genesis: Where?

Evan: Clause 3b. Article 6.

Chris L: So only way you can vote or to count toward quorum is to be physically or virtually present.

Evan: We had people call before.

Elisa Law (Secretary): So changing the times, we have to alert somebody.

Chris L: PMA?

Elisa: Yes.

Chris L: Office of Public Meetings something. In case anyone wants to pop in from the public since we are a state agency. So there's a motion on the table to change the start time to 6:30 for winter quarter. Is there any more discussion on that?

Evan: I'll second it.

Chris L: Any objections? Seeing none, 6:30pm will be our start time for winter quarter.

Kimberly: Thank you for your flexibility.

Chris L: Thank you for moving along smoothly. Now, item 4 is that I wanted to give everyone an update/presentation on my priorities for winter quarter. These are things that Austin and I have

been working on. Our fall was largely made up of meetings from everyone in the universe from administrative people to students across campus and student leaders from a lot of the professional schools. Basically, we wanted to get a sense of what kind of under the larger umbrellas of the things that I've been thinking about already in terms of graduate and professional student community and what exactly are the mechanisms that we could lean on in order to facilitate that. I have four broad areas. Some of them I talked about before and a couple of them will be new to you. We'll just go through them briefly and get some feedback. At this point, these aren't formal proposals. We've been working on them but they haven't risen to the level of official GPSS platforms yet so now would be a good time for thoughts, feedback and concerns. The first one is one that everyone has heard me talking about a lot, which is graduate student peer mentoring. We actually moved forward on this at the end of last quarter with a meeting with people who were interested in working on that. We met and talked about it and some of the initiatives that other units on campus are thinking about or pursuing mostly in Student Life and the Graduate School who are mostly thinking along parallel if not exactly the same lines of ways in which students can help other students be successful in their academic and social lives as students. Student Life revolves mostly around international student acclamation. In the Graduate School, there's seems to be a lot of partnering graduates with undergraduates and also senior graduates with junior graduates. Although that project will probably move more slowly than we first thought. There's a lot of similar ideas floating around and we've decided that we're not going to wait for everyone else to move along. We decided to move forward with our version and our goal for this quarter is to have an idea of what a program will look like and what a sustainable and easily implementable one will look like and won't have that much of a start-up cost that we can actually pilot before the end of the year. So that's priority number one. Priority number two revolves around international students and Austin has done a lot of work on this so I'll let him chime in on this. We've been hearing again from Student Life, particularly Denzil Suite, the new Vice Provost for Student Life, is very interested in the international student experience. I think last year when we were trying to do the resolution on the international student fee we realized that we didn't know who international graduate students were, per say. So this is really a project that is part research and part action. For the research portion, we're working on setting up a series of focus groups with both people who work with international graduate students and international graduate students themselves to get a sense of what is this group of people? Who is this community who are somewhat covered by student organizations like the Chinese Student Associations but at the same time, we're outside of that since most of them are largely undergraduate based. It's somewhat connected to Phiutes but it is pretty controversial among most international students. So we're trying to get a sense of who is exactly out there and what they need and how we can facilitate these things for them to be successful. That's the research phase and the action phase is whatever we come up with that and we're also hoping to present the results of that in some kind of symposium in the spring. That's the second one. The 3rd priority is graduate student leadership. This is a smaller project which came about as basically as another version of Michael Kutz's Husky Leadership Retreat except for probably initially the leaders of the professional student organization since those are the most visible and most highly functioning groups on campus that are independent of GPSS that deal with graduate and professional students. The idea would be to get them into one room

for refreshments and basically talk about how we can all work together. There's been a lots of interest expressed individually from some of these people on interprofessional or social or professional development or whatever. Some of the schools already do do this. Business and law do it a lot and Evans probably does it with other schools I'm guessing. Part of it is self-serving to throw GPSS' hat into the ring but it's also to genuinely get these people to talk to each other and think about creative ways to do this. That can be expanded as well to other graduate and professional leaders on campus we might not know about or people in GPSS. It's definitely extensible but that's the initial area. The fourth priority is building a higher education policy committee that would a lot like the Science & Policy Steering committee that would not only be able to do much of the work to put on the Higher Education Summit on a yearly basis but also like the Science & Policy committee, put on smaller events throughout the year so it's not just a one-off thing. This includes a lot of the mechanisms of the workings of the Higher Education summit so every year we're not like reinventing it from the ground up which is where we found ourselves this year and also ensuring continuity and making sure that, for example, this year we created a whole bunch of contacts in a variety of different places and making sure that those don't just go away and we have to re-establish them every year. So those are the four big ones. We have some smaller things that some fit underneath these things and some not but those are the big meaty projects for winter quarter. Austin, did I miss anything?

Austin Wright-Pettibone (University Affairs Director): I think the thread that's kind of weaving everything together is the idea of strengthening the graduate student community on campus and really bringing together the disparate communities currently found on campus and making it into this one thing under GPSS which is what we're all about. We're really working to create this institutional memory throughout this year. Through the leadership and professional groups found, as Chris said, a lot of interest with creating professional networks so we're exploring ways to do that at the moment and with international students, I think that's been the big focus in mind for the past couple of weeks. We're really partnering with OEA and Denizil to create these focus group and pull together a task force and create some policies to improve international graduate student acclimation and retention on campus and bettering their feelings about interacting with domestic students which there is some trepidations around that at the moment.

Chris L: OEA is, by the way, the Office of Educational Assessment. They've been vetting some of our focus group questions. And one last tiny crazy idea that goes along with the international thing that I just thought it up and thought I should mention this to someone. Take it for what it's worth. It's just a wild-eyed idea. Because we have had historically problems of getting consistent international student representation in the senate, would it make sense to have a permanent seat in the executive committee for an international graduate student? We kicked it around and came up with a lot of pros and cons with it but its just something I've been thinking about.

Alice: I think it would be really difficult to make the case for having a permanent seat for an international student and not one for other interest groups. We would have to always have a woman and you have to have someone from LGBT. It's an obligatory slippery slope.

Chris L: That was the main weak point that we identified.

Chris E: I would echo that. One of the telling things was last spring for the election for the executive senator, a person ran and said, "Actually, I think the most important thing is diversity and LGBT." The question came from the senate that asked, "What else do you care about?" Personally, I think it's in the best interest of this board to have specific members that represent specific demographic groups which could be international students, someone from the sciences, someone from the social sciences, etc. I think that could cut down on the amount of Evans people. I would rather have every decisions that gets made should go through the lens of somebody who cares about that or is specifically caring about the interests of international students which I don't think is there. I would say though, if that atmosphere is in the senate to go through that because I think that would be going through a bylaw change that the executive committee will consist of X, X and X.

Chris L: It would definitely be a structural change.

Chris E: Filling it would also be a thing. Not to say that we're scraping the barrel, but it did take us a little bit to get candidates to come forward for a position recently without those specifications.

Chris L: That's also true. Both points well taken. I don't want to get too far into this discussion since that's a minor point compared to the other things I just mentioned.

Evan: Do we have an international student spot in the senate?

Chris L: No.

Evan: Because I think we have an opening for the LGBT community.

Chris L: That's an idea.

Genesis: There's a Phi Utes' seat.

Evan: I'm just thinking, if we have it anywhere that might be a good place.

Alice: Is there an organization of international students that's separate?

Chris L: No, not for graduate students. The thinking behind that particular idea is that since there isn't a go-to. They have a robust student organization that do include graduate students but they also are largely undergraduate. Because there is no central place or central person. Again, I don't want to go too far into this particular point.

Chris E: Is there a place within the standing committees now that international students affairs,

questions, issues can be brought up?

Austin: Diversity.

Chris L: Well we did Student Life for the mandatory fee.

Austin: If I could just step back. A lot of where this is coming from is in every meeting we have had where we talk about the topic of international students, we try to plan our entire agenda around them like peer-mentoring international students, thinking about open access and leadership on campus. The one thing that every department has sided on is international students and have said that they do not have the resources to provide effective support for their international students. They say that their international students feeling ostracized among their larger community, not interacting with domestic students in class, having domestic students not wanting to partner with them in class, not having social activities integrating them with domestic students, not really having the experience of a UW student but having the experience of an "other" person on the UW campus and that's something I think that GPSS has, not only the ability to but an obligation to work to rectifying this situation to the best of our abilities. Since we are uniquely positioned as a student senate group, we can do a lot this year in supporting that and push the administration who has shown to be willing and eager to work with international students and work with us to develop new solutions for international students.

Alice: I think that's a great approach since I feel like, as a body, GPSS is doing so many different things and we're all over the place. Probably the best place that we could be situated in with this whole area is pressuring the administration like the Dean of Students to do something. I went to a really small liberal arts school in upstate New York but we had a crap ton of international students because they have a Coordinator of International Student Services in the Dean of Student's offices. They have all these services for international students. They have support for international students such as a international friendship program to help them integrate. I feel that we could ask the administration to at least like create a position like that, a Coordinator of International Student Support. That could be something that as a body, we can get behind as a structured thing. Allocate this money to create this thing and put it on them to create the program because if we try to do it ourselves, it'll fall apart.

Chris L: They recently hired a Vice Provost for Global Affairs and his position is not exclusively concerned with international student life but it partially is. Also, Denzil, the new VP for Student Life is personally very interested in improving the international student experience. We're lucky to have an administration that is actually very supportive right now.

Genesis: That's the thing. If they are supportive, then they should try to make a way to dedicate someone who will improve international student life as opposed the new Global Affairs VP who only has a portion of their time set aside for them.

Austin: If you want to talk about how we're moving forward in our agenda, the first step is to

finish our meetings with OEA to figure out these focus groups because there's been no research as of yet on campus as to figure out what the international students are experiencing. We're getting the concrete data and leading that which has the side effects that we're promoting ourselves as an organization on campus that does that kind of thing. The idea of it is to partner with Denzil and I agree with you. I think that we need to be doing more and I think this will be creating the the opportunity for us to tell the administration that this is what you need to be doing concretely, and here's the data to back it up. After we finish with the focus groups, we're working to simultaneously convene a meeting with all the people who are currently working with international students on campus throughout the departments so we can start to have collaborative discussions to work toward a solution rather than each individual department coming up with their own solutions and having those departments feeling the weight of it or the administration. So I think we're going from both below and talking to everybody in the school about it and then from above to try and pressure the administration.

Chris L: Part of pressuring the administration is providing them with the data.

Alice: Also, probably pointing to institutions who are doing it well and maybe even smaller institutions with fewer resources. I just sent you two links of the website so you can look at it. You can say that we're an R1 institution and look at this tiny little school who's doing it better. If you can find a lot of examples like that.

Evan: And cater specifically and ostensibly to international students. It's actually surprising to me that we don't have a dedicated position now.

Chris L: Keep in mind that we're talking about international graduate students. Student life barely touches graduate students at all so international graduate students is even less.

Chris E: I think this is a great conversation. I will also echo what you're talking about and that you're well on your way to get on with it. Give us some more if there is more to say but we should also check on our agenda.

Chris L: Any other quick comments on anything else we touched out? Thank you. I just wanted to give everyone a head's up with what we're doing. So planning the senate meeting which we can actually do visually for the first time. So approval of minutes from 11/20.

Genesis: Didn't we also have minutes from Dec. 4?

Chris L: We did not. We didn't have a meeting.

Genesis: Yes we did. That was when we approved the legislative agenda.

Chris L: So we actually have to approve both sets of minutes since.

Elisa: Correct.

Chris L: So the GPSS spotlight presentation, unless anyone else has something...

Genesis: Can we do the spotlight on MLK Jr. Service Day? Since it's coming up the following weekend and we would like to get GPSS involved.

Chris L: Do you want to do it as a spotlight or as a separate announcement?

Evan: If we need something for spotlight, might as well do it for spotlight.

Chris E: I want to propose something. I was able to send both the Chair of the State Steering Committee and Jake to the Washington State Budget Matters Policy Conference that happened. I think they can easily fill five minutes on what happened there as well.

Chris L: I also have something that I would like to talk about as well.

Genesis: I think you're hogging the spotlight just a little.

Chris L: It wouldn't be me.

Chris E: I would frame mine more of what Jake does and how this pertains to the senate.

Evan: Let's do it.

Chris E: Since I think it was to focus on part elements of GPSS.

Genesis: Can we make a specific item for MLK?

Chris L: Yes.

Evan: So are we still having a spotlight discussion?

Chris L: Yes.

Genesis: It's going to be on budget matters.

Chris L: Elisa, how much time would you like?

Elisa: 5 minutes is enough.

Chris L: The Academic and Administrative Affairs Committee is going to do a short presentation and a call for volunteers not only from the senate but to pass along to their constituents for our

affiliated university committees. The idea that we're trying to move toward, although it was not done last year even a little bit so we're actually way ahead of the curve now but, every thematic committee, so Student Life, Academic and Administrative Affairs, Community Affairs, Diversity, etc are actually, in the bylaws, responsible for recruiting members to university committees that overlap with their areas. We have quite a few and Peacefull Dawn Roscoe will be doing a presentation on that. There are a lot of faculty committees. We'll give her 10 minutes.

Genesis: Can I have a line item. I need people to apply for my money.

Elisa: Diversity too.

Genesis: Can I be almost to the end since I'll be late?

Chris L: What do you want to call that?

Genesis: Funding opportunities. I'll need 10 minutes. I have a slideshow.

Elisa: We haven't gotten any for diversity funding at all. Just one.

Chris L: Can I roll you guys into together to one?

Genesis: No. They're separate funding streams so its two different thing's were talking about.

Elisa: I can just be in announcements.

Alice: Let's do it separate since we don't have any line items. If you want to highlight it and it'll be on record that you asked people for money. Don't shortchange yourself.

Chris L: How much time do you want?

Elisa: 2 minutes.

Chris L: I'll just give you 5. I'm going to be doing a more put together version of my winter priorities for the senate.

Chris E: Can I suggest that you lead with that after the spotlight discussion?

Chris L: I sure can.

Alice: What if it's before?

Chris L: Okay.

Evan: It'll set the tone.

Genesis: Yes, so I can get there in time.

Chris L: Chris, do you need a legislative update?

Chris E: Yes, indeed. At least 10 minutes. Aside from leg update, we'll need to do transportation as part of that. That will be important.

Chris L: I'm going to put you above the funding opportunities. I'll give you 15 minutes. I'll cut myself to 10 minutes.

Chris E: I hope to be under that as well.

Alice: Sorry this is so nitpicky but they're not winter quarter priorities. They're your priorities for winter quarter.

Chris L: I do want to do a State of GPSS. Even though it's not long persay, but we have a lot of information so I want to keep it at a minimum.

Alice: Plus people will be happy and get all stoked for winter quarter.

Genesis: Then budget session comes around. Line item by line item.

Chris L: So here's what we have. Approval of Agenda, Approval of Minutes, Previously on GPSS, Presidential Priorities, GPSS Spotlight and Discussion, Legislative Update, MLK Day of Service, Academic and Administrative Affairs Presentation, Funding Opportunities, Diversity Funding, Announcements and Adjourn. Anything else? Just as a preview, sometime during winter quarter, Alice Schwif--something German from HFS wants to come and pitch the new dorms on the Burke Gilman for next year. They're having trouble filling. They're to the point that they're offering one month of free rent to graduate students.

Alice: They already did that.

Chris L: I think they're still doing that.

Genesis: Didn't they offer us a tour last year?

Evan: Is it Mercer Court?

Chris E: \$1800 a month?

Genesis: And you have a share a kitchen. It's ridiculous.

Chris L: In any case, that's just a sneak preview. Anything else that anyone wants to see on the agenda? Then I will entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Alice: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objection? We have an agenda. Moving on to executive senator reports.

Kimberly: The sexual assault task force went online on Monday. The report is on the President's website. It's out and next week, the president will be delivering a message to all the students about the report. I can ask Helen and Susan if they want to come and present to GPSS. I can coordinate that for the meeting after next week. We already hired a consultant since the student conduct code is going to be changed and we have to go through the Washington Administrative Code to do that. A consultant working with the university to do that. Some other things were looking at and going forward is looking at training and making sure we're reaching as much as the university population as possible. So we're going to start planning on how it's carried out, who we hire and how we recruit volunteer trainers. There's some ideas we're thinking of right now. Those are the main points so far. Also some branch of the military came and spoke with the task force and was really impressed with the report and what we've been doing as the University of Washington. They wanted to work with the task force to develop their own approach to sexual assault.

Chris L: GPSS remains at the task force's disposal. If there's anything that we can do as well to disseminate or whatever it happens to be. Also the Community Affairs Committee which really needs a reason to exist is particularly at their disposal. Evan, Alice? Okay, Chris. You have some stuff to tell us?

Chris E: I'm going to move through this quick but feel free to ask questions if things don't make sense. I will implore you on input on some things. First thing is transportation. I sent out a letter recently. Hopefully you all looked at that. I will say briefly that this is a public meeting and the letter is some what confidential information but speaking directly, we're going to move ahead with the Plan B option for King County. It's just a letter to support that.

Chris L: Is that the local funding option?

Chris E: Yes, this is funding tools that are already available.

Chris L: What was Plan A?

Chris E: That the state passes a comprehensive transportation package. That's still the key priority at some point in light of not having Metro take cuts or have to pursue that. The idea is to move forward. You'll see in the letter that that is a really quick deadline so that'll have some real

implications. The input part of that is to say that I believe from these conversations that I have the authority to sign on to this. I will take any objections to that thought at this time. Okay, so I'll let them know we're signing on to that. I can talk about the fact that the group called Transportation Choices Coalition is working with UW Transportation to hire a liaison that will be a campus organizer for the campaign. As the vote comes nearer, we're going to be on a really strict timeline. Hopefully Anya will be our point person on that working with ASUW as well. With that person we're probably going to need some voter drive stuff. We have some questions about when deadline cutoffs are going to be or if that's even open. The second part of that is that they are raising money on that for the campaign. Generally, students aren't involved in that because we're poor. I've encouraged them to say, "Let's try and talk about possibilities where students give a dollar, a text thing or some kind of point of sale that would be optional. If it is possible, we could raise a certain amount of money will that be \$2500 or \$5000 which to get 2500 people to give a buck. I would say that's a pretty lofty goal but as a population, it's a small percentage of students. The idea would be if we could find an easy way, maybe find a match or find some kind of program where you donate a bus fares. Those kinds of things I would say at this time. Is that something we want to pursue or do we want to stay out of the funding part of it?

Chris L: Just to clarify, this is something we wouldn't run ourselves but support?

Chris E: We would work with ASUW and King County Now to put this idea in place. Right now you can give money on the King County website. It can be as simple as telling students that this is what we're trying to do. I still think going to a website and putting in a credit card is not a financially hassle but if they will actually do it.

Chris L: Are you proposing something like if you went to the bookstore, you would be given the option of adding a dollar?

Evan: I like the donate a bus fare idea.

Chris E: These are not set in stone, just conversations to be had. I really like the idea that we're even in our position financially or bringing to the table what we're still kind of doing our part or think it's that important to push.

Evan: Can we ask the coffee shops on campus to ask them if they would like to donate a bus fare?

Chris L: That would be through HFS since virtually everything on campus is through HFS so it would just be doing it through their system.

Chris E: Correct. There's a phone call tomorrow morning about the letter and then when that gets turned in some campaign type things will be happening. So with this conversation, I can bring this up and say that these are the kinds of things we can do. Can we make that happen? I think the conversations around that can run through the State Steering Committee. With this

committee, obviously I don't want to deny anyone's help or connections but I just believe that it needs to be something like that for students to do it and I think they would but if it's going to a website, people wouldn't do it. So switching gears now, Anya and ASUW are going to be the point. You can also talk to Jake but that's part one of what the State Committee will be working on. I think we can switch gears to the legislative agenda. I have been in Olympia for the last two days. We've just been setting up and have chosen teams. I got on the Veteran's Affairs Bill campaign group. It's on our agenda. It's a much better place to be at and putting our resources toward than for than the Dream Act or the Voter Registration Grant, which is good but Lucas at ASUW is on that committee so we have some parallel lines. The specific bill is, right now, the GI Bill, post 9/11, only pays for instate tuition so students that are here who's been honourably discharged but not from a Washington deployment will pay out of state. So they're seen as an out-of-state student so the feds pay the in-state portion and they are left to pay the excess. This bill fixes the technicality that if you were discharged within the last two years from any deployment, and that's honourably, you would automatically pass that barrier and be seen as a Washington resident and get instate tuition and the GI Bill covers your whole tuition. There are several states around it. Actually, Washington has pending legislation. Oregon, Idaho and a lot of west coast states already have this in place. Last year, there was a hold up from UW on this bill because they didn't like it and said it would cost them money and that there would be a fiscal impact. I spoke with Margaret this year and she still says there would be a fiscal impact this year but she won't stand in the way. So that bill along with the fee-based programs bill, bill 1669, will hopefully be reintroduced to the state and send them to the Rules committee in the House. They would then quickly move through the process of going to the floor and they go to the senate. I'll call it Melanie's bill, since they were the people that put their blood, sweat and tears to this bill. They had it set up so there shouldn't be any concern but a slam dunk is not a slam dunk especially when most legislatures right now don't care to do anything. They want to go down there and spend 60 days and go home. That's mostly the senate. I don't think we have a problem in the House. That's where things will get sticky. So those are two really good ones that are on there. Representative Verchelli also put out a textbook sales holiday bill. Will be looking that with Margaret. It's on our legislative agenda so we're going to work with him on that and other synergies we're working on. I will say that I'm doing an independent study with social impact bonds which works very well with what Representative Zeiger is working on so we're working on that together. That will serve as a template for what I believe is laid out in the first tenant of the legislative agenda where we talk about how we show the value of students to legislatures. What I'm looking at is some kind of formal process where Olympia throws out ideas that they want worked on and the University of Washington students do policy work on that. So whether that be through coursework, cost-benefit analysis, policy analysis. There's an opportunity for some policy challenges that are around and also degree project work. So right now I'm talking with the Evans School about this. They haven't given me anything but we'll explore what that might look like. In the same vein, I'm very sensitive to the fact that this doesn't work for us unless it's open to more than the Evans School. Even if that's a natural hub for where that might exist, I'm still stuck with the parameter that it still needs to be open to at least Law, Social Work, Public Health and the Jackson School. I think the way that we frame this is that it's a pilot project and talking with legislatures, they think this is gangbuster stuff. Why

wouldn't we do this? Obviously, they are at a lack of time, resources and staff and a multitude of things that needs to be worked on. I think from a student perspective, especially from where I see it, they are desperate to work with something that gives them legitimacy or that will get used. I think it's sad when students get awards from their departments and the only people that read them were the 3 people on the panel that graded them. So I think that there is a really good opportunity to build that bond. This specifically speaks to how we can show the value of students. I think there are some technicalities like how that gets paid for. I've penciled out an idea that looks like we could ask for \$20,000 which could pass for a fiscal note but also asking for any money could be sticky. So if anything, it's time to start talking about this and get people excited. Then in the future, the one thing I will bring up is that I think GPSS should definitely be involved in our bylaws to add a duty for the vice president to make sure they coordinate and advocate for the continuance or sustainability of what I call a student policy collaboration. You know, once we start throwing institute or center on to things, everybody gets weird so we want to stay away from that. Kind of just being the coordinator and champion so they're constantly doing that and also making sure people are aware of the opportunities such as the diversity funding and other programs. We'll also note that a really common ally is possibly having other housing for this if it does become contentious or political is the actual Graduate School. We have a great ally with Adam working as the Special Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School. I think it's an awesome thing to look at and I think it's getting people excited or at least enthusiastic about looking at it more. We have a great opportunity with a template-like program I'm working on with the legislature so that's where that stands. On that note, the Steering Committee will be working on issues of sales tax exemption on books, veteran's affairs and fee-based programs because we will need, especially with the veteran's affairs and fee-based programs, we're trying to get some students to go down and testify. I've heard from numerous senators from last year that the most compelling testimonials from there through the whole session were students that talked about the fee-based programs. It would be the impact and the wow factor. So we want to keep that going. For Lobby Day, I saw an email that was tentatively February 8th. Anya will be working with them. She's going to organize and Jake will be helping when he can but as Organizing Director, that's really her gig.

Kimberly: Is that a Saturday?

Chris E: Maybe it's not the 8th. I will also say that the WSA Lobby Day is the 15th. I told them not to expect students from UW for that and ASUW echoed this because our lobby days are within a week of that. Just logistics wise, we can't run four more buses down there or have the support say from the graduate students especially in the light that a majority of those bills are focused on undergraduate needs and concerns. So I think it's better for us to focus on the UW Lobby Day. There'll be some specific times where we can take a group down to do some testimonies. Another thing that I did see is Library Sciences. They put out their own lobby day. Maybe we could coordinate with them and having a list of them. If the sciences had one, maybe that's something the Science & Policy committee members want to go and have people from their schools go and advocate. I think that's more what we talk about is not specifically about tuition but if we can find issues that students are interested and want to go lobby on, just to be

there.

Chris L: Yeah, there's a ton of lobby days. There's a Nurses Lobby Day, and Educator's Lobby Day...

Chris E: So I think there's some importance to letting people be free to choose what they want to do. Also, for us to be aware and we're sending students to those and I can facilitate those in Olympia whether that be scheduling some meetings or joining them. All the better. I think that's it for now. I'll be doing a similar schpeel during senate meeting and can talk more broadly and in more detail at that time.

Chris L: Any questions for Chris?

Evan: I would like to just not that I like the idea of collaboration. I've had the pleasure of at least one of my classes had a private collaboration with the science industry that worked out really well which was the focus of the class. Science and Policy is hoping to do a similar thing and there's no competition between the two. It'll only be synergistic to have both aspects running at the same time to make UW a resource.

Chris L: Genesis?

Genesis: My committees won't start meeting until next week. I'm going to open a new round of travel grant applications next week. Then I'm going to get started on our budget process so it can go smoothly.

Chris L: Elisa?

Elisa: MLK Day is coming on the 20th. Of the three sites that you can volunteer at, the Denise Louie Education Center is a painting activity is full already. There's 7 spots left in the Jumpstart activity kit-making for preschool kids. There's also several spots open for the Teen Free Meal Program which is the event that I will be coordinating at the University Congregational Church.

Chris L: I thought it was at Hillel.

Elisa: It's at University Congregational Church.

Kimberly: Denise Louie is an awesome organization.

Elisa: So coordinating that just means picking up t-shirts and being in contact with the person at the church and making sure everyone is happy and has someone to go to with questions and taking pictures and what not.

Genesis: There are other sites. There's United Way of King County that is partnered with UW.

Chris L: There's a link to the Carlson Center where you can go the United Way website and to all the projects. You can sign up for any project you want. Those are just the ones we sponsor with GoMap.

Elisa: Yes. Ideally we would fill those spots first and encourage people to look at other options.

Chris L: Do we know how many professional & graduate students we had last year volunteer?

Genesis: Not that many.

Elisa: There is very little information of what happened last year. There were very little pictures and what not.

Genesis: It was namely the office that volunteered because Adam and his then fiance volunteered at the museum at Beacon Hill. Kristin, Brian and I volunteered at a old people's home. I don't remember how many senators signed-up. It was barely anyone.

Chris L: Does GPSS actually sponsor any sites?

Genesis: Yes, there's six sites that we sponsored. There's a museum, the one we painted at and there was another one as well. An outside one.

Elisa: So theres that. I'm in the process of purging our roster of attendance non-compliance senators. So as per our conversation at the last exec meeting, senators that have already been given a warning had been gently encouraged to reconsider their commitment to GPSS and their GPA has been notified as well. I've also given them the option of renewing their commitment. But hopefully the language is clear enough that you should step down if you can't do this.

Chris E: They can be born-again senators.

Chris L: ASUW is not here so president. The graduate program reviews we'll be having next week is for the Psychology Department so we're getting them to help us setup a focus group and help disseminate a survey. The Academic and Administrative Affairs met today and is looking like a strong committee. Now I need to get Community Affairs running. I actually encouraged them before the break as a committee to sponsor another project and received crickets in response so I'll ping them again. I've been holding out carrots of things that people might be interested in working on such as the sexual assault stuff. So far it's been difficult to garner much interest but were moving forward. This quarter we can finally convene the committee communication board?

Alice: Committee Coordinating Board.

Chris L: Yes, so we'll be doing that and get that off the ground and that committee's main task

would be coming up with the committee chair handbook. There are a lot of things we haven't gotten to this year but I feel like we're doing strong in the things that we are doing. For example, Julian Reese. He's our appointment to the faculty senate committee of faculty affairs and he was saying last year, he had no communication with GPSS and this year, Austin has already sat down with him individually and writing reports. We've been doing all this for all our university committees. Our work with the roster, Elisa has been much more on top of that than anyone last year. We're doing a lot of the institutional work that hasn't been done and we're setting ourselves up to be strong in the future.

Genesis: Except no one wants our money.

Chris L: Sometimes we can't even give it away.

Genesis: I don't know if that extra \$20,000 from SAF was a one-time thing or it will go back into our general fund or they'll take it back. I'm not sure what will happen if we don't use up all our special allocations fund.

Chris L: Any announcements?

Kimberly: I finally found my notes. So when I was talking about the training, and the next step is talking about creating exploratory groups that talk about training and how that's carried out and also investigational staffing. We have the funds or will be given the funds to hire an investigator who is specialized in sexual assault.

Chris L: To work with UWPD?

Kimberly: No, we haven't worked out where that person will be housed but this will be processing the Student Violations Code. We'll also have an exploratory group who will work to implement a plan to collect data. Also, can the minutes be sent out way sooner than the day before the next meeting? Because I would like to come back with that to the Student Bar Association.

Elisa: Sure. I'm sending out the all-senate email now with the agenda, minutes and announcements. Is there anything anyone wants to add there?

Alicia: It's awesome that it's going out right now. Can you also send a reminder on the day of the meeting and Monday?

Elisa: Sure.

Chris E: I think we're over-sensitive of not emailing people but that's what we have to do.

Elisa: We got a lot of flack for that.

Chris L: Standard practice for last year was a week before as mandated by the bylaws and on a

Monday but Monday could be a reiteration of the official email and Wednesday could be a one sentence email. Anything else? Then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Alice: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Executive Meeting
January 22nd, 2014
HUB Board Room

Chris Lizotte (President): I will call this meeting to order at 5:31pm. I'll entertain a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): So moved.

Kimberly Schertz (Law): Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? The agenda is approved. I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): Motion.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Kimberly: Do we have quorum?

Chris L: Yes, we have 50% plus one. The next item is, I distributed an item that you can find in your information packet. I'm essentially asking for, and I took off the appointments to the faculty councils because I haven't received their information so that'll be at a later date. There's a conference in Boston in March that is a society of college and university planners that I'd like to attend using my travel budget for the airfare. I distributed some of the highlights of sessions that I would be going to. There's some other ones as well just to give you an idea of what sessions they have. I have spoken with Genesis. I have enough money in my travel budget to cover this plus me and a second person to go to SAGE Day on the Hill in April so that won't be a problem. The registration fee, I'll cover somehow. I've applied for a scholarship or I'll figure it out myself.

Genesis: You'll still have money.

Chris L: So looking at potentially \$300 coming out of my travel budget. I don't technically need exec approval. I thought I would ask for it.

Evan: Sounds good to me.

Chris L: I'll entertain a motion.

Evan: So moved. What am I moving for? Since you don't need our approval.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): We don't need a motion. Verbal support on the minutes.

Chris L: So I guess labelling it as an action item was incorrect. The next thing is that I also said in my email that I might have two resolutions. I created one. I held off on the other one which essentially will be a similar resolution authorizing the creation of a committee for the graduate peer mentoring. We had a meeting of that group, which is right now an ad hoc working group. We had a meeting yesterday and they had a conversation about longevity and continuity and I told them about what I'm doing for this particular one and they expressed interest in doing something similar for that so I'll bring back another resolution that will look very much like this except all the whereas clause will be different. So just to walk to you through it, essentially what this does is the senate approves the creation of an ad hoc committee, which the senate has the power to do. I essentially gave myself some tasks that directs me to come back with bylaw changes to establish the permanent standing committee, which the senate will have to approve, which directs me to come up with and present a plan for transiting for leadership and also for making sure the committee is continuous and stays alive. Just to make sure everyone understands this, the Higher Education Policy Steering Committee is essentially modeled on Science and Policy. It would be responsible for putting on the annual summit and also much like Science and Policy, the hope would be to do one or two additional small events throughout the year. If anyone has any suggestions or things that I've forgotten or that I should add?

Evan: I just have a quick question. It says "no later than the last senate meeting of 2014 winter term" which would be the last senate meeting of your presidency right?

Chris L: No, since that would be the last meeting of spring term.

Evan: Then that is fine. I was worried about it carrying over with someone else's presence.

Chris L: So that's March 12th. Anyone note that it actually directs me to present two sets of bylaw changes. One regarding the committee itself and one changing the job description of the president to say that this is your job. I'm not planning on bringing this next week to senate. This is for the next senate meeting after that.

Kimberly: So you said that the other resolution that you're going to create a committee for the peer mentoring program is basically going to look like this but a little different?

Chris L: Yes, the part that'll be substantially different is the whereas part since it'll probably have a different set of justifications.

Evan: Is this going to the senate as a whole next week then?

Chris L: No, because I didn't submit it to Elisa. If anyone wants to co-sponsor, you are more than welcome to sign on.

Kimberly: I'm down.

Evan: I'm not against it but I've never really participated in it before so I don't know how much my co-signature is worth.

Chris L: As kind of an aside, this is sort of pointing to the problem of the Higher Ed Summit that it is this sort of thing that gets passed off year to year to whoever is interested. So the fact that people are like "Oh I been to that?" is sort of emblematic of what this is trying to address.

Kimberly: This might be outside of the scope of our meeting but I guess just keeping in mind for next year, it would be possible, at least parts of it to the evening.

Chris L: Yes, believe you me. There are many changes coming down the pike for that. Any other discussion for that?

Evan: Good to me.

Chris L: Thank you. That moves us right along to a similar discussion of a proposed bylaw change brought by Yasmeen Hussain in Biology. I'll turn over to Elisa in a second. I'll just not that Judicial has seen this and approved it so this is just for our information.

Elisa Law (Secretary): We don't have to change anything. This is only for our information and this will be going to the senate at the next meeting. In essence, it's an attempt to avoid the lengthy process of going through a motion or a resolution as a senate line by line and editing it and adding things in as we go along because it takes long time. The change is that the proposed motion or resolution will be added to a discussion board that will be accessible to senators. They can propose revisions up until 48 hours before the next senate meeting. Whoever owns the resolution will be able to take whichever ones as friendly and repost or redistribute to senators 24 hours before the senate meeting. Then, any remaining changes can be made at the meeting but hopefully this way, Yasmeen is hoping that most of the amendments will be made previous to the meeting.

Chris L: It's at the discretion of the sponsor? Or in other words, they don't have to accept any changes electronically?

Elisa: No.

Kimberly: Hopefully that will improve things.

Elisa: My only question is on what system or platform are we going to be making this accessible to senators and how easy will it be for whoever is putting the motion forward to accept the changes and track that?

Evan: That was going to be my question. It should fall mainly on the author but it has to fall on someone on GPSS to set the framework to post it.

Alex Bolton (Law): To have a consistent way that it's done.

Evan: We need to define who's job will it be to set the framework for this discussion board.

Chris L: It has to be something that can track changes.

Elisa: Google drive?

Genesis: The last time we did that, they used Catalyst. They set up a discussion forum that you couldn't actually change the document but you could view it. It was a board so you can put in your discussions.

Chris L: If they wanted to make actual changes, they just reference the line to add or change it.

Evan: I say that would be fine preliminary until something better comes along and the admin of that board should be the author.

Elisa: Ideally, none of the officers will facilitate that process. That would be completely on the resolution holder other than sending out the announcement that it's on the board for discussion.

Evan: Agreed.

Alex: Is this saying that every piece of legislation would have to or is up to discretion of the author as well?

Elisa: This would be in the bylaws and that's the process it would have to go through.

Chris L: So it would have to go up on a discussion board.

Elisa: Yes.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): I think this is fine. I don't know what there is to say that we couldn't do this anyway with a bylaw change making it happen. I also don't think it does anything to control for how long it will take to go through. People who don't do it can still bring it up on the floor. I really think that under a little consideration, this is a great discussion of that topic that came up of caucusing. Under the idea that says, it gets brought forward once it's already been decided and language is approved so it's really just a formality. We're talking about the right place for the discussion and what I tend to hear is that the floor seems to be counter productive so maybe looking at that, but at the same time, sure.

Chris L: There's only so much we can bylaw-ize in order to avoid that.

Elisa: This is just an effort to address something that upsets a lot of senators when something like this comes to the floor and takes a long time. At least this way, we can say you can add comments and if it's taking too long, its your own fault.

Evan: This is something we already do, but hopefully and what I thought was nice is putting it in the bylaws as a mandatory step will start encouraging people to utilize that.

Chris L: In theory.

Evan: Encouraging people to participate in the online discussion forum as opposed to how its an option and we have to go through it anyway. This bylaw set-up to me sounds like do all your business on the online the and only if we need to, we can take smaller changes on the floor. It's nice to see it written up that way since it hasn't been presented that way so I'm not adverse to it.

Chris E: I agree but I question whether it will work to take down conversation time since the real issue is whether people care to do it before. I actually see an email as a much easier way than logging on to a discussion board. If you really wanted to cut down time, I would make it so people will have to put in writing within a certain amount of time before. It's one of those things that this is cool and it feels good so why not but I don't think it does anything to address how long it will take to pass a resolution.

Elisa: All these things will be discussed when it's put to senate. I think they will vote yay or nay if they think it's a good measure or if it's useless.

Evan: I think it can't hurt. We'll see if it helps and if it doesn't then we can look for other alternatives.

Chris L: I'll just say two things. One is, in essence, because of the mechanism that's being used, the changes will have to be in writing because they won't be able to edit the document so they will have to say line whatever change this to this. In a way, we will have them in writing. The second thing is that it's impossible to predict. In the past, we used go posts and made it open like on the international student fee, I'm pretty sure we had a forum and left it open for two weeks and had maybe two posts. Then still had a half an hour discussion. You're right. There's nothing we can do to guarantee. We can only hope.

Alice: As far as I'm concerned, I think the benefit of this language is not so much that that it's going to cut down on revision time in senate because that's always going to be the case. It's to clarify what the procedure is to editing a resolution before it comes to the floor and clarifying that because that was a big question mark with the transportation stuff. It's useful because even if no one uses it, at least if people want to do that, it's in writing and people can refer to it and say this is the procedure for doing this and this is what our due diligence is. It doesn't mean that we don't

have to send an email. We can send a link so for the people who are going to need it through email or actually will look at it, they get the email and click the link and it's on the Google Doc. That way, it's more streamlined for helping people who want to make changes. It could cut down that way but it necessarily won't have to. In order to cut down the time to discuss this change in senate will depend a lot on how it's going to be presented so if we presented it as this ambiguous change it won't be short but if we presented it in the way that, well I'm biased, but in a way that I outlined where this is formalizing the process and make it easier and more transparent and not diminish the importance of having deliberation in senate but talk about it as a formalizing of the pre-production process, I think it will be well received.

Chris L: I agree.

Evan: Do we know what Yasmeen's take and purpose is in doing this since we are attaching our own thoughts to it? Which is not bad but she's also the author of it and will be presenting it a lot.

Chris L: I'm sure she's open to help. She might be open to input in the manner it's presented. Hopefully so we can offer what you just said since that is a really good way of framing it.

Alice: What's happened in the past, or at least last year is that someone would come up and present their resolution and Trong would inevitably stand up and say well, we talked about this in exec and here's our take on it. If I have your guy's approval, I would like to, after Yasmeen's done presenting it and give that take as the formalization of the process etc. and speak for the conversation we had and say we support this and this is why so that could be presented but we don't have to dictate Yasmeen's presentation since I know she's opinionated and probably would like to present it in her own way.

Chris L: Any discussion on that?

Evan: I'm not opposed.

Alice: I will do that.

Chris L: Thanks Alice. I think, just to sum up, it does sort of formalize a process that we tried before. We haven't done it for every resolution but we've been doing it more and more and actually now there's no doubt in anyone's minds on what can or can't be done online with a resolution before it's brought to the floor. Any other discussion on that?

Chris E: I just want to make sure, I think it did but it clarified one issue. The main issue for the transportation one is that the only thing we were able to edit was the original one but I think what people wanted to see and what we had ended up doing but suspending the bylaws was being able to put them side by side so people could see the difference. It does do that right?

Elisa: This addresses that.

Evan: Which is a bonus and a good thing to add.

Chris L: It does mean that the author has to go through and make the changes themselves, the one's that they accept as friendly. It doesn't say what they do with the changes they don't accept.

Evan: People can just assume that if they don't see their changes, they can bring them up again.

Alex: It's on the proposers.

Evan: How much do they think this change needs to be made?

Chris L: Okay. That's an excellent point, Chris. Thank you for bringing that up. Anything else on that? Then moving right along on the planning of the Jan. 29th senate meeting. Elisa and I are dueling edits. I have one request that I know of of a visitor, Elizabeth Windor of the Environmental Stewardship Council would like to come and talk to the senate.

Alice: Spotlight?

Chris L: Yes, anyone else know of anyone outside parties who want to come?

Kimberly: I have asked the sexual assault task force but they haven't responded to me.

Chris L: I know at some point HFS wants to come but they have not contacted me yet.

Elisa: What's the name of the lady?

Chris L: Elizabeth Windor.

Evan: What are they presenting on?

Chris L: The Environmental Stewardship Council which either oversees or is overseen by the Campus Sustainability Fund.

Chris E: She's in CSF too? The chair of that one.

Chris L: Yes, the Environmental Stewardship Council has an appointee to CSF or is it the other way around?

Chris E: I believe she is the GPSS appointee to the Environmental one and sits on Campus Sustainability Fund as a representative for the Environmental Stewardship Committee where she serves as chair.

Chris L: Hopefully she can clarify all that. We have a tidy 15 minute meeting here. Anyone else have anything? Chris, you'll have a legislative update right?

Chris E: Sure.

Alice: I think we should have a separate discussion of what Lobby Day is and have a couple people talk about their experience and have a couple examples and maybe have someone from ASUW come talk about it. Chris, do you think you'd be able to have someone from ASUW come talk about it? Since it's primarily their thing. It would be cool to introduce it so people know what it is, what the logistics are, why they should get involved, why they should get their constituents to get involved and give them an overall picture of the whole event to get some stuff and I would like a little section on during that or separate about the Science and Communication and getting people in scientific departments to come to Lobby Day. Chris, you and I need to coordinate on that. I don't know if you made any progress with the science people?

Chris E: Anya is in charge of that.

Alice: When we talked last week, you said you were going to get a meeting set up hopefully with people in the science committees. We can get some separate meetings with that.

Chris E: There's a question about that of whether we do that on our own or whether we go through the ASUW process because that becomes a different animal. So the other part of it that I will touch on is that I think there's a good conversation going on about which Chris started the other day about the Graduate School. It really promotes how we talk about the Graduate School in general so for me, it's good or if we want to have meetings with science people, we should do it ourselves. We don't have to interject our meetings with which ASUW is setting up and two, if we're doing that, are we talking about the Graduate School in general or Science and Policy? There's ideas flying around and I think that that's an interesting thing to say that one what we really focused on was a poster session, which we need to make sure we can set up. Apparently ASUW doesn't want to be a part of that but we need to tie them down to see if they have a room for the whole day or if we need to get our own room.

Alice: Sorry, Anya sent an email about the poster session. She said they just couldn't add an option on the registration page and that they need to add a separate registration period. So that's on us. It's not that they don't want to have it. It's mostly graduate students and Lobby Day is on February 6th?

Chris E: I will say it again. Anya is in charge of this. I'm happy to facilitate in any way or let me know if she's not helping you get what you need.

Chris L: This discussion isn't pertinent to what we're doing right now. Could we leave it for another time?

Alice: Well, this is about the agenda next week. Sorry, is Lobby Day an ASUW event or ASUW and GPSS co-sponsored event? Point of information.

Chris L: I believe it is co-sponsored event.

Alice: Okay, so it's your event. It's not Anya's. If we need to do graduate related stuff like the poster session, like setting up meeting to talk about the Graduate School, that's your job. If we haven't done that already that's concerning to me. Last week, you said you were going to get on setting up separate meetings with science committees in Olympia. If you haven't done that yet, that's okay and that's your prerogative but I'm really uncomfortable with you saying that this is Anya's event.

Chris E: She's the staff member who's in charge of organizing Lobby Day.

Alice: She works for you? I think that to say that this event is Anya's job is wrong. I think it's your job and you hired her to help you but if there are things that we discussed that we need to do that we're responsible to GPSS and the Graduate School to have done, I think that you need to take responsibility for that.

Chris E: Point taken. I'm going to defer to Chris to move forward.

Chris L: Are you prepared enough to give an overview of Lobby Day at the next senate meeting?

Chris E: You bet.

Chris L: Can we work out the logistical things that need to happen with Science and Policy presenting beside Lobby Day from now and until then?

Alice: That's up to Chris. I would love to but I don't have the means or not in my place to go schedule meetings with the science committee so if that can be set up between now and Lobby Day and it's in your agenda and you think it's important, I would love to be a part of that but at this point, it doesn't sound like we even have the groundwork to have this be possible at this point.

Chris L: Chris?

Chris E: We're in conversations. I can meet with Anya later and maybe get an update. Sorry, I'm ill advised to deal with that but communication lines have been opened.

Chris L: As far as this agenda goes, can you provide an update on Lobby Day?

Kimberly: I can also talk about my experience during Lobby Day last year.

Evan: Point of information, I remember last year there was a poster session. Where does that

fall? Is that a regular thing that happens on most Lobby Days?

Alice: Yes.

Evan: I don't think that was organized by Science and Policy. I think that was talked about in SLSC.

Alice: It wasn't. Melanie organized it.

Evan: I wanted to know if that's the thing we're having and we're planning it. Someone should talk about it since that was a big deal last year and they wanted to get a lot of people with posters.

Alice: That was the biggest thing that we did.

Evan: It was a lot of scientists that ended up doing it.

Chris L: The conversation I'm having with Dave is separate and is not necessarily related to Lobby Day.

Chris E: True. Sorry if I imposed.

Evan: Is the poster session going to be happening this year?

Chris E: I believe so.

Evan: Ready to go?

Chris E: If you guys want a whole run down of this, because of my responsibilities in Olympia and Metro and Lobby Day happening, which necessarily didn't happen last year, I've had to delegate to my staff to take care of certain items. Anya is in control and working with ASUW with Lobby Day. That is why connections were made with Keolu and Alice about Science and Policy. We had conversations about getting a poster session together. I know that's important so I've been talking about that to legislatures about that. I did bring up that we need to have an interesting ASUW of what those roles will be as we break out with Science and Policy. I do know it's been in a week. Sorry I haven't been in town or connected with you in that amount of time.

Alice: It doesn't need to connect to me. It's not about having conversations. It's on the 6th. Is there a room? Who's reserved it? What time is it? Where's the link to register people? That's not the Science and Policy committee's job. That's your job.

Chris E: You're right. I totally agree with that but I don't think that it's February 6th either.

Evan: To tie it back to the agenda, can we be assured that you or Anya will have the logistical backbone set up for the science platform at least as far the poster session goes so that Science and Policy can recruit for it more?

Chris E: You bet. That's the conversation we had and I think we're sticking with it. I also gave an update to the State Legislative Committee no more than 15 minutes ago.

Evan: Then as far as the agenda goes, we can have an update about what is Lobby Day and we can have a separate update from Alice specifically from Science and Policy trying to recruit for a Lobby Day poster session, which is also Lobby Day but science oriented and also helps Science and Policy's science communication.

Chris L: It's part of our Lobby Day that ASUW doesn't participate in.

Alice: Just in case there isn't a room, time or a registration page already set up by next week, can you take me off the agenda and by that point if there is a backbone in place...

Chris E: Point of order, I take exception to the language.

Chris L: Why don't we refrain from speculating what may or may not happen from right now and then?

Alice: That's what is setting an agenda is.

Chris L: We can always remove that from the agenda at the beginning of the meeting.

Alice: I just don't want to draw attention to it at the meeting. I don't think we should have a separate line item on the agenda. The idea behind that was to have separate meetings with just graduate students with members of the science committees. I don't think that if those meetings aren't set up already, I don't think we should have a separate line. I can just pop in and talk about the poster session and science communication during the Lobby Day update.

Chris L: Your preference is to leave it off and add it in?

Alice: Yes, I'll just pop in rather than having to say at the beginning of the meeting that we originally wanted to do this but we're not now so take me off the agenda.

Chris L: Yes but you don't have to say it like that. You can say remove item 10 from the agenda.

Kimberly: I think it's better that they come in expecting it to be this set amount of time, and if we need to change it and take something out, then people are happy are to take something out. I don't think it's a poor reflection on you if you have to make an announcement that we can't talk about this now.

Alex: I say we could just be broad. It's a Lobby Day item for 15 minutes and if you want to pop in. I don't know if we need to be overly specific in the agenda. The whole point is Lobby Day and to me it's a sub-section of Lobby Day.

Evan: Does that work for you? To bump up Lobby Day to 15 or 20 minutes?

Alice: How about this? Can we change it to science communication and that way, I can talk about the science communication workshop. By then, we'll have it scheduled with the Science and Policy committee and when we are advertising for the poster session, I can say "Hey, come to the science communication workshop. Get your constituents that are coming to the poster session to come to the workshop, etc." Does that work for everyone?

Chris L: How much time?

Alice: 5 is fine.

Chris L: Chris, do you need more than 10 minutes for the legislative update?

Chris E: No.

Chris L: How about for the Lobby Day discussion?

Chris E: I mean, I guess I can talk about about it. It seems everything else is delegated out.

Chris L: Do you want more time?

Chris E: I don't think so.

Chris L: Anything else to add to the agenda?

Evan: No. Do we need to plug travel grants at all? How are we looking?

Genesis: Yeah, we can talk about travel grants.

Evan: We can put it in announcements.

Genesis: Yes, put it in announcements. No, actually give me an agenda item so I can do a frequently asked questions about the travel grants. Can you put me towards the end as well since I have to come from class?

Evan: Just right before announcements?

Genesis: Yeah.

Chris L: How much time do we want?

Genesis: 5 minutes is good.

Evan: What's your update going to be Chris?

Chris L: Oh, you just wait and see.

Evan: Since it's only 5 minutes this time.

Chris L: It's not going to be as exciting as the last time.

Evan: I have high expectations for you.

Kimberly: Did we put the bylaw change?

Chris L: No we did not. That's going to go...

Evan: After the presidential update?

Chris L: Actually, I don't need an update.

Alex: Let's see how much time this takes.

Kimberly: At least 20 minutes.

Evan: But her name's not on this.

Chris L: That looks good. 70 minutes. Anything else?

Alice: Last year, didn't we have committee updates? Did we take those out for whatever reason?

Chris L: Austin and I have been talking about that and we're planning on doing one at the last meeting of the quarter.

Evan: I feel like there's been some committee updates like Genesis mentioned there could be one and whenever there's a big event that a committee is in charge of.

Chris L: Just to expand on that and I'll talk about this more in my update. We've been talking about the information sharing flow system from university committees to the GPSS committees

to the UAD to the senate that will hopefully streamline the process so that we don't have to do what we did in the past where one committee chair stands up one after another and talk. We're still working out some kinks but we're hoping this will streamline things a little bit. Anything else? We've talked about him personally doing an update at the last meeting.

Evan: Cool.

Chris L: Anything else? I'll entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Evan: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Then this is our agenda. Thank you. Moving along to executive senator reports.

Evan: I have a question just regarding the presentation at the last senate meeting. There was quite eloquently stated a call for filling position to university committees. Has anything come of that?

Chris L: So we have a couple of candidates. We were suppose to forward those two particular committees, the academic standards and teaching and learning. I would have given you their bio or information if I had gotten it but I don't think Dawn got it so she didn't give it to me.

Evan: It seemed like Dawn was also the chair of the committee?

Chris L: Yes, Academic and Administrative Affairs.

Evan: Is she also responsible for coming to exec and reporting back to us?

Chris L: I'll actually talk about that in my update but that's a good question.

Evan: Cool. I'm excited to hear more about them. That seemed like that was going to go somewhere fast.

Chris L: We have candidates and by candidates I'm assuming it's one for each.

Evan: Within a week is from a general call is pretty good.

Alex: Our senators are communicating.

Chris L: Anyone else? Alex, Kimberly, Alice?

Alice: Well, full disclosure and transparency on that issue. I actually didn't know this when you made the appointment but I have class at the same time as the faculty council on research this quarter. I don't presume that I will next quarter so I will be able to go next quarter. In light of the fact that I can't go this quarter, and there's only two more meetings left, do you want me to resign and get somebody else that can go or stay on and start going next quarter?

Chris L: You don't have to resign. In fact, if you can find somebody to go for you, a proxy would be fantastic.

Alice: Okay cool. I will do that.

Chris L: Okay, let's move on to officer reports. Chris?

Chris E: I just sent out an email detailing all the bills. You will notice that House Bill 2109 is part of that now. I don't know if we need to ask for endorsement but it definitely works with Number 1 of our legislative agenda promoting value of students and collaboration. This bill gives money to the Medical School to start recruiting for a residency program in the Tri-cities as well as another teaching hospital in Yakima to help serve southeastern Washington's rural and underserved areas. I've connected Josh with Paul Calvert, he's the senator from the med school with their lobbyist as well as people that were there to testify on the bill so hopefully we can coordinate and I'll follow up on the bill as well. I dug out an old email that said this is actually one of the things that is important to med students so I think it's a good bill. The other stuff, vets is a third reading. There's a rules poll for 1669 which is the fee-based programs bill the other day. That's on its third reading so if it ever goes to the floor we'll see them. The textbook bill just dropped yesterday. It has changed from something that was UW specific to bookstores on colleges campuses to be a bit more encompassing of all students of higher ed and it also covers materials which would mean if you were going to be a TA or an RA, you can buy gloves or workbooks and all sorts of things. We can have the conversation on it but I think this hurts the bill. It puts a huge fiscal note on it of \$10 to \$15 million. Far outside the range of what we would've been looking at, which was strictly on campus which I think would also help people from going to the outsider discount bookstores and brings them in and hopefully help push purchases from parents like sweatshirts. So it's something good for UW. I think the other version is better. I'm talking with the bookstore. Louise was out of town today but will be in contact and have a face to face with her next Wednesday when I'm in town. Connecting on that, the other stuff is Lobby Day. It'll be on the 6th. I've been in conversations with doing things with Science and Policy. So the jury is still out where we have some things that we need to connect with ASUW on. It's a partnership so we have to make sure that they're there but we also need to do some things. I need to do some things for coordinating, who might be there and scheduling meetings if it is going to be outside. LAs are very protective and they want to know who's going to be there, how many are going to be there and what we're going to specifically talk about. I've had some conversations with ASUW with limiting the number of meeting with the big groups and limiting bill lists. I think last year they had 5 bills they wanted to talk about. Either 1 per group or graduate students to not talk about specific legislation but to talk about value. This is the

conversation that Chris was having where we have some pretty good numbers about how graduates do provide incentive to employers, create great value for the state and I think that's the conversation we want to have. With Senator Seaquist and Haler and with both Representative Reccelli and Walkinshaw and also Hans Zeiger who's on our side if he can help with really talking about how we carve that out. In this aspect of getting differential tuition, tuition caps and pay it forward even. It just doesn't apply to us. It's only for undergrads. People can pat themselves on the back and tell people how we gave more money in education last year and got a tuition cap but that's not true for graduate students. So I think those are things that we need to be aware of and I think there's a messaging of how we start to talk about that. Do we just pop up in every meeting that these things are happening and say well, this is all nice but it doesn't address graduate students? I think there has to be a more constructive way to do that. but I think that conversation of how we split this off and actually in the future of tying WSA and other campuses. Right now the president of WSA is a graduate student from Eastern so figuring out how we grow the grad student group as a whole. So maybe next year or years in the future, we can have a graduate student Lobby Day where we talk about graduate issues. At this point, we're doing ourselves a disservice by joining with ASUW and that's not to say that's from the programming but mixed messages are hard for legislatures and not having united fronts are hard for legislatures to understand. The real value of Lobby Day is people showing up and legislatures saying "Hey, look at the kids. They came out. They really care." Not necessarily sitting in a meeting and changing their mind. We're kidding ourselves if we do go in with this idea that if we do go in this 15 minutes meeting, we're going to get them to change their vote on a piece of legislation or give them that one piece that got to them. Maybe that's too real but I think that our value is is that students do go down and we have a good time and they interact and the legislatures go "Hey, that was awesome" and then they leave and they say "I felt good about that. That was fun." Also building in time for people to see the flooring bay and sit in a committee meeting. One of the things last year that came up was that it was regimented and people felt like there was always somewhere where they had to be. I think people were not necessarily calling it a field trip. We're going for a reason and we want to represent ourselves well and talk about student issues but I think how we control that can improve and change. I think of those things is limiting distractions. On that topic I think a powerful thing for GPSS to do is to do a poster session that we talked about. I think that's important and there is a bit of finagling to get out of ASUW whether they have a room or not and all those things. If they have a room, there's no need to book a second one. Again, those are dots that need to be reconnected and I have full faith that they can be reconnected by senate next week. The other thing I want to talk about is transportation. So three things that we're focusing on in that group. The State Legislative Steering Committee is working on is the need to get it out so we have to make sure that senators can push this message or connect to people that know whether that's UW transportation, WashPIRG, GPSS. Whatever group they want to connect to is alright as long as we get people out. There will be on Feb. 3rd, a phone banking and we can offer that up to anyone that's interested. On Feb. 4th, there's going to be a King County Council hearing. It'll be how we did the transportation meeting. Well, we didn't really have the opportunity but there was a forum held and we will get better opportunities to speak. This will be an interesting one if we have senators because unlike the transportation forum downtown, they said "Let people talk.

We don't want to hear from the lobbyists." I think the King County Council is much more inclined to hear from student leaders. The next day, the 5th, we're proposing to have a press conference on campus and a room is being set. We'll get that out but it'll be on campus. We can start coordinating with student leaders to speak at that. I think it'll be good.

Evan: So on the topic of traffic, I remember last exec meeting, we had been approach by UW to see if students would like to donate any money. Has that gone anywhere?

Chris E: Let me follow up on that. So we actually cannot give money to campaigns. Also GPSS can't officially take a stand on an initiative.

Alex: Can't the senate do a resolution?

Chris E: That's something I'll have to double check with Rene. We can support people going out to vote on the idea of going for the council or the meeting because at that point, we're asking them to put this on the ballot. We can say we believe you should put this on the ballot. Once it's an initiative, I don't know if GPSS can take a stand. Luckily, there's an RSO being created right now. We can do that. Melanie brought forth the idea of doing a student event where some small complimentary money can be gathered and I think what we're talking about is this idea of some students giving some money. It's that important to them. What that would be would not necessarily be as important as what we did. So I think that will happen in March or closer to the event and that works. They need extra money to vote. Another approach would be that even if we can't support the campaign, we can buy materials that are helpful.

Alex: What about getting more students involved and aware? We send out emails to the Law Schools and what can we say here that doesn't get us in trouble? We could have an update that is important to UW students since we take the bus and subsidize to Metro but I'm not sure how we do that.

Chris E: Here's another interesting part. Actually, the UW WSA chapter can and they are our group and we give them money through the star system and that actually pays our dues for the WSA but they can also be a group that is able to advocate. I don't think we want to play that game of are we in compliance or not. Genesis is nodding right now. It's one of those things we can get things together. There are those groups that can do that. I definitely know an RSO that was created that is called Save Metro or whatever will be able to mobilize. What we can offer is email lists, contact lists, and giving it to right people who can send it out.

Evan: Is there an RSO that you founded that we can fund them through FMB? We can't fund certain things but we can fund room reservations and things like that and I imagine ASUW can do that too.

Chris E: I'm happy to bring that back to Kyle Murphy who's hitting that up. Say if they need a room for a press conference, we can possibly do that.

Evan: It would be another application but it would just be another application and we can totally fund them.

Chris L: Is that it?

Chris E: That's all from me.

Chris L: Okay, Genesis.

Genesis: Okay, I finally got through our expenditures from last year and we actually went \$2000 over for our Fall Social budget but everything else is under budget and Higher Ed spent way below the allotted amount so based on our line items and allocations, everything is good. We have money. We overspent in one and underspent in another so it looks bad when we budget for things.

Evan: How did Fall Social go \$2000 over?

Genesis: Apparently we were misunderstanding where our food budget comes from or whether or not if it's already part of the approved budget of senate. I was told that I will have a totally separate account of where our food is paid out of.

Evan: Me too.

Genesis: Exactly, and then by the time we spent everything, they said, "No your \$4000 budget already includes food." That would've been nice to know so that we wouldn't have gone through Bay Laurel.

Evan: I was under that impression that money came from SAS.

Genesis: Exactly, but apparently its already built in to our budget.

Chris L: So we get our allocation from, in previous years, from different sources versus now, it comes from the Provost, which they give us \$20,000 a year which is already accounted for in the budget that we approve. It is not made clear what is our SAF allocation and what is our provost allocation.

Genesis: So in going to this year's budget process, we're going to make it clear that everything is in here and that there's no separate account that you're going to be funneling money from.

Chris E: Can I ask if that money is available to be reallocated? I'm asking this specifically if we as GPSS have \$300 budgeted for Lobby Day that we contribute. So when you think about 8 buses, refreshments and everything that goes into it. One of the things that they asked from us

is for more money if we can give it because they have less fees from the star programs or SAF. It's interesting to call it a partnership on Lobby Day when we only give 300 bucks.

Genesis: We can look at historical documents to see why its at \$300 when the Higher Ed Summit, which we do in some conjunction, why we have such a large budget for that and yet for Lobby Day, there's barely any money. So we can look back and see if there's a precedent that was set and why we only allocate that much money. FMB. So we have \$18,000 left over in our account. We had to send back two application this week to come back next week since one was not prepared and one didn't show up.

Evan: The library event? That looked pretty cool.

Genesis: Yes, we funded a library event and it was mostly grad students.

Evan: The RSO was grad students and the people attending that weren't grad students were potential employers.

Genesis: It was a good event for them and their program. Travel grants is looking good. We got a flood of emails for that. We're going to try and give away at least \$8000 this quarter since we were trying to budget giving away \$8000 every quarter whereas last quarter, we gave away \$4900. By the end of the school year, we're still going to have money left over. It's not about trying to give money away. It's also about the merit of their application. My assumption is that there will be more conferences that people will want to go to in the summer and the spring so we'll see more applications and approve more then. That's it.

Chris L: If you remember anything else, don't hesitate. Elisa?

Elisa: I don't have a whole lot. I sent out an email about all of our funding opportunities to the GPAs. Hopefully that will get out at least the opportunities that aren't just for GPSS senators including travel grants. Diversity Committee will be meeting next week to discuss our forum for this quarter. MLK Day was a great success. There's a new album on our Facebook page and there are a couple articles written in The Daily and another newspaper. Unfortunately, GPSS wasn't mentioned specifically. That's something we should think about next year. Advertising more that Gomap and GPSS are cosponsoring these sites because it just focused on United Way and the Carlson Center which it should because they're doing most of the facilitating for the event, but it'd be nice if GPSS is at least mentioned in The Daily since I interviewed with them and I did mention where I was from, but anyway, everything was a success.

Genesis: I remembered. FMB, we had a conversation trying to get the word out some more on our funding opportunities. We're looking at banners to hang on the side of Kane Hall. We're thinking that we're going to make it a generic banner, no date deadline so future FMBs can use it. We looked at putting an ad in The Daily but it was cost prohibitive. For a day, a full page ad was \$1,040 and that was their student rate for student organization. We're probably going to have

our banner ready by next week. I'm working with Rene to specifically target RSO leaders through their listserv.

Alex: Just an idea, when we send out a Law School GPSS update, we include links to the GPSS website. Maybe if there was a little pitch and ask all the senators to forward it to their constituents. I mean more we can harass them.

Genesis: I think we can copy and paste the email that Elisa did to the GPAs and use that as the same thing to forward to their constituents to say that there's funding.

Elisa: You mean to senators?

Alex: Yeah.

Elisa: It'll be going out tonight.

Alex: Okay.

Evan: Have we ever thought about looking at the past groups we funded and seeing if we haven't funded them yet, maybe sending them an email?

Genesis: Yeah, I think from the past, we'll see those coming up. Based on the fund balance sheet, it's pretty much looking like it's in the same order. We'll see more in the coming weeks.

Chris L: Okay, stuff I'm working on. First thing is I finally got both of my committees up and running. One is led the very enthusiastic Peacefull Dawn Roscoe. Academic and Administrative Affairs is suppose to meet tonight but I don't know what happened.

Alica: No, the poll was for two weeks from now. She was getting our information and availability and schedule it when it's good for everyone.

Chris L: Okay. A lot of stuff for that committee. Right now, there's major revision to intellectual property policy on campus that potentially can affect grad students. So we have two appointees on the relevant faculty committees. SKPC and IPMC. Hopefully they'll be able to come in and give an update.

Evan: That'll be important.

Chris L: I'll ask the other officers now if you have committees that haven't been started yet, I ask that you do. I know Student Life has been a battle but there have been major changes to the ship program and by that I mean it no longer exists.

Alex: It doesn't exist anymore?

Chris L: It's gone.

Alex: I finally got an answer to that. I was harassing people all over and couldn't get an answer.

Chris E: We talked about it in our Higher Ed Summit.

Chris L: That's right. The good thing is that now they want feedback, which is after the fact. I'll connect you with Austin. That might be a good way to spur people into action. But other committees since we need to get the Committee Coordinating Board together and Austin is initially chairing as University Affairs Director so if you haven't already, assemble your committees and please designate someones who would be willing to be contacted to come together as the CCB. Internally, we are planning on meeting with all of the senators in groups that more or less adhere to areas of study and we're going to try and get a sense and vibe of what they get out of the senate and what we can be doing to give them more value. His initial estimate was 30 meetings and has revised that down to just over 20 meetings so it's going to be quite a few.

Evan: That's ambitious but cool.

Chris L: That is Austin for you. We also are starting kicking off our international graduate focus groups. We still need to do some outreach on that but we finalized all the questions and this is a project that Austin is very interested in doing. He'll be facilitating those in conjunction with Laura our Special Assistant to the President. Student Life is very interested in the data we collect because it's a big priority for Denzil Suite and his team.

Genesis: Didn't Denzil also give us money to facilitate the focus groups and everything?

Chris L: Yes he did. Denzil has pledged a nominal amount of money for refreshments at these focus groups which is great because we can't do it and that'll get people to come. We'll also be convening a round table of more staff and faculty that work with international students as part of this initiative. That's a little bit further down the line. The other communications working group among our staff is made up of Anya, Joey and Austin. You've seen emails from them. They have a memo on communication policies. I don't know if it was all of exec. Maybe it was just staff and officers. The idea is we're creating a coherent internal communications policy that includes notifying when things get posted on social media and one person is one top of all that and they can be facilitating the messaging so it's not just a free for all. There's no duplication of effort so that's a positive step. We met today with the Graduate School Communications Specialist and we talked with her about some strategies and also about partnering with them more tightly to message their events and them to message our events. That was a really good thing. This is a project we've been working on since the Fall so it's really nice to see it move forward and come to fruition as a policy and as a set of recommendations. We're also talking about the committee information flow and how that will work once we have our theoretical full committee structure up and running which we haven't for several years so we're still trying to

make a system that hasn't been utilized. The vision is we have all our appointees scattered to the winds. They will all report to the chairs of GPSS committees that are affiliated with them. So Academic and Administrative Affairs and the faculty councils that touch on that. Then we have the Research Council, Council of Libraries, etc. The chairs of those committees will filter that to University Affairs Director who will make quarterly reports to the senate and the chairs can as they see fit, come to senate and present information not only from their university committees but from their own committees as well. We're just trying to think of a way so that little information gets lost so that we can centralize the information gathering as much as possible and also so the having a reporting structure that is present.

Alex: Is there an idea of eventually, I know its hard to ask for volunteers, but preference to members of those committees for built in overlap? Like have some overlaps. Maybe a person we appoint to the faculty council is a member of the relevant committee?

Chris L: As it turns out, that is in the bylaws. Members of faculty councils, for example, Teaching and Learning and Academic Standards are suppose to be members of Academic and Administrative Affairs. That is something that was 100% ignored last year.

Alex: It's hard to make it happen to find people who can do both, but if you can, it helps.

Chris L: Yeah, we're trying very hard to do that. That's another reminder to the officers to look through the bylaws, look through your committees and make sure those connections are there because that is really going to help insure continuity and also information getting to the right place. Continuity in terms of succession over time. I guess the peer mentoring group. We met yesterday and we are forging full steam ahead. We're going to start bringing administrators around campus and dive in and start thinking about what that will look like. I have a great group of people. They are really gung-ho about it and finally, on topic of the Higher Education Summit. So I don't remember what I said about it to this group but the first day of the Higher Education Summit this year where we talked about pay it forward went really well. The second day was not a success. Not because of the panels. They were fantastic. We had virtually no turn out. That is something that I take full responsibility. There were a lot of mistakes that I made and milestones I missed out and a lot of steps that I could've taken to make that more of a success. So in April, partially because we underspend that budget by so much, we're going to be doing what Sanne, our Events Planner, so accurately labeled Higher Ed Redux which is essentially going to be a mulligan and redo of the panels, the one on the Affordable Care Act and how it affects students. That one because the information was so good and no one was there to hear it. We had a great panel that was extremely informative and the idea is not to debate the merits of ACA. It's law and at this point, it's not going away so this is what you can expect. Since we're trying very hard to make this a success, we already booked a room so save the date. April 15th, which is also Tax Day, which was the only day we could get the Walker Ames Room. We didn't want to do it on a Wednesday or a Friday or other awkward days of the week. The reason why I think it's funny that it's on Tax Day is that we put this on and people will somehow connect the dots and stage of protest against ACA because it's Tax Day. That's the date. We're having

conversations and Laura is the active staff point on this. We'll be doing a lot of outreach to Health & Sciences to make sure we do it right this time. We'll be doing outreach to virtually everyone we can think of and also thinking through our advertising which a lot will be done through affiliated departments.

Alex: I mean, it affects everyone.

Chris L: The idea is how it affects students.

Alex: As an old student, if you need it.

Chris L: Potentially and in the evening. All of these things that will as much as possible remove the issues we had last time.

Genesis: I think we can find someone in a class that can find this as their instructional material. It worked well for us for the marijuana thing because one of the FOSEP people was a part of a class and made them come.

Chris E: I was going to say that that is the key. Both Rene and Christina talked about tying it an organization like FOSEP or some committee because that's what's going to make them show up, not because they're necessarily interested. I think people are available. At least have our exec or staff come and sit there. How we get people to come is by groups.

Alex: Also, I think it'll be a big enough deal so we can have GPSS senators tell their constituents. Kind of a briefing of ships going away and this is our options. I've talked to people about it and planning on what they were going to sign up for exchange or ship again. I had a lot of discussion with classmates on what they're going to do and we debated and I talked to the university about what the options were but nobody seemed to know.

Chris L: That's good to know. That provides an extra impetus to have a clue to what's going on. That's pretty much all I have. Any questions for any of us?

Alex: Is the peer mentoring have anything to do with the mental health initiative?

Chris L: It's intertwined. I call it mental wellness that's been taking the form of peer mentoring. If there are no more questions, we'll move on to announcements.

Genesis: Valentine's Day Mixer posters are available in the office so you can go post those around. We also have hand bills.

Chris L: Tomorrow evening, there's two events going on that might be of interest. One is the Career School's program, Getting Hired with a Grad Degree, which is going to have a panel including a former GPSS president which I was notified of today which is something we talked

about in our communications meeting. It'll be Adam Grubb. That and the other event that's going on is a mixer for grad students at the Henry Art Gallery.

Genesis: Tomorrow from 4 to 7.

Chris L: I'm definitely going to the Getting Hired one. So any other announcements? I'll then entertain a motion to adjourn.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Executive Meeting Minutes
February 5th, 2014
HUB 303

Chris Lizotte (President): I will call this meeting to order at 6:30pm. I'll entertain a motion to move item 8a, the Vice President's report to item 3b essentially or after item 3.

Alex Bolton (Law): So moved.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? So now I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? I will now entertain a motion to approve the minutes from the January 22nd Executive Committee meeting.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? Okay, Chris.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): So, quick Lobby Day update. We ended up with 47 people signed up which is actually a really good number considering that overall there was maybe 110, 15 of which are ASUW and OGR employees. So I think in raw numbers, we probably actually beat them. There is a poster session being set up. It works best if we move that to Friday. We now have four speakers set up. One from protein design, one from clean energy and one from molecular biology as well as a student at the Evans School who's doing some work with a PhD student in economics. Those four speakers are set to go. We also got paired with 3 to 4 poster presenters. The idea is that also clean energy and Evans and anyone else who wants to give some posters, we can get those and add them to the room. So that event will now be from 11am-1pm, next Friday. There will also be some coordination that Chris has done on some interest on the WSA Lobby Day on the 14th. We'll have one van or two and the idea would be to go and do our event, wrap it up and come home. This might be a better footprint for us as we move forward to really focus on a research presentation and maybe even make it a little bigger and have around 30 students who go and do a really great research presentation and come home. This will obviously all be boundaries of logistics, day and timing aside. I think it became in the best interest to separate the two so there is no confusion of what is Lobby Day versus what is a poster session and how they work together and then distinguishing those and pulling

people out for our own accord and seeing what those messages would be. In the long run, it's seeming to me that our needs and differences are different enough that if people want to go to the ASUW Lobby Day, that's awesome and this is obviously up to whoever is here next year but I recommend to move forward with this small event. I see students every day on campus who are there with their program whether that's pharmacy, library sciences, social work, the real estate guild...

Chris L: Wait you mean the capitol campus?

Chris E: Yes, the capitol campus. I'll go by and see people in their lab coats and pins and shirts and say "UW is awesome! Let me tell you who I am." Just let me know. I think it's more important that people are interested in what they do and be a part of that and that we are aware. Actually 100 students in different programs took part in a lobby day. It seems to work better. We brought up some good thing. Even feedback from Alice that people getting away and trying to spend a whole day is tough so I think we learned a lot of good things but we also have some solid showing ideas from that. I'll also add that Science & Policy working right now to do an encore workshop specifically targeting our presenters for next Friday and also whoever else wants to go but trying to really make that work will be a nice addition.

Chris L: How was the orientation?

Chris E: We didn't have a lot of people but the people that were there got a lot out of it. I think what we're really getting down to is the home stretch. Talking to Anya and Jake and things are really good now is that ASUW is feeling the pressure to fill groups and team. That's becoming internal. We had an idea that it was suppose to be at 8AM. There was an email that was sent out that said 7:30 so does that matter? Since we have different lobby agendas, we're not talking about bills. We're talking about value. Do our students need to be about the part of an hour long orientation of what their bills are? We're still along the ride so we make the best of it but we understand the differences and take everything with grain of salt. We're there to be a presence and everyone's working hard and that's the most important and not getting caught in the weeds. One of the things last year was getting caught in the weeds of we're going to do this and we're going to do that. It's not a fair critique of how these things come together because it's moving parts and tying things together. I think we're lucky that ASUW works as hard as they do and let us be a part of it.

Chris L: Questions for Chris?

Alice: Are you going to advertise next week? We should probably set a day for the workshops next week. Do you want to do a poll of the people that are going to the poster session and see what day and time works best for them or do you want me to just pick a date and time and hope that everyone shows up?

Chris E: So I'm working on sending an email out right now to the people that are specifically

going to be part of that presentation and lay that out and I'll copy you so you see who the people are and feel free to follow up and give them details. It might be easier to give the date rather than doing back and forth. What I'm doing right now is I have to send that out before I send an email to all the people that signed up because the people that are part of this presentation are part of the mass email that goes out to all lobby day stuff so is it still on tomorrow? I need to send something to them that's really clear and then as we move forward as we move into Friday and into next week, really hitting the legislatures hard. Also moving the date is a really big win for us since Friday is a cut-off so everything's busy. Next Friday, they're planning to be on the floor. Everything is wide open for schedules except for a possible floor session. So it's a really good opportunity. Also, I wanted to say that we have State Relations and Margaret and Patrick have been working with us. They have food for us at the event so they really were essential to making the connections for next week for protein and clean energy and without the department heads really leaning on students. I don't think we could make that happen..

Chris L: I promise the people who contacted me separately. Anything else?

Alice: I think rather than following them up separately, could you just include in your email to them?

Chris E: Sure, but what I need to say at this point is that it will be sometime next week and ask what day works best but unless we have a room right now, I need to send that email out in the next 20 minutes or so.

Chris L: So you guys will figure that out.

Alice: Sure.

Chris L: So we'll move on to item 4. Unfortunately, Josh Kavanagh and I had a miscommunication. I told him we were meeting at 6:30 this week and 5:30 next week but he understood it as 5:30 this week. So he will not be here but if you flip to your information section, past the budget. So there's two documents. One is the finance report. We'll skip that for the moment and the next is the summary. Essentially, the proposal that is being considered right now or is being offered right now is that the u-pass fee actually only pays for part of it. The rest of it is from, and you can look at the funding item, is institutional support which comes from administration. The administration has actually pledged to scale their contribution with the cost of the program with gratuity which is great. These are costs that are not associated with actual Transportation Service. For example, salaries for people that work with the u-pass program in Transportation Services and so on. The City of Seattle grant, which apparently is nothing, and the other item is the TDM fee. TDM is Transportation Demand Management fee. It's surcharges collected at parking and it is by the Regents and Transportation Services. So with the universal u-pass, the decision was made to allocate that TDM fee to both student u-pass program and the faculty and staff u-pass program and the way it was distributed was on a per capita basis. In other words, students being much more numerous than faculty. Anyway, the bottom line is that

students got a disproportionate share of the TDM right now. If you look at the financial report the student u-pass program is in the black. This year it's estimated to have a 1.3 million dollar surplus. The u-pass stabilization fund which is the pool of money to even out the bumps is at \$4.5 million so we're sitting pretty. The faculty and staff, not so much. They're \$500,000 on the negative side. Reallocating the TDM fee on a cost basis. So the proportional cost of the two separate u-pass programs rather than proportional participation. So reallocating it on the cost basis rather than on a per capita participation basis allows the u-pass faculty and staff program to operate with a very slim positive margin. It's on the last page. It says budgeted surplus \$20,000. The result of this is that our surplus for the student program drops to about \$700,000 at the end of the year. We still have an ending balance of \$4.5 million so we're still good. There will be no increase in the u-pass fee at least next year. In subsequent years, it's impossible to say particularly with the financial instability that Metro is facing but it was made clear to me that any increases in the u-pass fee is not because of the reallocation. For example, Metro is thinking of a 25 cent fare increase. We do lose out by taking a little bit away of our cushion but it helps keep the faculty and staff program afloat. One critique is that the faculty and staff program is not universal therefore not sustainable in the long run. At one point they will have to do what students did and make the choice to go universal or not or just drop the program.

Alex: They did a major rehaul of the faculty and staff side of the program a year ago. Did you see anything of the numbers since they changed the program? It used to be that if you qualified for the program and the u-pass like being able to do carpools or commuter ticket which the faculty and staff can buy, and then they got a rid of the requirement and anyone can get it if they had a u-pass or not. The senate structure used to be that people buy u-passes and now it's more like the byproduct separate and not driving people towards the u-pass.

Chris L: He did not say anything about that. Genesis?

Genesis: Point of clarification, what this presentation is telling us is that they're going to take money from the surplus and move it over to the faculty and staff portion so they don't run a deficit?

Chris L: Exactly. The thing that I highlighted is that no money is being taken from the u-pass fee, the \$76 dollars. Nothing is being taken from that.

Genesis: So they're just moving money within an account essentially?

Chris L: They're taking another source of revenue and reallocating it. Basically the faculty and staff program is expensive to run because there is less participation so they're reallocating it based on the cost of the program rather than the number of participants.

Genesis: So then the student u-pass or fee is going to essentially supplement or subsidize the faculty and staff?

Chris L: I wouldn't say that.

Genesis: Why wouldn't it though? Because you're taking money from the student u-pass that's in their fund balance or account and moving it over to the staff so they don't run a deficit.

Chris L: It's not taking money away from the account. It's just reallocating the money that will be credited to the account. The other reason is that the money going to the student side is already disproportionate to the cost of the program.

Genesis: I don't have a problem. I just wanted clarification.

Chris L: I want to mention two things. First of all, this is for our information. We're not asked to act on it unless we so strongly object to it that we want to bring a resolution forward. In exchange, they're exploring two options to help compensate. One is additional parking solutions including metered parking on campus, a possible parking discount for students and a couple other things or bike improvements. I don't know what that means but I think there is a bike sharing program lurking around. We had it in my college and talk about tragedy of the commons. They're exploring way to compensate for this reallocation.

Alice: But if they're taking it away from a surplus and they're saying that it won't affect us anyway, why do they feel the need to compensate?

Chris L: We started having this discussion last summer. To be honest, I was always feeling that it would be fine. Kutz felt a little bristled but I think he's more or less on board now. Josh thinks it's important to have good political capital with students. I think he genuinely cares. He really wants to be an advocate for students for whatever reason. Any other questions?

Rene Singleton (SAO Officer): Is the reception that everyone has is this change permanent or one time thing?

Chris L: This is a permanent change.

Genesis: Permanent change from taking money from the student's side and reallocating so that the staff doesn't run at a deficit or just for now so they're in the black?

Chris L: Permanent change is taking this other source of revenue and changing the way it's allocated.

Genesis: So it's not a one time allocation?

Chris L: No, it's changing the mix.

Genesis: Giving them a bigger slice of the pie.

Chris L: Giving them a bigger share of this source of revenue that comes in department fees. Any questions? So at some point I've asked them to present to the senate. Again, we're not asked to act on but I felt that it should be brought to our attention. We should at least know. I will say that all 3 of our representatives on the u-pass advisory board are fine. I'm fine but I felt that we should because the the u-pass program has come under such heavy criticism for being that was something that was negotiated behind closed doors which is totally misplaced but people still have that perception. I just wanted this relatively minor change is out in the open so that's the issue. So if there are no questions on that, we'll move ahead to our main presentation which is the review of the budget. Genesis, before we start, I think what might be helpful is to explain our role vis a vis Finance & Budget's role in this process.

Genesis: So I asked the officers to give me changes for their budgets which I then put into this draft and then changed the personnel pay rates in line with the GSA schedule. There's not really any major changes on this first draft which is worksheet one. I think Natalie put it as the second one. So what you're looking at is just officer changes or requests that they like to make on their budget. Then FMB looked at this to make sure that all the numbers made sense and everything matched up and clarified our general fund balance. Exec's role tonight is to decide how much we want to ask SAF for money. At what level do we want to request money? Just a reminder, last year SAF asked us to spend down our general fund. That's why they didn't fund us at our full operating expenses. If you look at the last page, this year we're on track to spend \$418,000 which puts us in the red by \$70,000 and SAF only funding us at \$348,000.

Evan: So just making sure I'm reading this right, minus the \$70,000 and with all predicted expenses, we'll end up with \$124,000 in our general fund and then next year's budget is to not run a deficit at all so we'll just keep that \$124,000 right between what we should have.

Genesis: That's assuming that SAF will funding us at 100% of our request.

Evan: So we're not asking them to pump our general fund back up at all?

Genesis: No, we're just keeping at normal levels. If you look at this version, our expense will only go up because pay rates will go up for officers and tuition waivers go up like 5%. That's the main increase for next year's estimated expenses.

Evan: But we have a decrease in our expenses. \$418,000 to \$411,000. We're actually cutting costs this year

Genesis: Are you looking up at the second worksheet?

Chris L: Can you explain which because we have two.

Alice: Can you walk us through this?

Genesis: Yes. The first version, if you look at the last page, the expenses should be \$437,207. That's version 1. Version two will be the other one.

Evan: What's the difference between the two?

Genesis: Version 2 is so when SAF doesn't give us the extra \$10,000 for special allocations. This version two, I went ahead and decreased funding for events, summits, different socials and stuff.

Evan: So this is the contract between what we like and bare bones?

Genesis: Yes.

Evan: So the first one's bare bones, the second one is the other one?

Genesis: Yes. So the worksheet one is keeping everything at its current level. No cuts to anyone. No cuts to social programs whatsoever. Version two is cutting back a lot just so they don't look at our increase in request but they didn't fund us that much. We're going to go through worksheet one. Administration, if you look at that I only increased officer materials and incidental services. We had a lot of our staff choose to have business cards and that racked up a lot of costs. This is just a lot of things of people getting started in their positions. This is assuming that that will happen again next year. So I just increased the allocation for that. Committee funds stay the same. President's fund, you see his conference travel go up by \$1,000. This was disproportionate to the VP's conference travel and we wanted to make it equal. Did you want to talk about that?

Chris L: Yes, Chris and I discussed about this a little bit. So generally speaking, there are more opportunities for conferences that the president would attend versus the VP. I don't think that's a general rule. That's what I observed this year.

Chris E: This is what I envisioned and Rene you can clear this up. That money is specifically for the SAGE Fall Summit and or Lobby Day with SAGE. The reason why there's more money in my account is I generally pay for the travel of the two SAGE delegate to DC.

Rene: For some years, what you said is true. Other years, two of the delegates had been paid by the president's budget. The Lobby Day expense generally come from you and all the travel you may have and any kind of expense from Olympia generally come from VP but your positions for funds and money put in for travel, that is to say. Some years, people didn't want to go to SAGE. They went to that other group in Los Angeles.

Chris E: USSA,

Chris L: NAGPSS

Rene: NAGPSS and SAGE. Because you used to go to NAGPSS all the time then you went to SAGE. I think there was only one time that you guys were playing with USSA.

Chris E: That's what's in the budget.

Rene: You can choose where you're going next year. It's a different call for the kind of things that people need to do because of your titles but you're going to end up with something that's going to get you out. The only thing that seems to get you to DC for the most part is SAGE. NAGPSS I thought was handled in different places and I think that's why you guys got out of it because you wanted more of a federal experience.

Chris L: The reason is because that covers graduate students from all sorts of institutions and SAGE is specifically large public research institutions.

Rene: NAGPSS is exclusive.

Chris E: Super cool and prestigious.

Chris L: In terms of funding the SAGE delegates in a sense, it doesn't matter who is funding. It ends up being equitable. The VP has more, then the VP pays for both or the president pays for one. The VP pays for one and we each pay for ourselves.

Rene: I would just put an asterisk notes of what you decide in side of your final version so whoever gets elected next year can see what your intentions were.

Chris L: This is not a \$1,000 of new funding. I think this is \$1,000 reallocated.

Genesis: Yes, it's just moved.

Chris E: For the president to use as he wishes.

Genesis: No it's for conferences. Mainly for SAGE and stuff that you guys do together.

Evan: So it doesn't matter who's funding it.

Chris L: I'm not wedded to the change. I've observed this year that as it turns out, NAGPSS is bugging me to go to their regional conference in LA but like you said SAGE has been a relatively constant thing. NAGPSS, we haven't been involved for awhile and we may not so it's hard to predict and if the money stays in the VP fund, I think that's fine. Just in that case, next year VP will take on both SAGE delegates.

Evan: It sounds like to me, no matter where the money ends up, there's no actual change. Either the VP or the president will use that for the SAGE delegates.

Chris L: Presidents can choose to go on their own or more conference on his or her own for example.

Alex: And without it you wouldn't be able to or possibly won't be able to.

Chris L: Another thing for example, I went to the WSA thing in Eastern that didn't involve a flight but you drive. Things like that as well

Rene: Also include next year's advocate. Do you know where?

Alex: Pullman.

Rene: We need to build that in because everything is always the same and some years certain things come up like budget years so you need to keep that in mind because that determines a little bit of how the state does things.

Genesis: Who would go to Apple Cup?

Rene: Sometimes the president goes.

Chris L: Going on the administration's expense.

Rene: In part.

Genesis: With Board of Regents right?

Rene: Board of Regents but if students wanted to have a meeting in that timeframe for some other reason that would give you the flexibility to do that too because they know people are going back and forth and that's main point for me.

Chris E: I think Rene brings up a big thing. One of my top considerations is that we won't be using this money. It will be used by other people. We need to give them the ability and tools to make the decision themselves. Whether we put it in a line or not and stipulate it and say "Hey, this is extra. We're thinking of you and putting \$500 out there." That doesn't mean it's going to be spent. I'm more prone to say if we want to, let's add a \$1,000 straight up to president's travel line and keep the VP the same with that consideration that the \$1,000 is for X, Y and Z and if it's not used, it goes to the general fund.

Chris L: Another possible solution, and I don't want to hold this up because this is a relatively minor thing for me, would be to put all travel budgets in one travel budget that both officers can draw from.

Genesis: Just split it right down the middle. If we're going to put it in one budget, just split it down

the middle.

Chris E: I think there's also the idea of flexibility that there's a pool of money and they decide to use it. I will say that Chris, we're very lucky to have him because he's way more inclined to go things that I know Adam didn't go to last year because he spent a lot less money but I think it's for them to decide what's good. If it's possible to say this is a separate travel account for lobbying and also gives them the freedom to take a staff member or maybe the secretary or treasurer because the president and VP are unavailable.

Evan: I think it can be lumped to a pool in administration. We already have a social one so just have a pool of travel budget for extra UW outings.

Genesis: So we're creating a new line item.

Alice: Before we create a new line item in the budget because I feel that if we can keep it simpler, we can. Is there a really important reason to create a line item?

Genesis: Just creating one pool of money.

Alice: Rather than having it in both?

Genesis: Yeah. So both VP and the president know that there's \$8,000 to work with, decide ahead of time and between each other what conferences they will go to and what to prioritize. Doesn't matter who's going to pay for what because it's coming from one budget, from one fund stream.

Evan: Takes it out of one executive officer fund and puts it so any officer can use it.

Rene: Question, let's assume that the people that are elected hate each other, if you put a certain amount of money in both of the funds and the difference that you're trying to expand here in this new line item, potentially they would be happy but if you have personality problem... You can save you some trouble.

Chris L: We're not proposing to add money.

Genesis: No it's all money that's still here.

Rene: If you look at those, that would be the third place.

Evan: So if people hate each other the most safest way is to split it down the middle?

Rene: Yes. The president has theirs and the VP has theirs. Parts of it is how you do your job but maybe the other pool is the optional thing or the new things that come up. You can have a

power play with money big time.

Genesis: Then evenly splitting it down the middle is a good idea if we're considering personality differences.

Rene: Just in case.

Alex: What kind of pool are we talking about? \$2500 each and \$1000 in the third?

Genesis: Total conference travel is \$6,500.

Evan: \$3,250 each plus possibly a pool.

Alex: But we're not necessarily doing a pool anymore.

Evan: No.

Chris E: These are just carving out the VP budget and putting it back in the president's budget and the president creating a pool?

Genesis: Are you just totally opposed to taking the \$1000 from your budget and giving it to the president's budget?

Chris E: No, I guess I'll just be quiet.

Genesis: No, I just wanted to know where you're coming from.

Chris E: We both just talked about if you take \$1000 from the president's budget that evens both accounts. Then you can move that money to the pool that we're talking about.

Evan: I see what you mean.

Genesis: So if I take a thousand from the VP's budget and put it in a pool, the president's budget is still disproportionate to the VP's budget.

Chris E: Alright, then make them equal. Sorry I didn't have that number. I thought it was \$2,500 and \$3,500.

Alex: That's what I thought too.

Chris E: Which equals \$6,000 which I thought was the number was.

Chris L: As it is right now, president \$2,500, VP \$4,000.

Chris E: Okay, so we'll do \$2,500 a piece and \$1,500 for a pool.

Genesis: Does everyone agree with that?

Chris L: Sure, works for me.

Evan: Either way. Depends if you want to play it safe.

Chris L: I should preface this by something. In a sense, it doesn't matter what we think. We're just passing this budget.

Genesis: Right, we're just trying to anticipate stuff for next year.

Chris L: I'm reminding myself as much as everyone else.

Evan: In view of planning it safely as possible, I think Rene made the good point to not have a pool because then you can power play on it.

Chris E: I guess my thing on this is historically like I'm saying, Chris is a lot more involved than a normal president would be and we look at these things and go "Yeah, that's nice." But in reality, usually the VP is bigger because they go to WSA and all these things. It should carry that because of responsibilities, that travel line should be bigger for the VP. I'm able to throw it up because I'm all for flexibility. I like that but I think what we end up doing is we get in this idea that we think is really great and then we're putting restrictions or hampering what someone is going to do next year. We can wash our hands and laugh at it and say good luck and put them in that position.

Chris L: We can just leave it the way it is.

Genesis: Status quo?

Chris L: Status quo.

Genesis: No additional \$1,000 for you?

Chris L: If it really comes down to it, there's nothing preventing it other than the two people hating each other. There's nothing preventing the president to ask the VP, "Can I take something out of your travel budget?"

Evan: Or can you pay for my SAGE delegates?

Chris L: So I think in that scenario and the interest of not prolonging this discussion on a relatively minor item.

Chris E: I could be wrong but I think there's flexibility in this too. No matter what the line says, as long as we're underneath our budget, we're pretty well.

Alex: How are you looking on your budget?

Chris E: I don't know. We went to SAGE. I'm closer on my travel to Olympia.

Alex: Are you feeling it as a bumper holding you?

Chris E: No, no at all. Here's the thing. We go to SAGE and we might have extra in that but just because I didn't use it, doesn't mean whoever next year might see something or be more ambitious about searching those things out.

Alice: So do we have any sort of data to look at as for the actual spending goes from previous years or this year like the first quarter that we can look at? Looking at this, I can say, "Sure that looks fine" but for how much is actually being spent, I don't feel like I'm in a position to say what is good or not good because I don't know.

Genesis: I can get all of our current expenses for you.

Chris L: Maybe if you have an idea off the top of your head.

Genesis: So Chris hasn't hit half of his conference travel yet.

Chris E: But I'll be paying for logistically, three people to go to DC in April.

Genesis: Right.

Alex: Which is half your money, almost.

Evan: Can we go to the next item and leave this as a status quo?

Genesis: Yes, so there's nothing else changed in the president's budget. VP's budget. Chris, do you want to justify or explain for job resources?

Chris E: So the job resources thing. This is the idea that I will make the case that I think there's plenty of people that don't think I do enough or stay in contact enough and so I pay an extra \$50 a month past what I used to have to be able to have a smartphone. So that's just the difference to be able to have a smartphone. I didn't add in the cost to buy a smartphone. Maybe it's one of those things. Maybe there's an expectation that people have it. On the other end, if they don't it's a nice thing and I would call that a resource that you need to do your job. There's \$40 a month on that. There's also about \$100. I'm working with the bookstore right now. I had a conversation with Genesis about how we work with the bookstore to do this. On the other hand, I had several

conversations on how we do that and it was left to me to do it. In the end, it's easier to give \$150 to buy a tie and a sports pin and a polo shirt. Again, it's not something I'm tied to. I'm just saying that I think it's important to what the VP is and the job that it's tied to. They do help the community. If it doesn't get used, it doesn't get used. It does stipulate that there would be receipts so if people didn't feel the need to do that, they don't have to but looking forward, it's an interesting thing. It's not necessarily something I'm tied to. I threw it in there because it's my prerogative as a budget request.

Genesis: I want to give the exec some background on the conversation we had and where FMB stands with pushing back on this job resources. What Chris mentioned is reimbursement to buy a tie and a pin. This benefits only one person. You can't leave that with this position to go on to the next person. It only benefits one person and that's not the purpose of SAF fees. It has to benefit the entire student community, not just one person. That was FMB's thought process on this.

Evan: As far as the cellphone bill goes, I don't think that falls into the same category because you can't take the data plan with him without continuing to pay for it basically so that one would be okay. Office supplies is okay but with that one I agree.

Genesis: For office supplies, there is a line item for correspondence stuff which can be expanded if that's the case, but to buy clothing items or items that can't be transferred to future officers...

Chris E: Just an idea, how much do we spend on printing up posters for events?

Genesis: We spend like \$100 to print at least 30 to 50 per event.

Chris E: So that's a pretty good chunk and nobody's using those again. My impression is that for this idea of benefiting one person is interesting to me. As a representative for the graduate students, the VP is on the community, we're pulling people from Olympia and being able to identify by having UW colors is an important thing. So that's a distinguishable trait that can be seen so I think that does benefit all students even if it's on a small scale.

Evan: I guess it should be said that FMB agreed that it was a good idea as a whole but we just can't use SAF money for it because it will continue to benefit you on student dollars after the position, but we still like the idea so I don't know if we got anywhere of thinking of ways to get it.

Genesis: We talked about talking to the bookstore and coordinating something with them because the bookstore is independent of our fees and they can donate whatever they want. We have no control over that. So if you can work something out with the bookstore, that's totally fine. You just can't use our fees.

Chris L: My understanding is that the question is somewhat mute because we cannot use this

money to buy things.

Evan: Argument or no, we can't.

Chris E: Let's put it this way then. Noted, we can take the line out, but it should be important on the combined front for all officers that we look at these things. I do know that the bookstore provides certain items to GPSS. I've had this conversation for the last six months about how we should go on a united effort on this and it hasn't happened so I'm pursuing it on my own now. I think it's an important things that we look at or encourage. Maybe it might help to have the conversation now for next year and help the officers even that much more.

Genesis: I think you need to be clear on what you want from the bookstore. What are you expecting to get from the bookstore? The same swag that the president gets that was negotiated independent from us? I just don't know what you're asking for.

Chris E: A sweatshirt, a polo, a pin. I think there should be a determination for what should be base things that officers can wear to represent GPSS. Maybe that's a GPSS logo on this stuff. I think that as it goes forward, we talk about these negotiations, let's have that be more broad.

Evan: Just as far as taking out the line item as a whole goes, I don't think we need to do that. I do like the idea of considering increasing the VP's data plan whether that's increasing the amount that's being used or upgrading someone to an internet data plan because I can understand how you couldn't do that without a smartphone.

Rene: You guys gone back in forth on your notion of what you can and can't do. There are ways for phones to be a part of people's jobs. That can be covered in some respects. The advertising for GPSS is a way for you to be able to do events. You can take a cue from the undergrads. They took a t-shirt and put ASUW all over it. It is part of advertising. GPSS has not organize itself enough to think that far ahead about those things but perhaps you guys can lead the way to do that. I think that would give you a little bit of what he's getting at in a way. It's very narrow but it can be used for advertising. The option of you is to use your contacts. They're not promising you the moon but they have not given you anything and that money comes from off-site and I can come and help you guys out out you have to get it.

Elisa Law (Secretary): I think that's a great compromise. I mean using it for the advertising budget.

Evan: We have to formally get something going. It's not like an off-thing that you can just write into the budget. You have to get everything moving on that.

Alex: For next year?

Evan: At think at some point, someone has to. You can't just write it under the advertising

budget. You have to have the knowledge of what you're using and have specifics to see if they fit the guidelines.

Rene: Are we talking about shirts?

Evan: Yes.

Rene: You need time to plan it and it has to be legitimate. You can't just list it as print shirt. That's something that's always available for you but it sound like people want something that's a little more high end. If you guys think you need GPSS sport jackets, I think that can be organized. You can contact others about starting a different tradition. In terms of the positions that they give you, it's based on some kind of tradition. You didn't ask for those things. So I don't think you want to interfere with those things. Maybe with the sponsorship people, like that men's clothing store you might want to get in on that and do something for officers.

Chris L: So budget wise...

Alice: What if we took this idea of needing potential resources? Say for example, somebody already comes in with a smartphone then this money's just sitting there. What if we moved it into officer materials and administration? Or creating a line item in administration for officer resource fund just in case you need something to get started on the job? That way, it can be used for any officers if they needed something?

Genesis: Rene, what was done in the past when there were cell phones in the line items?

Rene: GPSS paid for cellphones for students. They would purchase cell phones and pay a rental fee.

Chris E: From UW?

Rene: Yes, the senate had a problem with that and took it away from you guys. They voted on the spot and that's the only line item they took out. That was the coup. They were not happy about it. If you go back in your notes, you'll find it in there. They thought that the officers we're being greedy.

Chris E: In that same vein, personally I think it'll be easier to have a UW phone. One it protects against misuse and two it's good to have those things separate so you have your own number that you can put on things.

Alex: You really want two phones?

Chris E: I think it's cleaner.

Evan: A lot of people prefer two phones.

Chris E: If i know if its only for work.

Genesis: So this is going on the assumption that the next VP is going to need a stipend or reimbursement for their cell phone services.

Evan: Where I'm coming from with the idea that they might is that only the two most minor carriers out of the four major carriers provide unlimited data. Verizon and AT&T are the most largest and most reliable outside of Seattle and they also have a tiered data plan. So the VP would start going into another tier which will be \$40 extra a month.

Genesis: We can call this a cell phone stipend?

Evan: That would be a data stipend but what Chris is suggesting will also work. I would be willing to pitch it to the senate. It's a different senate so they might have a different outlook on it.

Genesis: So it will be a data plan stipend. We're going to clarify that.

Alice: Is there some way that we can lump it in with internet?

Alex: It's a broad communication thing. It also allows too if someone doesn't need to bump up their data plan.

Chris E: Maybe they don't use it. This is the other thing. I have a budget for internet but I found a place that's actually cheaper than the rent allowed and includes internet.

Evan: Is the internet cost not at the office? It's more general?

Chris E: That's for when I'm in Olympia, so I can have internet.

Evan: Then that case, lumping it into internet costs will be justified.

Alice: I have a question. I thought that the budget covered the VP to have housing in Olympia.

Chris E: It does.

Alice: Why is that not included here?

Chris E: It's a part of the travel expenses. If you look at the breakdown of note 1.

Genesis: So then are we going to bump up internet cost from \$500?

Alex: Don't forget that there's going to be more than 3 months rent next year with the longer session too which would also mean more internet and more data.

Evan: I would use Chris's \$40 a month for 12 months figure.

Genesis: It would be \$580 plus internet costs?

Evan: It would be \$480 plus \$200 so \$680.

Genesis: Chris, are you not using all of your rent?

Chris E: That's correct. My rent is \$600 which also helps to offset mileage costs which we under calculated. This is the thing I really look at. Last year, Melanie didn't come back as many times so the budget was set at what she used. Whereas I come back for class so my needs were a little different. Also, I was able to find a place for \$600 but I think that \$650 is valid because I have better connections to find places to live that I can't know if the person next year can be there. If they can find a cheaper place, that's awesome but I don't want to inhibit them by saying I was able to find this place. That's not a fair assessment. I think it gives them more flexibility.

Evan: Are you ruling out the UW phone rental in lieu of the data plan increase?

Genesis: Yes.

Evan: Because I think we can do either one.

Genesis: Rene, does UW still rent out cellphones?

Rene: No.

Evan: Okay, so maybe not.

Genesis: Let's not go down that road.

Rene: You can look at the UW's policy on those things. We went through the hell of the last five years and we had it taken care of but then some people were written up for phones. Everyone's doing all these convoluted things. I don't know where we're going to be going forward. If you allocate some things, I'm sure we'll be able to find the right process.

Genesis: Essentially, allocating is what we need to do.

Rene: Yes. If it's there I think we can figure it out but I don't have that service.

Evan: With that in mind, can I propose to amend internet costs to communication costs?

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Having gone through last year's budget process, I would encourage us to think in these kinds of broad term rather than setting aside little miniscule pots of money. This is totally appropriate.

Alice: Can you add internet to include data plans and cellphones? It's primarily internet.

Alex: We're calling it communication?

Evan: Yes, to encompass everything. That's just based off of the \$200 that was already there and the \$40 months for 12 months so I think that's a fair extra two GBs a month.

Genesis: Chris, do you want to go over your staff training one?

Chris E: If this wanted to be a pool thing to encourage other officers. I think it's a really smart thing to do for the staff that comes in and the specific things the people want to do. I really like the idea that I can use my discretionary funds to send a couple people to the state budget policy event, which was a really great thing. Whether it's other things, I was able to get a discounted fee from them and a lot of times students want to do that and we can swing it that way, but being able to give training to our employees is smart and awesome.

Chris L: I would agree. Another thing this can be used for is last year, a leadership consultant was brought in to do transition stuff for officers. Something like that.

Genesis: So then we can clarify on this, it would be open to the entire office or just for the VP staff?

Chris E: In this scenario, just the VP's office but if this sounded good to people or a recommendation to be made into a larger fund that's usable for anyone. Maybe you can times that by 4 and stipulate that each office has a quarter of that to use. I'm cool with that.

Genesis: So it will be a pool of money for officers and staff.

Chris L: It can go into the admin section.

Evan: Are we doing a pool thing or put a quarter in each officer's budget? Rene, would that be an issue?

Rene: I just know that travel has been specific for arguments.

Genesis: So for me, I don't have any major changes. I'm waiting to see what this technology recharge fee is. We're waiting to hear back from Jane right?

Rene: Yeah, we're trying to figure out that is last year. We think that's the telephone charge for the phones in the office. \$56.

Genesis: Don't we have a telephone lease?

Rene: The \$56 charge will go to every phone in every office.

Genesis: And I see that. What's 4000 divided by 12?

Alice: It's 333.

Genesis: Then we divide that by how many phones we have in the office.

Elisa: We don't need all those phones.

Alex: The phones are cheaper now than they used to be.

Alice: I call the office sometimes and no one ever answers.

Genesis: It comes out to \$66 per phone so it probably is.

Rene: You have a voice mail plan on it and that's \$10. If you have full-time employees, you'll have to pay more.

Genesis: I added a software line item because that was to upgrade our computers and buy software but all of the computers are new and we only had one software purchase this year which was only \$70 so I thought that our budget of \$2,400 was a little excessive. So that's mine.

Evan: Is the copy machine lease \$3,000 a year?

Genesis: What they do is, we pay \$155 a month and charge how many copies we make on it. Our average use is 50 dollars every month.

Alex: Do they send the toner and everything?

Genesis: They come and service everything. They take care of all of that. Alright, secretary.

Elisa: I didn't have any additions other than what was suggested to go up like we do every year. Otherwise, I'm struggling to spend the money I have. One line item that we did add is web and IT services. We have no technical help with our website and our computers and so what we want next year's officers to do is to hire something from UW IT to come and do that because Tron did this all for us and now we're dead in the water.

Evan: I feel like we cut that last year.

Genesis: We did.

Evan: I feel like we cut it not because of Tron. We knew he wasn't going to be there anymore and I thought that they weren't offering what we needed.

Elisa: We were going to try and hire someone with IT skills for the Office Manager position. We factored that into our job search but that didn't quite work out.

Genesis: And there is more technical stuff that' needs to be done that our regular staff can't do.

Elisa: Like all of our computers need to be connected to the public server in order for the archiving system to even be feasible and the printer, not all computers are connected to that and this doesn't make any sense.

Evan: Do we know that web and IT services will do that?

Chris L: They did. My computer didn't print and they fixed it.

Genesis: Yes, having someone come it at the beginning of the year to fix all of that.

Evan: I just thought we cut them because we weren't utilizing them or they weren't doing what we needed them to.

Chris L: There was another thing. That sharepoint thing. That's obsolete. This is separate. I hate to go back a little bit but can you explain the arts and entertainment line?

Genesis: The arts and entertainment line is the T-Pain resolution. There's no way to give them back that \$10,000 right Rene? We went through this last year.

Rene: Actually, I don't know whether they know that they had the resolution because you didn't give them the money last year.

Genesis: We didn't?

Rene: I don't believe you did.

Genesis: We did.

Rene: I don't know if they had the resolution but you're suppose to know what they're doing this year but you haven't given it to them yet. You have to figure out what you want to do.

Genesis: I actually got an email from the arts and entertainment people asking if they can meet with me to talk about it so I think they know.

Chris L: It was because last year, they came and we said yes and it came out that it was T-Pain and people were up in arms so the resolution is basically saying that there needs to be more oversight.

Genesis: It says that we can't give them money.

Rene: Senators last year were angry about not knowing who was coming.

Elisa: Yeah, it's not being able to have a voice.

Rene: They hated it and they were actually pretty pissed.

Genesis: Yes, they were really mad about that.

Rene: It happened after the decision was already made and they found out later that they had a logo on it so I think the senators wanted transparency and the ability to give input on it.

Genesis: Which I'm hoping to negotiate on.

Alex: I don't remember that stuff going to the senate at ASUW.

Rene: Perhaps it should. They hire the director to make the decision at A&E and they always do it. They have their system and they're trying with theirs and they haven't had anyone complain yet.

Chris L: The larger question which we won't take up now is why we're giving them a much larger organization \$10,000 when we don't get anything in return.

Genesis: Didn't you say that was a drop in the bucket? Isn't that a drop in the bucket and it's just keeping our relationship good at ASUW?

Rene: The things that happens at UW happen because relationships. So you can imagine a set of GPSS people and a set of ASUW people bonding really nicely and caring about this particular time and then they went away.

Elisa: Here's the T-Pain resolution. No later than the fall term of 2013, an ad hoc committee shall be formed to make recommendations for how the Arts and Entertainment's fund shall be used. It shall be comprised of 4 to 6 people including GPSS senators. This may include one executive senator. Keeping in mind that the gift fund, should consult senators, ASUW Director of Programming, the VP of Student Life, etc. on how best to allocate these funds. So that was just

in an email.

Evan: So whatever reason I'm not familiar with Arts & Entertainment, is there any good reason we're putting \$10,000 on that than \$10,000 in RSO funding, money of which is arts and entertainment themed?

Genesis: History, historical precedence.

Evan: And which we have oversight on.

Genesis: Yes

Evan: And specifically goes to grad students and is well managed by us with our own money?

Genesis: Yes, it's because past officers did it.

Rene: We're not living in the time right now when those things were important. They used to be and GPSS wanted to be a part of it and they liked the acts that were coming and they were all excited about it. We're not in that era right now.

Evan: Are there any consequences to cutting it?

Chris L: Yes.

Rene: Are there some music that you think would be particularly hot right now?

Alex: Even like in Lobby Day, where we're piggybacking with them. They can just say you're on your own.

Evan: So this is mainly ASUW.

Rene: There is a resolution on that.

Genesis: To give them \$10,000?

Rene: No, for the T-Pain thing that you have.

Alice: To support it?

Rene: Yeah.

Genesis: Not just to support it but so GPSS has input on what comes next year.

Evan: That's cool as long as that does something.

Genesis: Are we thinking of slicing?

Chris L: No, I just remembered and wanted to know what it was.

Evan: Okay, back on personnel?

Genesis: Yes.

Chris L: Other than the required increases, everything is unchanged?

Genesis: Yes, except because we no longer have an information specialist and we have an archivist, we no longer have the research analyst so that's removed and it replaces the information specialist so that balances out.

Evan: Organizing director? That looks cut on mine.

Genesis: That's just for the summer.

Chris L: Wait, information specialist?

Elisa: That's the archivist.

Genesis: That's what it is in our innovation fund request. It's not called an archivist. Also, Joey is an advancement coordinator, not a director. Could somebody please tell him that?

Chris L: These things that we got from the innovation fund, are we now putting them on our permanent request?

Genesis: Yes, so that's the next thing. Special allocations. For this version, I assumed that they're going to fund special allocations with the extra \$10,000 that they gave us this year. On travel grants, there is a two year exploratory thing so for sure we're having that next year. Departmental stays the same. I decreased our advertising budget.

Evan: We don't need more banners.

Genesis: Yes, and advertising in The Daily is cost prohibitive. It just doesn't make sense.

Chris L: It's kind of pointless.

Genesis: Yes, another thing I want to point out for this is the \$50,000 to start up the endowment fund has already been removed from this beginning balance right here, the \$149,000.

Chris L: Okay. That's good.

Genesis: We will be in compliance with the UW standards going into next year since we'll be at \$124,000.

Chris L: I should've reminded you but our bylaws state that we automatically put anything above 50% of our operating costs from our general fund into the endowment fund.

Evan: I don't think we are going to be above 50% of our operating cost.

Chris L: Okay, so it's not a problem. If it's between 25%-50%, we can vote to but if its over 50% then its automatic.

Evan: It looks like we're going to close at \$124,000.

Chris L: Which is slightly above 20%.

Genesis: Also, keep in mind that our liability fund which must always be there is included in this \$124,000.

Evan: Why do we have liability? Oh, the end fund is a recommendation, not a requirement.

Genesis: This is keeping everything at our current levels with no cuts to anyone and I guess I'll have to modify the second version since we made some cuts for the conference travel. So version 1 was asking for a 26% increase in last year's SAF allocation but keeping in mind that SAF didn't fund us at our full expenses. They asked us to fund down our general fund. We can't spend down our general fund anymore because then we won't be in compliance.

Evan: So that's meaning that we know \$328,000 is not our operating costs and our operating costs we actually related was \$428,000 and they said no.

Genesis: Yes, and we're in line with what we spend this year. We're not increasing expenses drastically. We only went up by a few percentage points.

Evan: Question, do we have the year before to show that? I'm assuming the year before will have a smaller percent change just to show that we were trying to spend down the general fund. Maybe just for a point in the future, it might be useful to include when showing SAF.

Genesis: So the revised one that I'm bringing back will show that spending down our general fund balance. Questions?

Evan: Looks good.

Alex: What is the money that Chris mentioned about staff training. Did that stay in VP?

Evan: I think that jumped into administration as a pool.

Genesis: I just put a whole \$1200 in his and put in a note that it's a pool for all officers.

Alice: Why did we do that? Why don't we just put it in general administration and put a note?

Evan: We should do that.

Genesis: So it's going to be staff training and education opportunities.

Evan: Before we do that, let's take a 5 minute break.

Chris L: I'll entertain a motion for that.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Alice: Can I object and make it 3 minutes?

Chris L: Yes. that's fine. The main thing to discuss is choosing the particulars so please tell us why you elected to cut the things you did.

Evan: I want to know why office supplies hasn't changed at all. Sarcasm for the notes

Genesis: Because every round of officers loves to buy new stuff.

Evan: That's fair.

Genesis: We literally spend that much and more in office supplies.

Chris L: We're back at 7:57pm.

Genesis: So I keep those officer's materials and incidental services. I decreased small events and the fall, winter and spring social by \$5,000 each.

Chris L: How much did we spend on the fall social this year?

Genesis: We went over budget by \$2,000 because it wasn't made clear to me that our food budget is already included in here. The money that comes from a different fund stream to fund all the food items are already in here and it was not made clear. They kept saying it's coming

from a different account so my assumption was the \$2,000 that was spent on food was not factored in to this.

Alex: Either way, it was an awesome event.

Genesis: We went overboard with the food too. We rented out premium stuff for that.

Alex: It was the Halloween party.

Elisa: Right, it was so good.

Alice: I wish I stayed and drank.

Evan: So committee meeting funds got cut by half?

Genesis: Because I don't know what this money is for since you can't buy food with it.

Chris L: It is for providing that kind of things for committees. Wouldn't it come from the provost allocation?

Genesis: But you can't buy food for committee meetings.

Chris L: Why not?

Genesis: You have to have an educational purpose for your meeting. Like for our staff meeting, just because you have a staff meeting, that wasn't enough to justify feeding the staff. There had to have been a training component attached to it. That's why it was an employee handbook and position training as our first meeting of the school year. Committees just can't go buy food all the time for their meetings.

Chris L: Right. This was meant to be for the first and last committee meeting.

Evan: That's what it originally was for but I don't know if it falls in with what you say is okay or not.

Genesis: How does that meet the requirements of food policy for food buying?

Chris L: How does the fall social have an educational component?

Genesis: Because the fall social is open to all grad students. Committee meeting is just the select few people.

Chris L: So are you saying that where the funding comes from, there are other regulations of buying food?

Genesis: Yes.

Chris L: Oh, okay.

Evan: Not because this budget was made a few years ago.

Genesis: So you know for your forums and stuff, I couldn't give you money for that but because the provost gave you money for that, that's fine and there's also an educational component but if you were just meeting, then we couldn't do that.

Evan: So we don't need that much money at all.

Genesis: Exactly.

Alex: Maybe materials?

Genesis: So going down to the president, I cut the summit by \$4,000 because it was way underspent and we haven't started planning the Science & Policy but knowing how much is left in that budget, we still have a lot to use.

Evan: And advancement efforts?

Genesis: Advancement efforts, this is are alumni mixers and stuff.

Chris L: Which is already questionable in terms of can we use that money anyway to do those kinds of things which is where Joey's RSO, Friend's of GPSS, comes in. Presumably it could be used for other advancement efforts.

Genesis: But I don't think \$5,000 is justifiable.

Evan: No change to the VP fund?

Genesis: No change going from our conversation earlier. There was one change though for Lobby Day advertising. They felt that there wasn't a lot of money so I bumped it up to \$100.

Evan: But that's no change from the first budget?

Genesis: Yes.

Evan: There's also no change to the first budget to the treasurer's fund?

Genesis: I have to put this \$4,000 back but there's no change there. Actually, I don't know if I

highlighted this in the secretary's fund in the last fund but I bumped it up by \$200 because of brochures and stuff that was printed at the beginning of the year.

Evan: It wasn't highlighted but the change was there.

Genesis: Okay, IT Services. Pay is the same. There's no changes there. This is where the decrease in funding for special allocations comes in. It goes back down to the original funding of \$12,000.

Chris L: Since special allocations has historically been our least sought after fund?

Genesis: No not necessarily.

Evan: Sometimes it's been departmental and diversity.

Chris L: But also given that we historically funded a lot of inappropriate organizations that weren't toward graduate students. Is \$22,000 as in the other budget an inappropriate amount or is that an amount that we would feasibly give away?

Evan: We're doing good this year on Finance & Budget and we're getting a surprising amount of 100% grad student groups.

Genesis: We funded two or three in the last meeting that were 100% grad students and we even bumped up their request by giving them more money.

Evan: There's also been instances where departments aren't doing well enough so they recommend since they can't give them money anymore, they recommend that they form an RSO which is fine by us because we can give more to graduate students in programs to do program based things off of a different budget and it's working out very well so that should go well. As well as the fact that having the extra money, assuming that the money can go back and forth between the funding streams because we're thinking of rewriting the rules for departmental because right now the departments at the size of 1 to 150 get a max of \$350 for funding. Departments of 200 to 250 gets etc. I think there's three or four departments in the entire school that have 150 students so we're going to reallocate that based on bottom 25% and middle 25% and etc.

Genesis: These are actual numbers we got from the Grad School of actual enrollment.

Evan: And we get these every year so we might do a sliding scale based on a percentage. Hopefully what that ends up being, departments as a whole get more money, especially the smaller departments.

Alex: What proportion of departments usually request in a given year or so far this year?

Evan: You mean how many are the total?

Alex: Yeah.

Evan: Not that many.

Genesis: Not even 10% of departments on campus ask us for money. It's mainly the big ones that know that we exist and apply. And you also need senators to apply.

Evan: The better question might be how many departments that have senators ask for money which might be a lot more like 20-25% have asked for money.

Alex: Encourages participation.

Alice: Don't you need a senator to submit?

Alex: Yes, and it's more likely to be senators that's been around for a year or more familiar with it.

Evan: The end result of Chris's question is yes, the \$29,000 pooled funding is a logical amount. Cutting it back will hurt students but we funded at that before.

Genesis: That brings us to our estimated expenses for next year, which actually brings us below what we spent this year.

Evan: Even with the required personnel increases. Good job.

Chris L: Are we approving theses as two alternatives?

Genesis: Yes because our fear is that SAF's going to look at our first version where no cuts are made and we're asking for 26% increase in funding and they're going to be like what?

Evan: They should look at this years budget and say we're not really looking for an increase at all.

Chris L: I'm just asking because I'm not aware. Last year we approved a budget, not two alternatives, which is fine.

Evan: Does this go back to FMB first before the senate? Because I'm not sure if we can give two versions.

Genesis: If SAF comes back and says cut your budget, we already have something prepared.

Alex: And you can tell them that the exec board at least looked at both.

Evan: Yes, we can approve one and another one as a contingency plan.

Genesis: If SAF comes back and says cut your budget so let's approve one.

Chris L: So I'll entertain a motion to approve budget number 1.

Alice: So moved.

Evan: Question, did Chris's VP thing get moved to a pool? The training?

Genesis: Yes.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? Then I guess I'll entertain a motion to approve budget number 2 as a contingency plan.

Alice: Do we even need that? Can we just show the senate that and say as an executive board we discussed this second budget this is the one that we will approve if we have to go back?

Chris L: Genesis?

Evan: it would be nice to get approve first. Maybe not to present to SAF but something so we can approve that we've already approved and show the senate that exec approved this as contingency

Alice: I just think to keep it less formal if they have specific things that they come back to us with that we haven't thought about. It would give us more flexibility to informally say to the senate and re-approve the budget if they come back to us with something specific.

Alex: And they could point to it as pushback if you need to.

Chris L: Then we'll put this one aside.

Genesis: We'll just say that we agreed to a contingency plan in place. Should senate come back and make us change stuff since we have to put this toward senate and if they want something changed, then we have to come back and change it.

Evan: Can we present it to senate as information?

Genesis: But senate has to approve the budget.

Chris L: The senate has to approve our budget but I'm remembering that we agreed that the senate's role, I don't believe, is to be looking at each individual line item.

Genesis: I'm fine with that.

Evan: They want to some time.

Alex: That doesn't matter.

Genesis: Isn't that why FMB and exec exist so they do the work?

Alice: They can't put up a resolution to say let's change some line item. We approve it and they approve it or they object it. We put up a budget and we vote on it and we give to senate.

Alex: Is it the budget as a whole?

Alice: Yes.

Chris L: I was thinking maybe all they're approving is our SAF allocation request. Okay, are we done with that?

Genesis: Yes.

Chris L: Thank you. Are we able to get into google drive?

Genesis: Yes.

Chris L: Search for template for senate meetings: 2013-2014. Go to bottom and you have to add a tab for February. Just copy over the last one. So we will have Elizabeth Lindner for GPSS spotlight so that will be accurate. Legislative Update will stay. Chris asked for 10 minutes.

Evan: Do we want Chris or budget first? Maybe have Chris first.

Genesis: Lobby Day is gone?

Alex: Chris can do a Lobby Day update within the legislative update.

Genesis: 2014-2015 budget proposal? 30 minutes is good?

Chris L: Yes.

Genesis: Alice, you want anything?

Alice: I'll just say in the announcements that we're having another workshop.

Evan: I actually like our announcements now. I'm learning about a lot of events from Gary from Social Work.

Chris L: Are we missing anything? Can you change budget proposal to action?

Genesis: We're going to need to make sure we have quorum. You guys don't have anything? Does anyone want to talk about the task force sexual assault prevention?

Chris L: We can ask Kimberly but I don't know if she has one yet? I do not know any more.

Evan: I say keep it short and sweet and reward them for getting through the budget.

Chris L: Let's make sure we have everything. I can't think of anything else I have.

Genesis: I can't either. Josh Kavanagh is not wanting to come and present?

Chris L: Actually yes. Could you put him after Previously on GPSS as Transportation Services Presentation. I'm the sponsor. It should be the person that brought it to the agenda, not the speaker. Put in 15 minutes.

Genesis: That brings us to 78. Perfect.

Chris L: Any other additions? Then I'll entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Thank you. Then, executive senator reports.

Alice: I was hoping to have Chris here for this but I think there were some issues with the whole Lobby Day thing and the workshops and the committee. I feel that maybe the communication, and it might be specific to our committee Genesis but I feel that there is a lack of communication and coordination among the officers and the fact that the poster session was changed and neither of us knew about it. I feel that was piece mail and happening all over the place and I would love to see better, more direct communication but this was kind of specific to Chris's event so I don't need to take up any more time in the minutes and talk to him in person and you and I can meet with Caleb to talk about expectations but I think it's a bigger issue with the new committee structure with having chairs and overseeing officers. I think it's more important to stipulate where the responsibilities actually fall for the committee chair and the officers and

whose responsibility is it to do what as for scheduling meetings. I feel that with more people at the top, it's more easier to think about it as three points in a triangle all the responsibility are falling through the middle of the triangle and not a single one of us because were not particularly accountable. So it's not really anyone's fault but it's kind of all of our faults for not communicating and coordinating. There was like a complete and utter communication breakdown. On this whole Lobby Day thing, I feel it was a huge cluster. Personally, I think Chris should be held responsible for that but he's not here so I can't tell him in person but maybe I'll tell him on my own time. I just want to have a successful poster session since it's serving some of the graduate students but I don't know how to do that if I'm the only one able to advertise for the workshops. I don't know where my role as a chair of the committee to do that.

Genesis: I think we've already touched on this in our email and it's a conversation we can have outside of exec.

Alice: Totally, but just saying it might be an issue we have for other committees where the officer and chair are unclear where the responsibilities are. Maybe that falls in the committee coordinating board and committee chair training manual that doesn't exist. There is a space for exec to figure out how that should be addressed on a GPSS wide level because it varies from committee to committee and year to year depending on who is there but it'd be nice to have a more streamlined approach for how those issues get resolved.

Genesis: Absolutely.

Alex: A structural thing.

Alice: Yeah, but it need to start with better communication among the officers and the advertising involved and the committee chairs and maybe that was the idea behind the committee coordinating board but yes, expectations. We can talk about it later but as far as advertising for committees goes and the GPSS advertising person, who is that and where does that responsibility lie? I don't know.

Chris L: Anyone else?

Alex: I'll be going to Lobby Day tomorrow so I'll let you know how that goes.

Chris L: Evan?

Evan: Nothing.

Chris L: Genesis?

Genesis: Nothing. All I had was this budget.

Chris L: Elisa?

Alex: Didn't you guys go to the Elect Her thing?

Genesis: Yes. It was quite the event. It was really cool. Peacefull Dawn came Jessica Cafferty, who ran for secretary last year, came and the four of us were the only grad students there.

Alex: How was the overall turnout?

Genesis: They had 60 people there and they were shooting for 75 so that was good. Rep. Justine Farrell came. For me, the workshops that were a part of it was not as relevant because that stuff I've already done. I know how to do elevator pitches and marketing myself but for undergrads it was great.

Evan: Just wanted to add one thing from Finance & Budget. The pharmacy auction thing. That was the cool thing. We funded a pharmacy based RSO that had an auction to raise travel grants which I thought was really cool since I haven't seen that before. Essentially what it boiled down to was they asked \$1,000 from us and we gave them a little more because they raised \$9,000 last year and sought to raise more last year and so we figured we give them more for advertising, that's \$9,000 that travel grants doesn't have to fund. So I thought that was a cool use of the money.

Genesis: They're very well aware of travel grants as well.

Evan: They were even talking about not double dipping between the two so they could leave travel grants free. It makes our budget go that much further.

Chris L: Elisa?

Elisa: I have nothing. We talked about the Elect Her event already and there was GoMap undergrad and grad mixer today that was really successful. Diversity forums are coming up with three this quarter. I'm working on getting a facilitator at the race exhibit at our race themed forum. It's headed by Brian Tracy.

Chris L: Cool. Brian Tracy is the unofficial chair of Community Affairs.

Elisa: That's all I got.

Chris L: I have a couple of things. So we sent out a call for international students to participate in the focus groups as part of our international graduate experience investigation and we are already more than halfway to the number we're shooting for. Austin has really been working his tail off.

Evan: Props to Austin since he's trying to organize the giant senate meetings too.

Chris L: He doesn't sleep. I'm a little concerned about him. That brings me to my second point though. He and I are bringing in as many senators that will respond to small group meeting with he and I. We're grouping it by area and not by department. The idea is to find out how can we engage you better and what can we do to motivate you to engage with us. If part of that conversation that we should be having, I'll be taking input on what we should be asking and talking about in those conversations. If some of those issues is around communication issues or whatever it is, please advise. My goal with this is to find out what it is that we can do to make people really want to participate in graduate student government and make them proud of it. The peer mentoring task force working group is chugging along. We had Keira Veran from the Grad School program. We're talking with the Graduate School with housing part of our program with them. Next week we have the head of the counseling center to talk about what kinds of training we would need to give with who would be involved with this and what they can do to help support that. I'm also going to Lobby Day tomorrow so we'll see how that goes. Also I've been informed from the Graduate School that we're being tasked with finding and nominating up to two graduate students to go up to Washington to learn about science and policy. It's a program..

Alice: AAAS?

Chris L: Yes.

Alice: They have an awesome science and policy. It's for their inaugurated or incoming AAAS fellows that are on science and policy fellowships, traditionally people with PhDs go. Can I go?

Chris L: You can apply. So we'll be selecting people to do that. Program reviews are happening. We are behind but we're trying to catch up. The focus groups we are having is really great.

Alex: Program reviews?

Chris L: So the Graduate School reviews every graduate program not every year but it comes up in a cycle so we participate in that. I think that is all that I have.

Evan: Short and sweet.

Genesis: Congratulations. That was amazing. You should put that in the notes.

Chris L: Any announcements? Then I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Executive Meeting Minutes
February 20th, 2013
HUB 303

Chris Lizotte (President): I call this meeting to order at 6:33pm. Alice is going to be late and Elisa will not be joining us. First item, I will entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

Alex Bolton (Law): So moved.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): Second.

Chris L: Any objections or any amendments to be made? Hearing none, the agenda is approved. I will now entertain a motion to approve or amend the minutes from the previous executive meeting on February 5th.

Genesis: So moved.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Hearing none, the minutes are approved. So here we go. As you may know, Austin and I have been conducting a series of small focus groups with senators that we've been organizing roughly according to disciplinary group. Evan was with other College of the Environment people yesterday?

Evan: Yes.

Chris L: We've been framing it as a mid-quarter check-in and also asking them about issues of engagement and our perception that engagement in senate this year compared to last year and over the course of this year has fallen off. We had really positive conversations. We've done 6 so far and how many do we have left to do?

Austin Wright-Pettibone (University Affairs Director): We have 21 left to do.

Genesis: What? All before the end of the quarter?

Austin: I think we've done closer to 10.

Chris L: Okay, we've done 10 and we have many more to do but we've been getting great feedback and actually, what is making this easy is that they're about a half hour each. So far we heard the same thing over and over again from separate groups of people, which leads me to believe there should be things we should be concentrating on. They can be most usefully divided into three broad categories. The first one is that there is a sense of a lack of clarity and understanding of GPSS's mission, its purview and reach and its authority as an organization.

The second one is that, by and large, people are finding senate to not be particularly engaging. The third one is that people are expressing a desire for GPSS to come to them in their departments and engage them at the department level. Those are the three major theme that are emerging and we're hearing them almost verbatim from completely different groups of people again and again. Austin, do you want to add anything to that?

Austin: I think you summed it up very nicely.

Chris L: So there are some action steps that we are already taking and that we can take and I want to have a discussion of other things that we can do in order to rectify this. The first one as we discussed in our staff meeting last week. We have convened a very short term and focused working group that is going to excavate GPSS's mission because we do not have a mission statement. The closest thing to a mission statement is what's found in the constitution. No where on the website and none of our materials. We do not have a concise, one sentence mission statement. I think we can easily have one and I want to highlight that none of this is reinventing or reimagining. All this is is focusing and clarifying what we already have at least at that level. There might be some changes we can make organizationally that can help amplify those. So in terms of actual action steps, that's one. The second one around senate not being engaging, last year we tried last year as an executive committee, we tried hard to move meetings more toward less information and more discussion. We had to do as much pre-information in emails before hand, trust that people would read it and be ready to engage people in a discussion at the meetings and still keep everything under 90 minutes. Not easy right? We tried and some cases we succeeded and in some cases, not so much. This year, we've been slowly sliding toward the more informational info dump side of things which is fine. I don't want to give the sense that senate is useless or that it sucks. That's not what people are saying.

Austin: Some people are saying that it does suck though.

Genesis: How often do they come? Evan, was that you?

Evan: I was totally the one that said that. Full sarcasm included.

Chris L: So some people are cranks. Majority of the people are not. Whatever. I think trying to move the pendulum back a little bit and hopefully this is something we can think about as we plan the next senate meeting. I know I have some things that I want to discuss that can easily be made more deliberative. We should think about moving the pendulum back.

Genesis: Does that mean maybe making senators do their own agenda items?

Chris L: Well, ideally yes and there's something I want to speak to that in a minute but for the moment, it's not going to be feasible to totally rethink everything for the next senate meeting right? But as we go to the spring, to try to nudge things back in the other direction.

Alex: As far as the meetings not being an info dump and more engaging, when I was working with the faculty senate office, that was a big thing that we had to deal with too and we actually did a big change on how we set up meeting and try to cut down on reports. That might help and I might have to look back on my old notes to see what we did to help get some general ideas. Every group like this, it's always an issue because you have information you're trying to get out to the senator to get out to their constituents and to make it also more engaging is a constant battle.

Chris L: Yes. People had some ideas. One was that people expressed an interest in having time to talk with people in their related fields but with a purpose. Maybe we have a topic to deliberate about it and you bring it back to the group. That's one example. So that's point number two in addressing that. The third one is GPSS coming to departments or at least engaging at the department level. There was a lot of interest expressed in being able to set up events at the interdepartmental level between two or three related departments and we're trying to think of ways of how GPSS can facilitate that.

Austin: We don't have the capacity for that.

Genesis: And we don't have the money but go ahead. Let me hear your argument for that.

Austin: We can provide administrative support while the departments do the groundwork. Most departments have social chairs. If we can work with them, then we're able to provide the administrative side of things, get our branding on it and liaise with the departments themselves to put on the event. Then we boost our branding, people are getting what they want and we're already integrating with existing processes.

Genesis: What about the smaller interdisciplinary programs? Are we only talking about bigger departments and grouping smaller one together so they have one big event?

Chris L: Because it came up in a couple different contexts, one of the things we said is that we can't tell you who you want to hang out with. Another side benefit is that it forces senators from other departments to talk to each other.

Genesis: So we can't just bring them together. There should be a format, like we're going to come here to talk about this that relates to your department. But creating some social event is not really useful.

Chris L: Especially not during meeting time and I think people are pretty clear that that's not what they were looking for. They wanted to have a purpose.

Alex: Do we know where our senators come from? Evans has its own student government and they send 2 GPSS senators and the Law School has a BA that sends 2 senators. How does it work in Arts & Sciences? Is it completely by department or is there a sort of self governing

graduate body within these?

Austin: For most of the smaller departments, it's an email that gets sent out that says does anyone want to be a senator for this department. For the larger departments, it's more organized. It depends if we have a history with them or not so the big ones that you're mentioning, they do go through their association but other ones like Chemistry doesn't. I think Chemistry has an association with us. They're not as interested in student government.

Alex: Things that work with big ones won't work with small ones. Our events at the Law School have set up stuff with the Business School and we have a trivia night with the Med School. It might make sense for GPSS to try to facilitate more of that type of stuff and try to figure out something with the small but we don't have the related body to work with.

Chris L: Smaller departments will clearly need more support but for example, at least your senators has to provide the legwork.

Genesis: When I think about creating these opportunities for these departments, it makes me wonder how far are we getting into becoming just a social organization as opposed to something that does something substantive. If all were doing is forums and socials, that's all they're going to see us as and not as someone they can turn to for issues with faculty and staff.

Chris L: That's a valid concern but this is just one aspect. I think the reality also is that that's already the way departments see us. So you're right. That's certainly something we want to avoid. We don't want to make that our only identity.

Alex: And maybe in the mission statement, we can steer toward three main things we do.

Austin: I'm also thinking of political fund raising though. It's largely a schmooze event but there's the message that goes out so we can have that as one aspect of any event we put on as a substantive piece that describes what we're doing when we provide administrative support.

Chris L: The idea is not to come up with exact things right now but it's good to discuss. So people have said some other things. Another thing that has come up is things like travel grants and Science & Policy. Some departments already have very robust structures for that so they don't need it. For example, the College of the Environment has a really good science and policy framework to begin with.

Evan: I don't think there was ours so much as ESS's is what they were talking about.

Chris L: In any case, there are some departments that already have those structures. Their need is less to engage with us. That was not a strong a theme but that was something that was said.

Austin: Another theme was that some departments that don't have those things set up, do very much appreciate that we offer travel grants and what not. It's about 50/50. People who know about the programs are enthusiastic and the people who don't know about it are enthusiastic to learn about it.

Chris L: So that's the preliminary feedback. I just want to highlight those things because they really are echoing. I'll open it up for any comments or questions that anyone has.

Genesis: I overheard at one of them that there was talk about committees and opening it up for more than just senators. We have some committees that are open to anyone but it's a very limited number and we're very insulated where our committees are within us and not across campus. Was there any concern about trying to make our committees broader in scope?

Chris L: I think as far as membership goes, there are some committees that it is entirely appropriate that it's limited to senators. The majority of our committees are open to anyone. The reality is that typically that we've done is advertise them at senate meetings so they tend to fill up with senators. Alma in the Humanities meetings today came up with an idea regarding committees that absolutely blew me away and could really help us rethink the way we use committees and make them useful. It's an extremely simple idea. The way we imagine committees are that they are relatively autonomous from the senate and they do their own thing with investigating and researching. We've sort of tried to think through that somehow they will report back to the senate. She said that's going backwards. What we should be doing is taking issues of concern and bringing them to the senate and the senate decides collectively where to assign it. That way, everyone knows that this committee is working on this so there's an accountability mechanism. There's less of a sense of we have no idea what this committee is working on since we assigned it to that committee. One issue can be parsed out to different committees like she was talking about for example, creating a graduate student Bill of Rights. It's a huge project but it's something that Community Affairs might have a piece. Then Student Life has a piece in it. Academic and Administrative Affairs has a piece in it. If the discussion takes place at the level of the whole senate, then there can be discussion about what are the pieces and how do we distribute them? It's also a way to get people interested in a committee.

Genesis: So thinking of what issues we had this year, we haven't had very many so it makes it hard to dictate or provide stuff for the senate to work on.

Evan: Yes, that was my question too. Where are these issues coming from? From us or are they going to be identified by the senate?

Chris L: That's a good question. Ideally, the senate is a forum where anyone brings any issue that could be of common interest so from anyone or from us or from exec.

Genesis: If it comes from exec then it feels like a mandate for you to do this as opposed to it coming from the floor and decided on collectively. If it's from an administrative level, then it

makes sense that it comes from exec because officers interface with administrators.

Chris L: Or maybe instead of exec saying we will do this, we can say this is an issue that has been brought to our attention. Now collectively as a senate, will we decide to take this up?

Genesis: Yeah, that's a good way to do it.

Evan: I have a question. Which committees currently have unassigned goals? Because I know some of the committees already have assigned goals like Finance & Budget.

Chris L: She clarified which committees she's talking about. Those were Community Affairs, Student Life, Academic and Administrative Affairs and maybe Diversity but probably not. I'm talking about those context driven committees. So I'm not talking about the legislative steering committees since they know what they are suppose to do. I'm not talking about any of the governance committees like Judicial or Finance and Budget. I'm talking about the ones that are driven by content.

Evan: As their goal this year kind of been find a cause, more or less?

Genesis: Student Life has not had a goal because Student Life is not functioning since no one wants to be on Student Life.

Chris L: Right, we had trouble attracting people to committees precisely because we have trouble articulating what they're going to do.

Alex: From the discussion we had about the concert last year and how we had issues there, that's something we could say and make clear. We can do as a hybrid model too. Not to get repetitive but the faculty senate had a thing where some issues they would send to the faculty councils and report back in a certain amount of time. For other stuff, the council will do on their own and bring and present to the senate. That might be a nice hybrid. The committees can have their own babies that they work on and if they need someone with expertise on this issue and the committee can just hand it off. They can have a good back and forth too because even with the state and federal leg committees, just presenting the agendas in a way is doing that too. Saying here's the agenda we came up with and share with the senate so senators are more aware of that aspect of GPSS.

Chris L: It can definitely be bi-directional. We've been going completely unidirectional. I was really blown away. It's extremely simple and potentially powerful. It's not something we can implement instantly but if this is the direction we go in, it could only really be implemented next year but we can start moving in that direction over spring quarter.

Alex: What meeting was it? Is it all humanity grad students or you have some sort of council?

Chris L: So Austin semi-arbitrarily grouped together people by discipline.

Alex: I think the big issue is the a structure of the smaller departments as compared to the larger ones and if there was way to maybe try to group together somehow. I know the Arts & Sciences go by their 4 division. Does the College of the Environment have a group that meets together or are they separate departmentally?

Evan: They don't frequently meet. There's the college councils which were started recently.

Alex: Is that just on budget stuff?

Evan: It's mainly budget based. It gives them a forum to communicate but it's mostly budget based. I know the administration communicates really well among itself and COE but students, not so much.

Chris L: Last year we did a lot of caucusing by colleges, specifically around college councils. There's no reason we can't return to that but with some other topic or purpose.

Genesis: But the Grad School breaks them up in very specific way. I think we can use that format to break people up too.

Alex: It might just give it some structure. The Arts & Sciences are one. Then Health Sciences that aren't part of Arts & Sciences, etc.

Chris L: There's a lot of good ways to do it. I think the more general point is that people would like to see that with some sort of purpose in mind and not just to mingle.

Evan: I say as a general rule that humanities is a good idea to implement it. Although we should have a hat of suggestions to get the ball rolling and maybe some issues we think on our own if no one in senate has issues that they want to be addressed.

Chris L: Of course. I think there's another thing that is implied that people aren't aware that they can bring issues to senate. That relates to how they don't understand that the senate has any power. So why would they bring it to us? They've been seeing it as largely informational and not as a space to bring issues to deliberate on and dealt with.

Evan: That's surprising. I thought we had stressed that.

Chris L: You can say it a million times but we haven't been modeling it.

Alex: Our action aren't showing that.

Genesis: And there's nothing that has come up for us to do something and show that we have

the power to affect change.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): Well, participation is a big thing. I don't know how many people went through orientation to get this knowledge. I don't know how many people read emails. I agree that the idea should be that the information we send out should be informational to educate people so when they come, they can speak on this but we just haven't seen it happen. To get one comment on the legislative agenda is unheard of.

Alex: Not inherently a bad thing.

Chris E: There was just a couple other things that even in the short time I was there, people seemed to be engaged. Maybe it's a byproduct of where they are. I'm not feeling hurt but I think it's more on the other end of where it's not presented in a format where we feel we can do that. That's sometimes chicken or the egg.

Chris L: There is a problem that we can give people all the opportunity in the world and they still won't. We have to be prepared for that. We can, to a certain extent, do our best to provide the environment and see what happens. It may be difficult to do since you have to set the tone at the beginning of the year. We certainly did say that this is your senate. I'm not sure that we effectively modeled it in a way that was legible and a lot of people didn't make it to the first couple of meetings. What I'm talking about is not something that's ever been done or how senate has operated. We are talking about a big culture shift. It's not happening overnight but it's worth working toward. Any other questions or discussion on that?

Alex: Good work.

Chris L: Thanks, just have 20 more to go. So I talked about the value statement. I won't reiterate that but the State of GPSS notion that I brought up at the beginning of winter quarter. As long as everyone is on board, I would like to make the last senate meeting of winter quarter which is March 12th, kind of based around this. What this will be is a presentation of what we excavate as GPSS's core mission. Then what ideally I would like to do is have everyone collaboratively add their stuff to that, the stuff that everyone's been working on to demonstrate how we express that. Then there would be time for discussion.

Genesis: Is it more of a recap of what we did over the years?

Chris L: It's a recap but it's also looking forward in the sense that this is what we've been doing and this is how we're framing it and how we're thinking about it in line with who we think we are as an organization.

Alex: And it's not just about this year. It's about the organization long term. We did this work and we're going to do these things and we hope next year's officers will continue it.

Chris L: And we want to highlight stuff that we're proud of and we have plenty to be proud of. So that's something to think about. My vision is that the officers and the executive committee can think of how we want to showcase these things. If there are substantive things we need to deal with on March 12th, I don't want to preclude these things. There needs to be a space for that but I'm hoping we can craft an interactive presentation that can be informative, inspiring and entertaining all at once which is a lot of adjectives to cram into one thing.

Alex: Are you wanting to engage senate to see what they want to be presented?

Chris L: So part of the idea of these meetings are that they are feeding into. I mentioned that what we source from these meetings are what we're presenting back to you in this thing. I still haven't thought entirely through this but it's not simply a recap. It's not simple a "Here are the issues we want to address." It's taking all this feedback, information and all the things we've done and kind of organizing it around a core identity for the organization and showcasing that.

Genesis: So then should we nail down our mission so that we can format our presentation that way. Here's the three things in our mission and here's money to the mission. Here's what we've done to fulfill our mission.

Alex: Vision and mission.

Chris L: Exactly. That has to be the first thing. This working group.

Genesis: I think it's important to get that vision and mission first and format the State of GPSS accordingly so we know exactly what we want to present and how it should be presented.

Chris L: Another way I heard it explained and this was in the UW Marketing Council meeting, is that most organizations are very good at describing what they do and how they do it, but not very good at describing why they do it. Very successful organizations start with why they do what they do and the what and how is secondary. This is the kind of work that could take a year to complete and we're trying to do it in four weeks. I don't think we have to re-anything. We're just brushing of the dust. So this group is convening and is made up of staff and senators.

Genesis: Did you already find senators?

Chris L: Yes, I reached out to the Colins, Colin Bateson and Colin Syfort, Jenna, Ragan Hart. People who have some experience and who also have been engaged and it was not a particularly democratic process simply by virtue of the time constraint but at the same time, anyone is welcome to participate fully.

Genesis: Do they know what we're trying to accomplish?

Chris L: Yes. We're convene for the first time at noon and we will likely find another time for next

week since people's schedules seem to be squirrely and I just want to make it clear that this is not meant to be an exclusive exercise and it's more for the sake of time that it's done this way.

Genesis: Wonderful.

Chris L: So I think if anyone has any other questions on that, I think that's okay, he said as his voice was cracking. So let's move on to the agenda planning.

Genesis: So SAF wants to come in and make a presentation.

Chris L: Who?

Genesis: Kiehl wants to come in and make a presentation for our other seat in SAF that we've been having trouble filling. I think he thinks that if he makes a presentation, he'll find somebody so he wants to come present on what SAF does. So I gave him the GPSS Spotlight and he really wants to do it so I would want to prioritize his spotlight to this week. Don't piss off Kiehl. He does our funding.

Alex: Appease Kiehl.

Genesis: Let Kiehl do whatever he wants.

Chris L: This is February 26. Correct?

Genesis: And one more thing. I don't know if we can do two spotlights but remember the T-Pain resolution from last year?

Chris L: Do I ever.

Genesis: ASUW Arts & Entertainment reached out to me as required and they sent a survey out and I didn't see the survey on my end but he did change their survey. So they want somebody on the planning committee appointed by GPSS to help them plan. Another thing I found out from them but they want to recruit somebody but we need SAF to do their presentation.

Chris L: We can just put an item for them. Is there something we can actually discuss in addition to them saying they need someone? Do they want to come?

Genesis: Yes. They want to come to talk about what ASUW Arts & Entertainment is and why we should have a member on it because that was the whole thing last year. We didn't get a say last year who it was so this is our opportunity.

Alex: Two important things which are kind of big picture. I do worry that this is going back to the "speaking to" versus engaging. Is there a way to try and make it engaging? It's kind of engaging

because this is what GPSS did and this is how we're getting involved.

Chris L: We're not going to get there overnight but if you're talking to them and Kiehl, if there's a way to present and engage.

Genesis: I will say for the Arts & Entertainment they can engage but for Kiehl, I don't know.

Alice: Maybe make the Arts & Entertainment as the Spotlight and Kiehl an item. Does he care if he's the spotlight?

Genesis: He doesn't care. It's just in case people ask questions about what SAF does and why they should join.

Chris L: Check this out. I'm going to reverse the time allotted for discussion and presentation. It's symbolic.

Alice: So I missed the discussion on State of GPSS and making it engaging?

Chris L: One of the things that came up in the senator discussion is that we've been sliding down the scale of info-dumping and we're just trying to nudge. We're not going to get there overnight but we are trying to move the pendulum it back toward the other direction little by little. By the way, Genesis are you responsible for elections or is that Elisa?

Genesis: I think its Secretary.

Chris L: Because they really need to meet and form. Another thing we have is Susan Freccia and Ellen Taylor are going to come to talk about the sexual assault task force.

Alex: Maybe we can talk about GPSS involvement in that group too? So that way, we're not just info dumping. This is what GPSS did and these are ways to get involved.

Chris L: I'm not sure if there are things that are being asked of us yet but I will ask them to think in that direction.

Alex: There were senators on that group right?

Chris L: I think it was just Kimberly. She was the only grad student on the group.

Alex: I think Kiana was kind of involved. Even though she's not a part of GPSS, she's still a grad student.

Chris L: I'll put discussion so it's just not a wall of information.

Genesis: What else do we have going on?

Chris L: I'll talk more about this in our update but our peer mentoring committee is ready to move from planning toward implementation so we would like to get some feedback from the senate. So this is a good opportunity for discussion. Chris, do you want the usual?

Chris E: Yes. I might not have much though.

Alex: You have good news to share right?

Chris E: Yup.

Chris L: Anything else? Does what I have for times look reasonable? Does anyone need to be bumped up? How much time does Kiehl need, you think?

Genesis: Let's limit him to five.

Chris L: Fair enough. That's 73 minutes.

Chris E: Oh, we need 10-15 minutes to approve the federal legislative agenda.

Genesis: Does that have to be approved or go through Exec first?

Chris E: We can if we want to but I don't remember the state one having to.

Chris L: I don't think so.

Alice: Don't they have to receive it tonight in order for them to vote on it?

Chris E: It has been sent to Elisa.

Chris L: No, because it's not a resolution. The motion would just be to approve the agenda.

Chris E: Either way, it's there to be sent out tonight.

Chris L: Where would you like that?

Chris E: Wherever works best.

Alex: Somewhere in between the info dumps?

Chris L: I'll put you before Kiehl.

Genesis: Let's get him out before since he's a visitor.

Chris L: How much time? 15 you said?

Chris E: Sure.

Chris L: Anything else? Anything need to be adjusted? It's 83 minutes, a pretty full agenda. If not, I'll entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Genesis: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Hearing none, this agenda is approved. Executive senators. Alex, Alice, or Evan?

Evan: I have nothing.

Chris L: Okay. Officers, Chris?

Chris E: Just a couple of quick updates. First, on the event we did last Friday. It would've been nice for more people to attend and everyone was on the floor but I do want to say that it went well. The group that we had was dynamite and the wins I think are really on the idea that we had done this event in a formal capacity for two years now so it's staged to be that. Plus the students who went all now know each other. We have them as contacts. Plus the heads of the two biggest research groups and labs that have connections to the cool stuff like the Eco Cars and molecular biology and curing cancer and the common flu were some of the topics broached the other day. They are in connection with us on our side and happy. We're counting that as a really good thing moving forward. In the end, it's a big win. The next thing we need to do now that the cutoff happened yesterday, 1669 will be getting a hearing.

Chris L: Which one's that?

Chris E: That's the fee-based program. I'm trying to use my power to get Senator Bailey to do that hopefully next Thursday, which is the 27th, which will give us enough time to have it go out with my stuff for the federal legislative agenda with an update for senators to call and to get a hold of people. I want to identify at least two students to get them to come to Olympia to get that going. Otherwise, technically we don't see a lot of problems but it behooves us to have that student support there and give testimony on that bill. The federal legislative agenda was passed by committee and emailed today. It is ready to be sent to people. We'll be collecting all those inputs that will be coming over throughout the next week and having the committee going through it one last time with a list of friendly amendments. Then, anything we can't agree on will be brought up as well as any additional stuff so hopefully that will follow the same as the state

agenda. This is big news. It is important to us and is WSA's top priority this year, which is the Dream Act even though it wasn't a specific GPSS initiative. The first thing the House did was before the cutoff time of 5 o'clock was to go into new business and pass the Real Hope Act. This is a bill that doesn't have any DOCA requirements. It literally says if you graduate from a Washington high school with a couple of other things like you've been around for 3 years or so, but regardless of what your residence status is, you can get financial aid from the state through the State Need Grant and it also puts \$5 million in the State Need Grant. This was a coup and it was huge stuff. I can look at it but Washington is number 5 in the country to have this type of legislation. In regards to the federal legislation, something that Patty Murray's been working really hard is funding around this issue. Hopefully the Higher Education Act will be reauthorized and renewed in 2014 and there will be some pretty good incentive money to the states that have passed legislation like this. So it's very positive on that level and a little bit more germane on what our needs are. Metro's still meeting. We're having an interesting dance now because since it's moved from "Put this on a ballot" to now it being on a ballot, we're now in that handcuff stage on what we can and can't talk about. There's some events that are coming up but our involvement will be very much based on what those formulate as.

Chris L: So it will be a ballot measure?

Chris E: So the King County Council approved the Transportation Benefit District so next Monday, they will have their vote on whether or not to put on the ballot. It's very positive that it will pass through. The real question is what that vote will look like. We're hoping for 7-2 but they will still feel good at 6-3 but obviously, unanimous or the more people who sign on, the better. So we'll see what happens next Monday but the public hearing stuff is over and they're doing their deliberations and King County is really pushing their stuff so have the bulk of the work going.

Chris L: Excellent.

Genesis: So the Valentine's Day Mixer was pretty successful. We haven't gotten the numbers back from the card reader but we're thinking we had at least 250 people show up.

Chris L: Really? It seemed like a lot more showed up.

Genesis: Yeah, the room's capacity is 500 but when it's filled like that, I think it's around 400. It never filled to capacity. I think overall, it was good. We had the two bars which moved lines a lot faster. There came the issue though of people gaming the system and trying to get more alcohol than they were allotted.

Chris L: People were ripping their tickets in half.

Genesis: Yes, and they were putting in the box without showing me the whole thing but I finally caught on and said no. I became the drink nazi that night.

Chris L: Genesis told this huge dude no. He was like 6'5".

Genesis: It's frustrating because there's this perception that it's a free for all. Like it's a bottomless thing.

Chris L: We ran out of alcohol.

Genesis We did but I think we spaced it out enough that we had it until 8 o'clock and it was fine but this whole thing that people are entitled to more than will be allotted is crazy. The HUB Games really loved having us there. They want us for another event and we stayed well within budget. Finance & Budget, we've already spent half of the \$22,000 that was allotted at the beginning of the year but that was only for special allocations. Departmental allocations, we still have 2/3 of the money we started with and we're working to try and give away more money. Travel grants closed on Friday. We had a total of 60 applications come in. The committee will only score 38 because 4 were disqualified because the event already occurred. 4 I moved to next quarter because their conference is in the summer so they can apply next quarter. 13 were disqualified because some applications didn't have a faculty letter or students didn't have their application but faculty turned in their part. I think we're going to work on trying to get Science & Policy to meet next week to start planning for the Summit that we want to get started on already. Then I'm going to be making a presentation to SAF in justifying the innovation funds that they gave us last year. That's Mackenzie's position, Joey's and the additional \$10,000 and the travel grants. That's an update on how we're doing and what we're doing with what they gave us. I think that's it.

Chris E: So when's the cutoff for the next quarter's one?

Genesis: I think it's somewhere in May. It's going to be the 6th week of the quarter.

Chris E: There's a conference coming on May 28th. Im guessing that's before school's out.

Genesis: It should fall in.

Chris L: Remind me. I have a contact for Science & Policy for you two. I was cleaning out my email today and I found it and it's pretty cool. So Secretary. Elisa's not here. She reports that the diversity event went very well today. They had a good amount of people and a great discussion and some great photos of Brian Tracy presenting. He's one of our senators who's on Community Affairs and Diversity and is pretty badass. ASUW. I'm told Evelina is coming back but I don't know about that but I met with Michael twice today. Their student debt reduction working group is working on a live conceptual art piece in Red Square tomorrow where you come and put a box on it. They'll have a surface marked off with levels of debt like \$10,000, \$20,000 or \$30,000. Then you put a box on where your debt level is so it creates a 3D graph. They presented to the House Higher Ed committee or 24 corners and kicked ass. Apparently it was really good. Michael is also soliciting stories that are getting picked up by this national report

in Al-Jazeera TV.

Genesis: Good for them.

Chris L: Yes, it's like this huge thing. They are really kicking butt. I think that's all on their half. First thing. Chris, you want me to talk about the Grad School survey? What in particular about it?

Chris E: I'm guessing this came from Adam and the meetings you just did. Maybe what was our involvement or that whole thing.

Chris L: That was reviewed by Academic and Administrative Affairs. Upon reflection, one person asked me why we were sending this out and not the Graduate School which is a completely valid question. I guess I don't have a better answer than that I was doing it as a favor for Adam, which is not a sufficient reason for doing that. I think their thought process was if it came from us, it would have more legitimacy than coming from them.

Chris E: Did they set it up though?

Chris L: The survey?

Chris E: Yes.

Chris L: Yes, Adam came in and presented the survey to Academic and Administrative Affairs and we gave feedback. In the future, I will think twice about doing that again.

Genesis: Working with the Graduate School to create that survey?

Chris L: Yes or at least asking or requiring that. We do send out surveys that we don't create.

Genesis: Yeah, there was a space survey.

Chris L: I don't have a good answer.

Chris E: And that's okay. I'm not necessarily opposed to the sending but this goes back to the shade of that WASAC survey we got. One, we're looking at problems of adverse selection of who are pool is. What you're getting when you're not looking at scaling questions, which is all survey design stuff or how great is the survey. Which I think most of us as graduate students probably have more heightened awareness on this stuff than most. They say we're really interested in your input and I find that really patronizing because, for me, if you care about student input, you're going to pay to get a study done. It's neither here nor there and they're trying to get a student voice and opinion on this stuff, but for me, that's great. I guess I'll digress there. It's also about the idea on how this is used too. Is UW policy going to be based on a

survey that is somewhat non-random, highly elevated involvement student level? That's a scary proposition to me.

Chris L: That's all well taken. What Chris is referring to is the WASAC survey. That's the Washington Student Achievement Council. They crafted probably one of the most poorly designed surveys I've seen in my life and distributed it.

Chris E: Only to people in GPSS and ASUW.

Chris L: I totally get that. The Graduate School is a special case because they have no money to spend and I guess they are making policy. I totally understand all the points.

Chris E: I get it and I don't object to it but I think it's one of those things we should be willing to say that if you care what we think, do it the right way.

Chris L: Definitely well taken. The Science Communication event in Olympia last Friday. I agree it went really well. We had some LAs and at least one legislator come through. It would have been nice to have a little bit more but they were all on the floor. They were trying to madly vote on bills that day but I think the most important thing was establishing a precedent. I was talking to Rene today and one thing that is important that we've partially accomplished this year and we're setting a direction is that we're starting to distinguish ourselves from the undergraduates on our legislative stuff. It's no longer just piggy-backing on Lobby Day. We're establishing a particular identity in a positive way. We do have separate issues and concerns and a lot of what legislators pick up on is not what we're concerned with. So in that sense, it was good. I applied to be the UW Point of Contact and this was asked of me by the Graduate School. It's the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Catalyzing Advocacy in Science and Engineering Programs. Have you heard of it?

Alice: Yes, AAAS. What is it? Is it the fellowship training program or the week orientation?

Chris L: It sends two persons per institution to DC for 3 days.

Alice: Can you read the title again?

Chris L: Catalyzing Advocacy in Science and Engineering.

Evan: Is AAAS the guys who do science?

Chris L: Yes. GPSS will get to choose two students who are sponsored by the Graduate School so we don't have to pay for them but we get to select them which I think is pretty cool. We have to have those in by March 12th so I just receive confirmation today that we are doing that. Healthcare Summit. I've been reaching out to the School of Public Health. The Associate Dean there who is pretty involved is Mark Oberle. He's been involved with ACA outreach efforts and

we're starting to assemble the team. Also, Michael and ASUW is getting interested in informing students about that so they'll be lending a hand which is pretty cool. The international student forums are going well. We had one today and one yesterday and two next week. Austin led the one today and I think Tina and Laura has been helping out. Apparently today's was really good. Once we collect all the data, we're going to try to figure out what we're doing with it. So we want to have some productive continuing discussion or engagement around that in the spring. The peer mentoring project is just rolling along at a pace that I was not expecting. Largely because the Graduate School is enthusiastic about support it and so we are now in a timeline where we're thinking of putting out a call for applications for a pilot program for mentors to sign up by the end of this quarter or the beginning of this spring and then putting out another call for the 'real program' in the fall. People who do the spring program can extend to the fall as well. We've been getting good feedback from the Graduate School and the Counseling Center. We had Ellen Taylor come in last week to talk about training and what kinds of things we need to think about and we need to do some outreach to GoMap and anyone else that need to be in the loop that I've forgotten of. Those are the big players. Kelly and I and whoever from the working group who wants to participate will be making a presentation to the Graduate School executive staff which includes the heads of all the departments so if there's anyone we missed we'll get them as well as the Dean. That's a bi-weekly meeting so we're shooting for two weeks after. So that's exciting. I think that is all I have except this very last thing. I'm going to be interviewing people this and next week to serve as Vice President of Educational Outreach because David Szatmary is retiring.

Alex: What's the timeline on that?

Chris L: This sounds really fast but I think Jerry said by the end of spring quarter and maybe going into summer quarter?

Chris E: I have a couple things to add.

Chris L: Okay, we'll move on to announcements or new business.

Chris E: First, I will give an addendum to my report. The WSA meeting last Saturday. Chris just parked this in my head. This idea of graduate students being a different thing. One of the themes around that is a strong ask for the legislators to have a work session on graduate education and higher ed. There were really good conversation around that. There's been talk for doing that possible around Assembly Day, which would coincide with the Higher Education Summit. One of these talks that are on the table is that WSU actually does have a graduate student association. They're formed a little differently in that they're mostly grant writing but they do exist and they act in the NHPS. So working with them as well the Council of Presidents as well as working with the Margaret Shepard-type people and drafting a formal letter and hoping people will sign on to that and having that submitted to members of both higher education committees. The hope would be that by the end of the year, and this might need to be talked about in a broader level. We're still nascent in this. I think it's a really good idea to say let's have

that be the focus of the Higher Education Summit so GPSS can say we have 6 grand to throw at this thing. What do you have? Then maybe UW External Affairs has some money and PEMA has some money. Obviously bringing in David Easton and Adam and this is the thing where UW drives the bus but we want everyone there. So that's Western, Eastern, Central and Evergreen. Let's have everyone there and give them their chance to educate legislators on what graduate education means. It's a great build up. We can talk about this later but I think the the three main things are TA/RA funding, more spots that helps our students get waivers and also increases the undergraduate experience. The second things is the recruitment and retention of high quality faculty and staff. The third thing is how we backfill any money for research that we might lose from sequestrations and other things to make sure that commitments can be insured. I think you were UNC with me during SAGE but this is something that isn't being done. The state that goes after it first will see some huge draw. We can talk about specific things like recruitment and retention and maybe that's faculty or maybe we're trying to get Washington students to stay here instead of going to Georgetown or Stanford or UCLA or Berkeley but all important things on getting the best and brightest. So that's where that's shaping up. The second things is a tag along to this survey thing but maybe a better idea is the state committee is working on a survey on Lobby Day. Like did you know about it or was the information good for the day. I think that can be morphed into an end of the year GPSS survey so we ask questions about the mixers and all these different things and I think that would feed well into what you're talking about. Maybe something forming around the focus groups can be done and having a nice complete package to hand to the next officers.

Chris L: Actually, that reminded me that GPSS has usually done a student survey and that has been the realm of the Secretary.

Genesis: It's under the research analyst but we got rid of it.

Chris E: That's actually one of those things where I don't know what came about last year but that's in Jake's job description to be coordinator of the graduate student survey.

Chris L: That's a good thing to think toward the spring so we should talk about that. Any other announcements?

Alice: I want to say that we should try to make a charge toward getting another executive senator. I think we need to add an agenda item but if we want to start thinking about people and hitting them up individually or say at the meeting. I don't think we should have another meeting where we just say come talk to us.

Chris E: Did you touch base with Doug?

Alex: Yes. I talked to him about that.

Genesis: He's also a no-show.

Chris L: I saw him earlier today. Would it make sense to do what we did last time?

Alice: Ask for volunteers.

Chris L: And say we're opening it up.

Alex: And say we're going to have it at the next meeting.

Alice: I think we should say, next meeting, we're going to have an election so if you want to be an executive senator, this is the process. Is anyone interested?

Chris L: And you have until then and to make yourself known and come to an exec meeting or equivalent.

Alice: And we're having an election no matter what.

Chris L: Yes.

Alice: So I think we should just take people from the floor.

Chris L: That's how we did it last time and that's how we got Alex.

Chris E: I'm also willing to do it if we make a commitment that each of us identify one person that we want to specifically talk to. I can think of a couple people that run in the spring. Michael from Comparative Literature was one. I always feel good to lean on some of our people that are more vocal that don't necessarily jump in the race.

Alice: I would love for Alan-Michael. He ran for executive senator last year.

Chris E: I thought he was a strong candidate.

Alice: I did too.

Chris E: I think there is a point where we should encourage them and let that be known since he got pushed out or whatever.

Alex: Should we amend the agenda? Should that go under announcements?

Chris L: I can't. Unfortunately the computer's dead but we can add an item at the meeting.

Alice: I'll stand up and do it.

Alex: I'll second.

Chris L: Also, we should also strongly encourage people to start thinking about officer elections.

Genesis: I want to make it noted that I have approached people and the people I've approached said no I don't want to be officer and they are people that are active in our committees and who help out as volunteers. They want to do everything but an officer.

Alice: You guys have to make it look more fun. Come to meetings and talk about all the perks you get from the UW Bookstore.

Chris L: Anyone else? If that is the case, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Alex: So moved.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Executive Meeting Minutes
March 5th, 2014
HUB 303

Chris Lizotte (President): I will call this meeting to order at 6:30pm on my watch. Before we start, we have a couple of guests so why don't we introduce ourselves?

Douglass Tabor (Evans School of Public Affairs): Hello everybody. I'm Douglass Tabor from the Evans School.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): I'm Evan Firth from the School of Oceanography. I'm an executive senator.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Hi, I'm Alice Popejoy from Public Health Genetics. I'm also an executive senator.

Elisa Law (Secretary): Elisa Law, GPSS Secretary. I'm a second year Museology student.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): Chris Erickson, Vice President. Evans School.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): Genesis, Treasurer, Evans.

Alex Bolton (Law): Alex Bolton. First year law. Executive senator.

Chris L: Tina is our notetaker and Publications Assistant. I'm Chris Lizotte. I'm GPSS President. It doesn't matter where I'm from. No, I'm from Geography.

Alex Stone (Evans School of Public Affairs): My name's Alex Stone. I'm from the Evans School.

Chris L: Thank you all for coming. Moving on to the agenda. I will entertain a motion to add an agenda item before number 4 so between 3 and 4. Action 10 minutes. Meeting times for next quarter.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Okay, then we'll do that. Next I will entertain the motion to approve the amended agenda.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Now the minutes. This is a totally minor discrepancy but the last

meeting was on the 19th and the minutes say the 20th so I'll entertain the motion to amend that.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Any other amendments? Then I'll entertain a motion to approve the amended agenda.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? You guys will have to let the rest of the class have a chance. Moving on to item 3a, meeting times for spring quarter. As we all know, we've been meeting at a not standard time this quarter which is fine. 6:30 instead of 5:30, which has been the time that senate and exec meet really for no other reason than it is what it's been since time immemorial. A couple of request to consider a different meeting time for next quarter.

Genesis: For exec or senate?

Chris L: Exec. So I'll open the floor to that.

Genesis: Move it back to 5:30?

Chris E: Does anyone have interest in a different day?

Genesis: I prefer not a different day since I already made my schedule.

Evan: Let me pull up my schedule.

Chris E: 4:30 instead of 5:30?

Genesis: I have class until 4:30.

Elisa: I have class until 4:50.

Evan: How do you all know your schedules already?

Genesis: Aren't you going to be in Greenland?

Evan: Just the first one I think.

Alice: How far away is your class at 4:50?

Elisa: The Burke so I could get here in 5-10 minutes.

Alice: Should we do 5 on Wednesday?

Evan: Works for me.

Genesis: Tina?

Tina White (Communication Specialist): I think I'm good.

Chris L: 5? How does that sound? Then I'll entertain a motion to make our spring meetings, which we already have dates for correct?

Genesis: Yes.

Chris L: So make our meeting times 5pm.

Alice: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Genesis: Let me check the room first.

Chris L: Right. What do we currently have it booked for for these meetings?

Genesis: 6:30. When's our first one? April 9th?

Evan: Oh, then I won't miss one.

Alice: I'm not opposed to it being in the GPSS office if this is booked on particular days.

Evan: Same. That wasn't too bad the couple of times we did it.

Genesis: When's our last one? Oh, April 2nd is our first meeting.

Chris L: Yes, because the 9th and 23rd are senate meetings.

Alice: So is the 2nd our first meeting?

Chris L: Yes.

Alice: 5pm.

Evan: What a great birthday present.

Alice: That's your birthday?

Evan: Yes.

Alice: Maybe we can have a gluten free birthday cake.

Evan: That would be sweet.

Chris L: Is the room available, Genesis?

Genesis: When's the last one?

Chris L: We have exec meeting on the 2nd, 16th, the 30th and the 7th of May.

Genesis: We don't have anything after that?

Chris L: Last senate meeting is May 14th. No, wait.

Genesis: We have this. We're fine.

Chris L: Then we have the motion. Any objections? Okay, great. So our spring meeting times will be the days that we've set already at 5 o'clock.

Genesis: Do we have to do a public notice for that?

Chris L: Yes.

Genesis: Who does that?

Chris L: The Secretary but we can help remind each other. So the next item is the one I added titled communications protocol. What I'm hoping to accomplish in this is to nail down and codify a procedure and a consistent timeline for getting news and information out to senators. So not the email that we are required by the bylaws to send with the agenda and minutes. This is the post meeting interim email. So I'll just start off by noting that there's never been a codified procedure. It's certainly not outlined in the bylaws. It's just been convention. So it would be helpful to think this is something that we potentially might suggest as best practice for next year's office and executive committee. Something that makes sense to give enough time to collate any information that we want to send out and to get it out on a day where people will actually read their email. Friday is like forget it. I think that's the only day I heard where you really don't send emails. Then other days are fine.

Alice: And over the weekend is a given right?

Chris L: We actually had surprisingly good luck with emails sent over the weekend but I wouldn't suggest it for our senate emails.

Alice: We had problems with emails sent over the weekend too with missing communications and things like that.

Chris L: Let's take the weekend out also because a lot of people take the weekend off and it's problematic for officers to do that in that timeframe. I'll open that up to suggestion. Elisa, you obviously know what it takes to craft these things.

Elisa: It doesn't take long to craft them but having a set upon day where all the officers who are putting their information in know that they need to put it their information in by a certain time. What happened of me missing the attachment that Chris sent me was my fault. But having some kind of Google Doc and a set deadline like anything you need to get out in the Monday or Wednesday email need to be in the Google Doc by whatever time. I'm always like someone mentioned that they need to send me something and I'm still waiting for it but I don't want to bug them about it. That would be helpful.

Chris L: Why don't we work backwards and then decide when we want to actually send it to get a timeline.

Alice: I did some analytics research for my newsletter when I used to work and they said Tuesday afternoon was the highest email because Monday you're catching up from Friday and the weekend and by Wednesday you're piled up so Tuesday is like the sweet spot.

Evan: Who was the audience for that?

Alice: That was working professionals but I don't know how it changes for graduate students but it's probably pretty similar.

Chris E: So on the same end, our data does show that noon to 2 on Saturdays is the best because that's when people wake up from partying and check their email before they start their homework. But I think this is really about expectations because we've talked about it. I thought that the standing rule from what we talked about couple weeks ago was to have it in by 8pm on Wednesday after the meeting so it could be sent out Thursday or whatever the time was. The day before, we said that stuff so I thought it was known. When I talk about the expectations, I think this is about what the senators are suppose to do. I don't think it matter when it sends out. I think there's an expectation that when we send something, they read it and be ready for the meetings. Regardless of what day we have, unless they have a clear expectation of what their job and role is, I don't think that the day really matters. Obviously I think the standard would be you have Wednesday after we meet for exec and say Thursday morning that it goes out or it's known that we do it, like officers and whoever in this group, put together and sent to Elisa and

that goes out Wednesday night or Thursday and there's a reminder on Monday and Wednesday and I think that's been what generally happens.

Chris L: Let me clarify really quick. I'm talking about the email that we send as for your constituents. This is different. This not the minutes and agenda because those by statute have to go out the night we create them.

Chris E: So same principle. A lot of it is relevant information. The idea would be we have our meetings on Wednesday and what goes out to the senators and ourselves as officers since we do reports on the executive committee. We have those pieces that need to be sent by 8am on Wednesday so Elisa can send it by noon on Thursday.

Alice: I have an idea. Since we're trying to incorporate greater involvement by the senators in all things GPSS and in meetings, why don't we add into the agenda when we get there a little exercise on getting feedback from senators and talking about our communication strategies and get a show of hands of who is consistently forwarding the emails. Getting feedback from them. What week is the best? What time? What format would you like these in? Would you like them separate emails in deliverable format for special issues or all in one? Just having a discussion between us and the rest of the senators so we make sure that they're doing their job. Not only will that give us feedback on what's going to be most effective for who we have in the senate but it's also going to give them a sense of responsiveness on our part where we're trying to accommodate them and also accountability. If we have a conversation in a meeting in which they're giving us feedback and they are involved, they're going to feel more responsibility and remember when they get that email, "Oh yeah. I remember from the meeting we talked about this and it literally take five seconds to forward it and I gave input on when they should be sent so I'm an asshole if I don't."

Evan: That's a good idea.

Chris E: Again, I'm going to go back to this idea expectations that there's an expectation set that after the meeting on Wednesday, there's something that comes Thursday and it's the job of senators to send that to their constituents. So I would ask Doug because I see you every now and again from the Evans School and so is it clear to you that there's specific emails to be sent?

Douglass: The ones that repeat, yes. The ones that I see most often. It's definitely on Thursday where I'm usually busier at the end of the week and on Monday and Wednesday, they're more easier for me to catch and realize that I need to send it.

Alex: I think part of it too is what is the email for and what works for you too because you're busy getting ready for the meeting. I always treat it as I'm always writing an email to send out to the Law School Wednesday night. All I want the bigger email for is the links instead of looking them up myself. I actually can't just forward it. We don't have a listserv. I need to send it to the staff member in the Law School and she puts it in the daily journal of news basically and I try to get that to her Wednesday night so it goes out Thursday since it gets stuck on Friday and we all

agreed that Friday isn't ideal.

Evan: The only thing I would say is that, I agree with the analytics and I like the analytics, but we might want to do it sooner after the meeting because there are events happening on Friday. I noticed a couple of times that there's a Thursday email and the even happens tomorrow or tonight. I would like to wait until Tuesday but we might want to get it out sooner since we haven't advertised the event that's happening two weeks or two days ahead of time the last time we sent out the email so it's only come up this one time that it's happening two days away. Just for those rare events that fall between the wayside because I think those events are big attractors.

Alex: My big questions is whether or not is whether it's for senators to send to their constituents as far as a GPSS heads up for events or is it a senate report? I've always done a senate report and I don't put everything in there since that's overwhelming. I send them 10 things everytime, they'll just delete it.

Chris L: There are things that we have to send since there's no other way of getting that out to the graduate and professional student population at large. We have our email list and there's problems with that that we also need to have a conversation about before we start using it on a regular basis. A lot of them are time sensitive things like committee applications or things like that.

Alex: Maybe that's two separate emails. Maybe there's one for senate reports and then there's the one we're suppose to send of the GPSS events of the week.

Chris L: Right, we're not talking about the emails meant for senator consumption.

Alex: Right. For me it's for senators to send out. Maybe differentiating a report of a senate meeting versus GPSS events.

Chris L: I don't think we ever done senate reports. What I'm talking about is something that has events and opportunities.

Evan: Happenings in Olympia.

Chris L: Yes, stuff that needs to be communicated but it's not a report of what happened in the meeting.

Alex: Yeah, if there's an announcement for a vacancy, I'll put that in there.

Chris E: Do we make senators sign contacts?

Chris L: No.

Genesis: It's all volunteer.

Chris E: This is the idea of WSA, I had to sign a contract for WSA as a liaison that I had to check in with my school at least once a week. This idea of expectations, we have to set a firm expectation that you're going to read the stuff you get and two, you're going to send out one or two emails for your people. That's a very important job on our aspect as well. I also want to look at this whether you call it a metric or analytic of how do we ensure that that's being sent out? Do they copy something when they send it forward? I'm more interested in the idea that whatever it is, that those senators are taking the time to send an email to their departments.

Evan: The closest thing we have to a contract is the bylaws which by being a senators they need are required to adhere to and if they don't adhere to it, they're subject to removal. With the enforcement of them being the lacking issue, I definitely agree that we don't have a way to actually track their jobs, except for showing up to meetings through attendance.

Chris L: I would suggest that we very temporarily table that to the next agenda item and concentrate for the moment just on a timeline to send out this particular email. These are important points and they do feed into the larger discussion about engaging the senate but just in terms of mechanically having a process.

Evan: I would be in favor of Alice's idea of getting feedback from the senate.

Chris L: Okay. Is there any objection to having a brief thing about when is the best time to get it so you can forward it on.

Evan: When, how, what have you been doing.

Chris L: I'll point out too that we have gotten feedback, not necessarily on that particular point of when the email should be sent out so I think it's good question to ask in this context. We've gotten a lot of other feedback of what kinds of information and things like that. So those are things we already know and we don't have to ask again but the question of when and maybe for example, I didn't know the Law School doesn't have a student listserv. It may exist for other departments or programs so it'll be good to know. I can just go forward, click and bam. So you have to build in that extra time so it's good to know these things.

Alex: And maybe just laying out the expectation then asking them the question too since it'll be good chance to do that. I know it's more about engagement so we don't want to keep telling them stuff but telling the context of these are your expectations. How can we best help you do that?

Alice: Could I make a request to design this portion of the agenda? I'll run it to get feedback from people because I don't want to have us sitting up there being like what day works best for everyone? Raise your hand if you like Tuesday. Okay, here are our expectations of you. You signed up to do that and we need you to do this and if you're not doing it, raise your hand. You

know, it's not engaging. I think it needs to be an interactive process and people are walking to different parts of the room, meeting each other and talking to each other and really talking to us. Not just being like you signed up for this, blah, blah, blah. Seriously, we can't even get representatives from the majority of the departments in the Graduate School. If we're trying to get people to buckle down and cracking on the whip on them, they're not going to come. We can't even get them to stick around for the whole duration of the meeting. This is going into the next session, but I think it's really important to think about the people we have in the room and their personalities and their schedules and really use them as resource to figure out if we're doing things right because that's our job. Yes, it's their job to send our emails but it's also our job to make sure we're designing the process in a way that is beneficial to everyone. It's going to help them, not just getting angry at them for not sending out their emails.

Chris L: Chris then Evan.

Chris E: I'll yield to Evan.

Evan: I just had a quick question. While you're designing that...

Alice: You want to do it together?

Evan: No, you sound like the person to design this. I'm not a happy interactive person but I was curious if you considered building in or if you already had considered building in hearing in what feedback the senators get from those emails. I personally have never heard anything back except for the I'm on vacation autoresponder. I was wondering if you would consider building that in too to asking that. That was my small addition before I forgot.

Alice: Sure. First of all, is everyone comfortable with this concept? If so, in the next section, we can talk about it or when we're planning the agenda we can talk about and you should give me input and I can put something together that models that. Does anyone object?

Evan: I'm fine with it.

Chris E: I move for right now, we work on the process that people at the end of this meeting, we'll give our stuff to Elisa as soon as we can with the expectation that she sends stuff out as timely as she can.

Elisa: I have to do it tonight. I mean we don't send out anything other than the minutes and agenda.

Chris E: Yeah, I was thinking tomorrow.

Elisa: For next Wednesday?

Chris E: I was thinking for the purposes of this meeting, we go off the baseline that we'll get

what we can and get to Elisa today and she can send it out in a timely manner some time tomorrow and we can move forward with Alice running a discussion topic or agenda item for the next senate meeting which we will gain feedback to revisit this opportunity in how we formalize this process in the next senate meeting.

Chris L: Okay, that's a motion.

Evan: I'm curious about this motion. Is this also involving the post-senate reports to senators because this sounds like the thing in question. This sounds like a post exec to senators.

Chris E: Maybe even at the meeting we can come up with a fly by night thing for next senate meeting? I'm literally asking right now to table this but giving a parameter for what we can do in the midterm and moving ahead with the idea that Alice will facilitate this discussion in the next senate meeting.

Chris L: That's fine. There is nothing we have to do other than tonight, there is no other communication we have to send out between now and Monday.

Chris E: Within that context, let's narrow it to table this conversation with an idea that an agenda item will be added to the next senate meeting where Alice facilitates a discussion the best way we can revisit this and take action on it.

Elisa: By the next time this email goes out, Alice will already have had that conversation. We'll already have a plan so in essence, without having to table the situation will already be taken care of.

Chris L: We're all on the same page. That'll be what we'll do.

Chris E: So we're just not going to deal with the motion? I laid down a motion.

Chris L: I think by consensus, we agreed.

Alice: I second his motion.

Chris E: So is the decision of the chair to not hear my motion?

Chris L: Sorry, please restate your motion.

Chris E: I'll withdraw with contention.

Chris L: So the plan is this will be an agenda item for next senate meeting and based on the feedback we get, we'll incorporate that into our procedure for the future. In the meantime, we won't have an exec meeting and because we have to send out information after next week's senate meeting.

Chris E: I did have in their the intention that we would revisit and take action on this at the next exec meeting which I still think needs to happen but move forward at the chair's discretion.

Alice: I know that you put this on the agenda with the idea to talk about when we would send out emails but I think it's a pretty fitting title, communications protocols for communication in general. We don't have to talk about it in great detail but I feel like sometimes and even at the meeting last week, we had a communication breakdown and some senators we're confused what happened to their motion. That happened just now. I feel like this kind of thing has been happening and I don't think there's one actual source of it and maybe the whole motions and clarity of how things are going, like maybe it needs attention and I don't know how to address it necessarily. I'm sorry I'm bringing up a problem without proposing a solution but I feel like maybe we could have another little reminder of how motions go in the senate meeting where we talk about what happens to them.

Rene Singleton (SAO Advisor): Are you guys talking about parli pro procedure?

Alex: We weren't but we were talking about communication in general. We were specifically talking about emails.

Alice: I totally derailed our previous conversation. I just wanted to bring that up and say that maybe we can do a communication booster.

Rene: My second question is if someone makes an error and you acknowledge the fact that you made the error, you can move on. Are you saying you all have a problem or you just have an error that just need to be corrected? You're sounding like you have a whole senate and a whole exec dysfunctional since I'm coming in late. What am I hearing?

Alice: No, we're not saying that.

Elisa: I think in the next senate meeting, we can address what that communication breakdown was or was not and moving forward that you can make a motion on top of another motion for example. If there's a motion on the floor, you need to wait until it's all the way through to make another motion. Just a really brief reminder that will hopefully prevent that situation from happening again.

Evan: I feel like I remember it a couple times where there would be complex parli pro things that were going on and it fell to that one person in the room who was super familiar with parli pro who would say you need to pause, you need to do this. It came down to one person being super familiar with it and also calm and understanding and no one else is super familiar with it so we'll just have to follow this step by step so we don't get lost in parli pro. It took a delicate balance of leadership.

Elisa: The problem seemed like nobody was respecting that there were rules in place. They were aware that there were rules but were disregarding them completely.

Alice: That's what I was saying.

Rene: My observation is you're credited as an executive group. You try the parli pro discussion at the very beginning of the year when you whipped out paperwork to everyone. Typically graduate students come from different schools and they do different ways of communicating. What I saw last week because I was observing so I was looking at people who were frustrated because they weren't getting their way much more so than they were about the process. I want to make sure that sometimes when everyone's being accommodated or not or having someone look at something in a certain way, it seems confusing but part of it was you really did have people who wanted to do this and some people wanted to do that. I think parli pro becomes an issue when it isn't done to their satisfaction and the process of how you get there always becomes an issue. So I would recommend whatever you do, do it lightly because 50% or more or less in the room, if they were satisfied with the outcome, they're all happy and they probably can't figure out why you are bringing this up. Anything that you guys need to clean up, fix it and move on but I find that to be fascinating because that was one of the first times that I actually saw of people that had very different opinions and many people were not letting go of what they were wanting.

Chris E: I think Evan brought up a great point and the best thing that we can do is because our meetings are run through Robert's rules parli pro, someone who knows the parli pro procedure...

Elisa: That's me.

Chris E: So what we need to do is if there is a breakdown, to say we need to clarify this when something like that happens.

Elisa: Chris had it under control. He knew who was making a motion and he was trying to stop it in it's track and go back. If there was a question about what needed to happen, there wasn't. It was just a free for all and Chris needed to, as a person who leads the senate, stop it go backwards. If there was a question about parli pro and had some confusion there, that would have been my job to figure that out but that wasn't what was happening.

Chris E: Sure. So I'll say in that situation, if the person who's running the meeting isn't comfortable with it, what we should do is just stop and say we need to get a clarification from the person who does parli pro. You can make that determination and that stance as the parliamentarian, and I don't consider that request or I do see that there was a motion on the floor. It stands at that. Your decision is final.

Elisa: I agree. There just wasn't a question of what order we were in or what was going on. There was too many people acting at the same time without any kind of order at all, but yes. You're right.

Alex: It could be a divergence to shut people up too though.

Chris L: What I observed was people talking out of turn and out of order. So I stepped in and we generally use a loose form of parli procedure which is fine. I stepped in to enforce it to the best of my knowledge and ability. There was one instance where someone made a motion that turned out to be irrelevant. He wanted to suspend the bylaws and there was nothing to suspend the bylaws about and the only mistake I made was telling him that in parliamentary terms, it would be out of order because it's essentially mute. It doesn't exist. I tend to agree with Elisa. I don't think there was a problem with elements of parli pro. I think there was a problem with essentially discipline and respect for people who were talking. Hopefully the way I handled it came across that I was trying to give everyone a fair chance to express themselves. As the chair of the group, that is my responsibility. Elisa is the parliamentarian and her responsibility is to resolve any conflicts that come up but in terms of running the meeting, I am tasked with doing that in an orderly and timely fashion. Is there any other discussion on this topic? I'm going to consider that we moved on to the next agenda item at this point. We've had some more senator meeting and we reached what you would call in the social sciences, data saturation or in other words, we're not hearing anything new, which is good. Everything we heard is largely around the issues I outlined from last week. I think we have the direction that we hopefully we want to move in as we plan business in subsequent meetings and I'll also point out that we have very little time left this year and very little senate meetings left so we will have to do the best we can but ultimately, the lessons that were learning and the things we're talking about now and the things we're saying we need to change and address is all part of a larger culture shift over a longer time span than any of us will be sitting here. In everything that we're doing in designing the communications timeline, I would encourage us to not insert ourselves and not say what makes sense for me in this process but what makes sense institutionally in this process and for the next person that inhabits this role. That's the work that they're going to do. They will devise a new system. So having on that note, I think I discussed most of the ideas and most of the feedback that came up. Nothing new has emerged so are there any further comments or questions that we've talked about? I would say the only additional thing is at the greatest extent possible, people expressed a preference to have as much information sent to them in written form which of course then becomes the expectation that either things prepare for the meeting or things that come where we would sort of announce at meetings. I don't mean short announcements like posters but that's been the major things. That comes with the expectation that when we send it to you, you read it and if you don't read it, you're not doing your job. It's the expectations things that Chris was talking about which is also part of a larger culture shift that's going to have to happen. I've been thinking about this a lot and to encourage this kind of behavior, to the greatest extent, the executive leadership has to model it. I don't know how to model reading an email but I think it's also helpful in thinking of those terms in the sense that and I'm not exactly sure what this means. I'm freestyling at this point, but what hopefully will be talking about next week in the state of GPSS and what we'll be doing and the things we've been talking about doing like soliciting more feedback around particular topics, demonstrate that we're being responsive to them and they can be responsive to us. I know I'm using language that's not us and them and it's a limitation of my thought process at the moment but as much as possible, the senate should be space for the senators and I think we have ideas on how to do that. It's going to take time. GPSS, for as long as I've been involved, has had this same issue

of being just information dumping and lack of engagement. That's the way things have been, which is not to blame at the feet of any leadership. When busy people get together with busy lives and try to do things, that's how it ends up rolling.

Alice: I was just thinking that since we created the GPSS Spotlight with the idea of senators talk about their work or cool things going on in their departments or the communities that we haven't really reached out to them and we've just sort of used that as another avenue to dump from somebody in the administration or the outside and in the next meeting we can revisit that or as part of this, maybe in this planning the next one but bring that in the whole conversation of are you getting out of this what you want? Just gently reminded them that that's why we created it in the first place and since we haven't been getting volunteers, that's what we've been doing but on our end, we haven't been recruiting. Like "Hey, I heard something cool that you were talking about and I think you should do that in the spotlight." It's a two way street but in general, we can take this opportunity to get feedback from them on how to be more engaging because we don't know.

Chris L: Well we do since we've been having these meetings.

Alice: But at the last meeting, I came here late after this conversation and I apologize for that but after I think someone said to me that but then we proceeded to plan a senate meeting that was information dump so it's one thing to recognize it and one thing to see the problem and brainstorm but it's another thing to do something about it.

Chris L: I totally agree with you with the spotlight thing. It was designed and we have not been using it. That's one way we haven't been modeling behavior we'd like to see.

Elisa: Alma actually volunteered a couple weeks ago and I said we can put you in the next senate meeting after that but then she said I'm not ready that soon so I'll follow up with her and if she's still interested in doing it. Then she can be the spotlight and after her spotlight, we can make an announcement that this is what we intended so please volunteer.

Evan: I just want to make a point that I definitely agree to give the spotlights back to the senate as much as we can but on the other hand, the spotlights we've been doing with the administration have been surprisingly been successful. We brought in transportation and there was a lot of discussion on that and even if we it give back to senate, which I think we should, I would like keep in mind to bring in the administration people in a separate idea because while they've been informational, there's been interaction happening on the side of it.

Chris L: I think absolutely. For example, that was an important discussion to have. There's going to be another important discussion to be had about a new life sciences building and using student tuition money to pay the bond for it which has never ever been done on this campus. We can have this in the spring quarter and we can throw in Bob Stacy. We definitely can still do that but the idea is turn it as much from presentation to discussion no matter who it is.

Evan: I don't know if it's just been a matter of actively searching people to fit the bill but whatever it is, it's filled better than last year. It's filled with entertaining, pressing, short issues with short discussions. It's been really nice and I'd like to see that continue on the side at least on the goal of let's fill a spot and find something to bring to the attention. It's to set a goal to fill that spot.

Chris L: In other words, not filling it if we can't find something. I think we've described before that the cycle has been people haven't been stepping up, let's fill the time with something. People are then like there hasn't been any room for me to bring stuff in because the agenda's already filled up. I totally get what you're saying and I think we're on the same page in terms of turning back in the opposite direction so we don't feel compelled. If no one steps up, maybe we don't have it. Someone in the other meetings said maybe we have a 30 minute senate meeting if that's all we need. Maybe we do.

Alex: Some of the issue too is that other groups that meet on campus, when they engage it's on some sort of legislation be it a resolution. Our back structure doesn't have anything to bring stuff like that. What you're talking about is a role to engage GPSS in the life sciences building and I don't know if there's ways to take a step back of all of GPSS. Not doing just to do it either but somehow have something that come to or bringing it in some sort of form so there's a natural piece of discussion. We're talking about this and debating this. The source is a legislation or resolution or something but how to do that? I think that's why we had a hard time making them more engaging because everything's been structured like an information dump.

Chris L: To partially answer your question, one thing that we did in a well-intentioned way that we never followed through on is at the beginning of the year, we crowdsourced a series of priorities. Then we said go back and ask your constituents and see if it matters to them. My suggestion would be and it's a little late to do this now so we just have to learn from this and pass it along to the next people, is to take that list and we're going through this list and we'll decide collectively are we taking up this issue? No, it's gone. Are we taking this issue? Yes, sweet. Now we'll assign it to a sub-committee that's dedicated to working on it and then that can come back as an as needed basis. So we made this progress and here it is again. Discussion and then go back. We're at this point that the senate can express an opinion through a resolution. This is closer to the model that ASUW uses for their senate. We can't emulate their senate since it runs independently from their board of directors. They just have more people and more energy and capacity to do that but I think their model is much closer to that kind of thing than it is here.

Alex: Faculty senate sometimes has that issue where sometimes they have a bunch of legislation and they take forever but they're engaged but other times, they become information dumps because there isn't something to share so there's no easy answer.

Rene: I was going to say that issues like the one coming up using using tuition to bill a building, I know the undergrads are working on that in a resolution form. This is such a big deal so maybe that's something that you guys want to make a resolution yourselves and have everyone

debate because this is going to be asked like that. This is like every now and then, you get these earth-shattering deal but no one act like it is. This is the big one coming forward.

Evan: Is it a big deal because it's something that could set a precedent in the university?

Chris L: Yes. I'll talk about it in my report. This is probably the biggest policy thing that happened this year. It's really really big.

Evan: I think that's important. That's why I like bringing diverse administrative issue even if it's not directly relevant because these issues tend to be affecting all of them. Like the fee-based programs last year, even though it was affecting some of the smaller programs or some that were outside of the main sources of funding. I heard from other channels that people were sending out feelers to Oceanography even. So it was affecting everyone so I'm glad we caught on to it and I hope we keep doing that.

Chris L: Any other discussion on this?

Evan: I have one more thing to add to that. One of the ways I really saw it working well last year interactively is the task force. So maybe it wasn't super interactive inside the meeting but the travel grants task force got a lot done and they came up with a rubric. I was kind of curious to know what made that successful? The interact with other established committees to be so successful? Were they guided specifically by any person that made them successful because I can understand that a lot of task forces fizzle out. So I was wondering what made them work and can we do that for other task forces? That came to mind when you mentioned putting up priorities and assigning committees to do it.

Chris L: I can answer that. Another interesting thing that's emerged is we worry that we do too much as an organization and that's not the case in terms of what we've been hearing. People love our socials. People are really engaged in the Diversity committee. People have been really engaged in my working group for peer-mentoring. As far as I can tell, both legislative committees are really active. Today the table was completely full for the federal. Those things are not issues and the lesson from that travel grants working group is that if there is an important issue that people care about, they will engage with it. For our committees that are agenda driven, so Community Affairs, Academic and Administrative Affairs and Student Life which are coincidentally the three that we've been unable to do anything with this year, this is why I suggest filling their agenda early on rather than just creating them and saying go out and find things to do, which is the way it's been done. I should point out that this is only the second year that those committees have existed. There's not a lot of precedent to fall back on. A lot of committees function just fine because people want to do it and say in the federal legislative committee they have a clear task to perform and they have a lot to do. Same with Diversity. They have a clear set of things to do and same with Finance and Budget as well as Travel Grants. It's really in this center space of the senate itself where all the conversation has been going back to and not in the peripheral stuff.

Rene: Historically, of those three committees that Chris is talking about, there are people in this very room that just wanted to stop doing it. Then there are 1 or 2 people in the room say that no, we need it even though we haven't used it in 10 years. So it's not like you have a history of those three committees. Chris is absolutely right. They haven't been working and they never work but you guys keep them on but I don't know why. If you can't go back to your minutes and you can't see if something's been active, why are you doing it? That's not a question that gets asked. So you may want to do that. F&B meets every week and leg, you have a lot of stuff going on. Then you have a couple of these things that's on your books and nobody's asked why is it on there? Did it ever work?

Chris L: Charles told us to put it on there.

Rene: One of you guys could make that switch.

Alice: I'll ask that question. What Evan's talking about is task forces being particularly useful when you have an agenda driven situation. That makes sense to me. Last year there was the whole question of having to deal with professors who don't want to let you take your exams at a different time because of a professional development thing and we did a lot on that. Adam was like that should be under the Academic and Administrative Affairs committee but there's no one on it. Do you want to be on that committee? No, I just want to work on this issue. It makes sense that when there's an issue comes up, the senator brings it to the full senate, we talk about it and it becomes an issues and people who want to work on it works on it. That makes sense to me and if there's something in Academic and Administrative Affairs-like issue, it doesn't matter if there's an issue or not if there's a committee or not. Maybe we want to think about setting aside a separate date or one of the future exec meeting in order to revisit the bylaws and I know that wasn't a fun process last year but I don't think it has to be as extensive like that. There are a few things that could be revisited like the committees, the committee structure and the things that were put in last year that literally have not been touched this year like the committee coordinating board.

Chris L: I completely agree. My take on why those three committees have not worked is we haven't been giving them a chance to work. We've been thinking about them in a completely reverse way. At the same time, we don't need those three committees. It could be a system of just there's an issue and then people work on it and that dissolves once the issue is resolved. More generally what you're describing is the process we want to move to where things are brought centrally and given out because what we've been doing is thinking that they'll filter up some how. That's the part that didn't get thought through well. Whether we have certain categories for things or create ad hoc committees, that's a minor detail. What's more important is the flow goes in and then out, not...

Alice: Happening on the outskirts and maybe some of it trickles in.

Chris L: Right.

Alex: That might be a nice way too to engage the senate. If it's a task force of the senate and give them a date to report back and people feel more comfortable in smaller groups. Ideally over time, people will find stuff they're interested in and get involved that way.

Chris L: We'll have to have a discussion about it and it won't be too extensive but that's the question we should put to the senate. We think we have the basic principle is nailed down based on things people have said. The senate becomes a place where things are generated and assigned. What's the actual process of doing this? Do we still have the three standing committees or do we just create and dissolve committees on an ad hoc basis? It's necessary to talk but in terms of the larger thing, that's more about the detail.

Evan: I want to clarify that you three gotten what I was saying. I realized that I was jumping three steps ahead of my thought process, so thank you. That was my core idea that task forces would be the way to go. My thought further is that assuming we go with task forces, I want to identify what makes them work and not work because relying too heavily on task force and not having a centralized way to how we should direct them could lead to a lot of fizzling and demoralization. I would really like it to figure out what made the travel grants committee work because they came out with a heaving amount of paperwork and details and were meeting weekly and more. I can also easily imagine that task force meetings that say they will do grand things and fizzle out so it would be good to see what makes them work and what doesn't.

Chris L: Came we have that discussion later?

Evan: Totally.

Rene: I would recommend as an exec body, do a little bit of the work before you present it to the senate with what it is you want. Having a meeting of committees with a giant group and with all the different opinions, it'll be difficult. Operationally, you need to think about what you want and what you want is a managerial style. If you like a lot of control, you will want to centralize. You need to think about the people that are going to be elected and think about their styles because one style works better than the other because if you want people to be engaged and be involved and you have those standing committees over there, you get to work on everything. If you'd like a more inclusive model, then you'd want the task force model. That's something you need to work out ahead of time and look at it that way. With the travel grants thing, the executive committee made a recommendation to kill travel grants but the senators wanted it. They were mad and they had to come up with something one way or the other and they did it. That's what you would call grassroots organizing. The executive committee had very little to do with that and that maybe the the reason why it was so successful.

Chris E: Point of information, are we on agenda number five?

Chris L: Yes.

Chris E: Okay, so the committee discussion is great and robust but I'd like to know how that

pertains to planning of senate meetings?

Chris L: Planning and engaging senate meetings. In other words, how we're getting people engaged in the process.

Chris E: I'll also call a barring of extension of time.

Chris L: We are over time so if there's anyone that would like to have more discussion at this point, I'll entertain a motion to extend time. Otherwise, we should move on.

Evan: We can talk more later. The specifics can be worked out later I should say. Does anyone else have any ideas that they wanted to propose about engaging senate meetings?

Chris L: I'll entertain a motion to extend time or move on to the next item.

Alex: I'll move by 3 minutes.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objection?

Alice: This is really quick and it can be tied to the next item too. Maybe in the current structure, an initial way to get people engaged again is talk about the really great stuff that's going on in the committee. There are some committees that are going to be extremely boring if you force all committees to have a report section but if you had a space for committees that are doing really cool things, I think you should be doing that regularly. Conveniently each committee has a liaison in the executive committee, we should all be relatively aware of what's going on in the committees and let senators know and at least get some sort of a read on what we are doing. So maybe we can build that in the next meeting agenda if people are interested in that idea.

Chris L: Keeping that in mind...

Genesis: F&B had an idea and wants to do something like that.

Chris L: And they have a necessary thing to talk about. So the first agenda item will be adjourning the previous meeting.

Genesis: Evan, are we doing the state of funds? What are we doing?

Evan: We were going to just say "Hey come these F&B funded things." We were not talking about changing the funding thing.

Genesis: Oh, that's next quarter.

Alice: What's the State of GPSS for 35 minutes?

Chris L: This is something I've been discussing for several weeks now. This is the presentation that is the result of both the senator meetings we've been having with the feedback and also the working group that's been doing some reflection around GPSS's central mission and purpose. So the idea here is what we've done is excavated GPSS's central mission from nowhere. Not from nowhere but in terms of having no documents. If you go to our website, our mission statement is a mess. It's a whole paragraph.

Evan: You can say you excavated it from action.

Chris L: Yes. So the idea is to present this as a core organizing principle and all this other stuff is in service of that.

Chris E: So maybe this goes into the deeper issues and I'm totally behind this but specifically to that point of the website, especially talking about priorities and updating that. There's 2012 information spotlights on there. Melanie Mayock still listed as VP. I don't want to spend a lot of time on that but I'll wait on the other stuff about executive officer elections.

Chris L: I just put 35 in but I can reduce that. I'll not put in a time for now. What is planned and is open to any input is this is those two things, that core statement and that feedback we've been getting from our meetings. A lot of that feedback translates into a lot of the things of how to make the senate more engaging. A lot of the same idea.

Evan: I like having it. I feel like most or all of the senators that came to those meetings would like to see the results of coming to those meetings.

Chris L: We've invited every senator that was on the roster and I actually sent out invitation to senators asking them even if you haven't been making it to senate meetings, please make it to this one because we're going to be trying to articulate our vision and our work. This presentation aspect will be relatively short compared to the discussion around the things. If you want a model of what we have in mind, the working group, and I and Austin has been helping me on this as well, is the presentation I did last week of peer-mentoring program is having some core concepts and here are the things we still need help on and let's talk about those. So minimal presenting and actually posing a question. A lot of the stuff we've been talking about, we can pose as question. I think the best way to proceed is to start from that top level and ask why we are an organization. We have a statement and then descend down to more specific and concrete things that we can do. Does that make sense?

Evan: Can we make sure that we phrase the mission purpose as a temporary thing open to suggestions?

Chris L: Yes, this is not codifying anything. This is not rewriting a constitution or a previous mission statement. All this is, is what we have come up within four weeks.

Evan: I understand. I'm just saying to the senate as a whole.

Chris L: Right, this is as best as we can tell.

Alex: It gives directions too. A place to start the conversation.

Evan: As best as we can tell, what would you guys add or change to this?

Chris L: I will put in executive senator election.

Evan: Then we have Alice's engagement event.

Alice: Should we have executive senator speeches before information or can it be included in the same line? Or senator speeches, nominations as information and election as an action item? Half an hour, forty minutes?

Chris L: Yeah, I don't think we'll use all that time though. I don't mean at all to dictate this meeting agenda but things like what Alice proposed to maybe be a sub-item for State of GPSS, or not. In terms of being in part of the overall conversation.

Evan: I was thinking about that. My conclusion is to be separate because State of GPSS seems to be more GPSS, what are we doing to the constituents and this seems to be more executive senate to senate. It seems like two different interactive pathways so we should kind of keep separate so the message doesn't get construed or convoluted. This is how we're reaching out to your constituents. As long as you're coming here can we make that process make it go smoother from us to you?

Chris E: I want to finish that and to go back to the executive senator thing. So please feel free to finish that.

Chris L: Alice, what do you want to call that? Communication protocol?

Alex: Is it almost a workshop?

Alice: Kind of.

Evan: Engagement breakout discussion? Is it a breakout thing?

Alice: How about GPSS communication activity? You hate that.

Chris L: No the only word is activity. No, activity is fine.

Genesis: If you put breakout, they will leave.

Alice: Activity sounds fun.

Evan: Good call. Use a new word they aren't familiar with yet.

Chris L: How much time?

Alice: I don't know. I think before we finalize that, can we talk about really quickly? I need input for it. You don't want me to go loose with this. I'll have us playing telephone.

Chris L: I'll say my piece and let everyone weigh in. My suggestion is it really focuses on the aspects we touched on like what's the best day of the week? What can we do to facilitate you actually moving information from point A to point B and not be a meta "how do we communicate" activity.

Chris E: Does anyone want to work with Alice on this over the next week?

Evan: I'm not volunteering but I have a couple of additions. So possibly asking them if they do they want to codify. We're assuming they want it codified and that'll make it good but maybe they want to make it open ended.

Alex: Did we say we wanted to codify? I was assuming it was putting together maybe a best practice or something. Stay away from bylaw overkill.

Evan: Do they want it firm? What is their reactions been with their senators on this? What do they think will get reactions from their senators? I don't have any opinions on how you actually do the activity.

Alice: I think the content is the most important thing to hear from you guys. If you're not opposed to sort of a freeform method, I think people should talk to each other and stand up and do thing. No that I have any grand ideas right now but by next week I will.

Chris L: I will say that people have expressed desire to talk to each other in groups.

Chris E: I would support a brainstorming vibe.

Chris L: Communications brainstorming activity.

Evan: I would add in though is if they want to discuss or to lead them towards discussing this is that some of us do have mailing lists and some of us don't.

Alex: Gathering some of that info.

Evan: Yeah, like hey can you ask your department to make a mailing list, etc.? I think some departments will have agreement and will have thought this over on their own.

Chris E: Can we ask that Austin be available in this? I know he was in a lot of focus groups and a lot of that information will be helpful.

Chris L: If he can make it, I'll ask him.

Chris E: Even in the setup and the structure.

Alice: Will you connect me and Austin?

Chris L: Yes. Is that enough information?

Alice: So what I have from you guys is when would they like us to communicate and in what format, what are the reactions been from senators. Have they received feedback from them on the way we or they communicate and who has mailing lists and who doesn't. Anything else?

Chris L: I think the best practices question is a good one too. If we should gently codify.

Alex: Implicitly.

Evan: We're offering to do this for you guys and make it a regular thing on a regular timescale but if you guys don't care about that or want the opposite of that, then we don't have to do it either. Maybe they want it when it's pertinent or on the same day.

Elisa: I have something to add. The Elections committee will be making a brief announcement that the elections will be coming up but they should introduce themselves and announce that the updated elections packet is available online and what the dates are and the timeline is.

Chris L: Can I call it opening of elections season?

Elisa: Technically it's not me. It's the Elections committee that does it.

Chris L: But you're adding it to the agenda.

Elisa: I also wouldn't call it that because technically we opened it in February when we started telling people about it.

Chris L: Then elections committee update or reminder.

Rene: Please remove Elisa's name and put your election's chair on there to make sure that you don't have any bias.

Elisa: Seyda Ipek. Actually she will not be there but someone else will stand in her place.

Chris L: How much time?

Elisa: I would say five minutes.

Chris E: I wanted to comment on a thing to add to the officers about updating job descriptions for that. My comment is to work off the bylaws that were approved last April and it has to be the most updated version.

Chris L: Alice how much time do you want for you?

Alice: 20 minutes? No, maybe 15.

Genesis: Can you make sure F&B update is there? We would not like to be the last.

Evan: Well it would be okay since they would leave thinking about what they want to go sign up for and participate.

Chris L: Genesis what is this? Is this the discussion of allocating more?

Genesis: No that's later. This is a discussion presenting to the senate all the different RSOs we funded and events and putting a call out there for senators to sign up for events to monitor on behalf of F&B. Part of our funding, we require that they allow a senator to attend their event for free and see how and if GPSS is acknowledged.

Evan: That might be starting next round because our application says Finance & Budget committee members.

Genesis: Does it?

Evan: We can just double check that get verbal confirmation on the ones that are coming later.

Genesis: Is it just the committee?

Chris L: Chris, what did you want?

Chris E: Let me first say that we need to take care of it right away. The approval of the federal legislative agenda. I believe that can even come up before since it was tabled. It has the right to come up.

Alice: Before the adjournment?

Chris E: We actually didn't adjourn. So we can actually bring it up as business from the previous meeting. Maybe we need to check that because sometimes when you table it, it's tabled to the next meeting. Either way let's get it done.

Chris L: I'm going to take out Previously on GPSS. We don't need that. How much time do you need?

Chris E: Let's cut it to 10. I would think that everyone went through it and it's been available. No comments have been submitted so nothing has been changed.

Chris L: Genesis, how much time for the F&B committee?

Genesis: 5.

Chris E: The thing I want to go back to the executive decision is since we like to delve into the bylaws when it suits our needs, Article 7, Clause 1, Section B literally gives the power of appointing or nominating an executive senator to the officers. So there's this idea here where it talks about how we can interview and I remember this happening last spring where the executive committee took the time to interview and ask questions of the candidate and it was put not even to the vote. What we would do is we would make the nomination and the role of GPSS is to just to confirm that nomination but people still have the ability to run from the floor. Whether we do it in this meeting, I think it's in our best purview to ask some questions of Doug. Are you here to become an executive senators.

Douglass: And because it's enjoyable.

Chris E: Can we take a couple minutes to ask questions and make sure if it's in our choice to present him as the nominee?

Chris L: Well taken. We can do that.

Evan: I missed what you were saying because I was reading the bylaws but I feel like we have that power but we made a conscious decision early on so we don't seem like a centralized force that was forcing to take one nominee over the other so we purposely took a large step back so it doesn't look like we're taking control of everything.

Chris E: I understand that and I'm going to maybe take on that sentiment that we don't have that power but we've already done it.

Alice: What do you mean we don't have that power?

Chris E: Within the bylaws, we don't have the power to change it to our whim without actually taking a formal vote to suspend the rules.

Alex: You said the bylaw was?

Chris E: 7a Clause 1, b.

Genesis: Didn't you say that was an option of the exec to do?

Chris E: For the executive committee consisting of the president, vice president, secretary and treasurer and approved by the GPSS have been advised of duties and responsibilities of the executive senators. That to me say that we nominate and they approve.

Rene: You guys have done this about 20 million ways. If you look at that language, it's written to give you a lot of flexibility. If you choose to be more involved in the process, you can be. If you don't then don't. Some years nominate and some don't. Start off the school year at the beginning of the year and find that you have two missing executive senator slots left, you want to get it over with. Granted, people may not have been interested and that's why the nomination process is taken care of or not but you do have flexibility there.

Chris L: My recollection is, the last time we did this, is that we nominated two candidates who made themselves known to us as candidates and sat at the meetings, which we can totally do and then the vote of the senate is the confirmation.

Alice: I don't think we did that.

Chris L: Yes, we nominated people.

Alice: This year?

Chris L: Yes.

Evan: I was nominated which was last year.

Alice: We didn't nominate this year.

Chris L: The point is, a nomination isn't an endorsement. All it means is these people have taken the time to say their candidacy. Therefore they've gone through the process. It doesn't preclude people running from the floor. It just means that people running from the floor had not made themselves known. That to me is what nominating is. We understand these people are interested in this position and therefore we are presenting them to you as our nominees for it.

Evan: I agree that it's technically an endorsement. I was under the impression that we were purposely stepping back from that nomination role so it doesn't feel like an endorsement as to the senate as a whole. Even though it's technically in our purview to do it, the way I would read this is that while these four may also be nominated by a committee we can also allow them to all technically run from the floor even though they have come here and talk to them. So in the sense, the senate doesn't see us saying names.

Alice: I think we talked about that in the last time we did this. I don't think you said we nominate. You said these two individuals both came to the meeting and they're both great candidates and if anyone wants to run from the floor, they can. I think personally there's two reasons why I'm

supporting Evan and why we should stick to that. One is that we should be consistent. For different elections in the same year, we shouldn't be doing a different model. Secondly, the executive senator positions is the representation of the whole senate so to me, it would feel a little strange to have the executive committee to nominate someone. That's fine since it's in our bylaws but I don't know if there has to be a motion but I would prefer if we just say that Doug came to the meeting and he's a great candidate. Is anyone else interested? Father than saying we nominate Doug. Maybe this is awkward having you here. Sorry Doug.

Chris L: I don't see that much of a difference nominating someone. I agree that it's a little weird because there's no requirement to being an executive senator other than being a senator. If the requirement was you have to attend X number of meetings, then it would make sense to nominate this person because they gone through the proper process. It's weird that we have the power to nominate whoever the hell we want for what seems like very arbitrary reasons. My understanding is that our practice has been to nominate or to name and identified the individuals who have gone through this process and presented themselves to the executive committee and we present them as our nominee.

Alice: Which I think is why the language says nominee because that is what that means in fact but using that word in a meeting might convey a different message as an endorsement.

Evan: So while I normally don't like discussion of semantics, this one does sound important. I'm curious to the actual crux of the issue is. So Chris, were you bringing this up in terms of adherence to the bylaw's wish to interview the nominees or of the semantic issue at hand?

Chris E: For the sake the sanity, let's focus on number two.

Evan: Number two was interview?

Chris E: Yes.

Evan: Then I think we should totally still use our power and interview them at our choosing. I personally was interviewed when I came in and it made me nervous as hell but it worked out.

Alice: Interview privately with the officers or full senate?

Evan: I was interviewed both. It was a thing so they wouldn't run longer since they occasionally had long meetings.

Chris L: So you were not interviewed in an executive committee meeting?

Evan: No, I was interviewed one on one.

Alice: And I showed up at a meeting one day and was nominated and was elected.

Chris L: So we have done this many ways.

Evan: Chris, were you hoping to interview them now?

Chris E: Sure. I think Doug's been here before. He is a strong candidate. He didn't make it so he's back again. We have one quarter left so I think he deserves it. I think we're in a different situation than we were last time. I think he deserve our nomination.

Chris L: So when you say nomination, you mean endorsement?

Chris E: Call it what you call it.

Genesis: No, it's either a nomination or an endorsement.

Chris E: So all we're saying when we get up there is this committee comprised of the officers have nominated Doug to be a thing. People are allowed to run from the floor but that's what we're doing. We sat at this table and discussed 15 different ways to interpret that. Who cares? I'm not taking a Law School test so I don't need to spend a ton of time doing it but this the way it is. We can not do that. I'm just saying that's my preference.

Evan: So I see nothing wrong with interviewing them unless anyone has a time constraint. As far a nomination, I would not be comfortable with endorsing or even with the word nominate. So the committee as a whole, I would not be comfortable with that but with Chris solely, I would imagine there is nothing stopping him from endorsing a candidate but there would be recommendation to not have a split exec.

Chris E: Personally, I wouldn't do that.

Genesis: I recommend that Doug nominate himself and exec say that Doug has gone through this process. He's interviewed with exec, talked to us and gone to the meeting and let the senate vote. There's no nomination and no endorsement from exec. It's just Doug nominating himself and us saying yes, he's gone through the process. Why couldn't it happen that way?

Chris L: I'm fine with that. Any objections to that?

Evan: Just to play devil's advocate, why are we saying it instead of Doug?

Genesis: Why is Doug not saying he's gone through the process?

Evan: Yes.

Genesis: I just thought it was a certification that Doug has gone through the process.

Douglass: If it makes it easier on the executive committee, I'll just run from the floor.

Genesis: No because it implies he has not come through the process.

Douglass: I'm open to whatever happens.

Alice: I move to have Chris go up there and say we had one person come to an executive senate meeting last week and he has shown interest and his name is Doug. Unless anyone else from the floor, is anyone else interested? Yay or nay. Let's have speeches and an election. Not using the word nominate and endorse and not having any of the exec committee pontificating of his excellent qualities. Is anyone else interested?

Genesis: I agree.

Alice: That was a motion.

Chris E: Can we cut down the time limit then?

Chris L: Yes.

Genesis: I second the motion.

Chris L: The motion is essentially for me to confirm that Doug has done what is expected.

Genesis: Yes.

Evan: I have a question. Are you also here to run for executive senator?

Alex: No. Thanks for asking.

Evan: Yes, I would feel really bad.

Alice: What is your reason for being here?

Alex: I'm interested in running for a position next year. I was informed that I had to attend one of these.

Chris L: So the motion that I'm hearing is that I confirm that Doug did what he was expected.

Alice: Yes.

Chris L: Is there a second?

Genesis: I seconded it.

Chris L: I'm sorry. Any objections? That's what we'll do. Chris, would you like a legislative update?

Chris E: Yes, I can close it out.

Chris L: How much time?

Chris E: I'll go with the regular 10 but I can cover this in my VP report but that won't be until May so 10 minutes or less is fine.

Evan: Alice or Genesis, do you want to switch the position of the F&B and the activity? It seems like the State of GPSS transitions more smoothly with the activity.

Alice: Why don't we put F&B before State of GPSS?

Evan: I was just thinking that if we go near the end, then they can remember to go on the website.

Genesis: I don't care. It's Colin making the presentation.

Elisa: Should we do a Diversity committee funding update?

Chris L: Do you want to?

Elisa: Yes, it would take like 2 minutes.

Evan: This is a special thing where F&B is putting out this call.

Genesis: We need people to go to our events.

Elisa: Okay, then no.

Chris L: Anything else to add to the agenda?

Alice: Can we put Colin Bateson's name instead of Genesis for F&B?

Chris L: Sure. Any other changes?

Rene: I was going to ask a question for the election. I can't see where the election is in relation to their discussion of the State of GPSS.

Chris L: It's just State of GPSS, then elections.

Alice: Do you think it needs to be closer to it?

Rene: Well, right now do you know if you have other candidates? That may motivate people.

Chris E: I know Alan-Michael said he would in the meeting.

Chris L: Has he approached anyone?

Alice: Yes, he approached me and he said he would come tonight but maybe he forgot. He did run last year and he's been an active member of the senate and Diversity committee but I haven't talked to him beyond that. Maybe we can just have him raise his hand.

Chris L: Any other changes? Then I'll entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Genesis: So moved.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Then executive senator reports.

Evan: I have something that's not a report but just with all the talk with website that came up, at some point in spring quarter, we could discuss the Wiki so then it doesn't die out, it'd be great.

Alex: I talked to a few of you about this. It's kind of executive and it's kind of bigger. It's the whole transition of the student health care plan. I've gotten some answer on that and direct something toward the Professional School. I know GPSS has an event on it but maybe some specific schools might broaden the reach.

Chris L: The School of Public Health has an event that I will tell you about. Officer's reports.
Chris?

Chris E: So a couple quick update. 1669, the fee-based programs bill has been execed out and has made it to rules and Senator Marilyn Chase has the second reading calendar so we have 5 or 6 days to get on Boards of Consideration to be voted on. I see very good things starting to happen. We're doing all the right things and this looks really good. I just talked to Melanie today and she thought it died so that's very good. We're going to coordinate with Patricia Atwater and Michelle Dylan who did a lot of work on the bill so we'll be working with her to be invited to the bill signing. All good things. The veteran's bill is still out there and still alive. At this point, the WSA team and I just can't see a way how House gets away with not passing the Veteran's Bill after the senate gave them the Dream Act plus 5 million in the State Need Grant. It's a real bad message to not pick up the Veterans after doing that so we think there's going to be a way that Choppe is doing his things so we'll see how that works out. As the last item, WSA is moving to a new set up where they're going to approve the legislative agenda for next year at the spring general assembly meeting instead of the fall assembly. It gives more lead time to develop campaigns and work on things over the summer. I think it's solid. We're going to be

working on three proposals on the state committee. We're going to begin pushing on how we go about next year and I testified today in front of the House Higher Ed committee. It was a bit of a interim work session planning kick off and we got to be able to do that. We talked about this deal that we still want the joint legislative committee to take up a work session then they can commit to it, we will start up the task force to start working on that. So a couple things around this and a resolution might come around in this aspect and the reason why is because the organizing director position has proposed this cut. We didn't use this cut last summer but I'm going to make the case that it's important for next year to have someone around to help with planning but let's cross that bridge when we need to but fingers crossed that we see that happen. There are three areas were looking at: TA/RA funding, recruitment and retention for faculty and students. When we talk about students, it's really an interesting piece that we can add on of retention of instate students of Washington. We keep them from going to the Stanfords and UC-Berkleys and the UT-Austins of the word and keep them here so that'll be an issue. The third part is how to ensure or backfill any federal research money we might lose. One of the things that came up today is they're still there but they aren't keeping up with inflation. How do we find a metric that says if they are under 3 percent, how does the state then ensure that the money is guaranteed to make sure that the commitments are kept up? It'll take some work. It's a lofty idea but there's is no state in the country that does that so right now it's an exponential benefit. The other part is something we laid out and it's one of the WSA things and I think it's very graduate specific. When we talk about the value of graduate students and here at the graduate level, used in policy. So whether that's the student achievement council level, the state board level or whatever. How do we coordinate that and I worked a little bit this session on how we can formalize a policy process between the legislature and Evans. I think as a coordination point, that's good. The Law School already has a couple with youth and justice and they have a science and technology seminar that work specifically with thee legislature. So there are some things out there. EPAR is another model but maybe one of those things is a database or web-based model where some filter would be in place where you can upload papers or research to an area where people can go search. Another idea for this mechanism would be is in this state so there's a mechanism, maybe when they commission a \$250,000 study that \$25,000 or \$50,000 grand would be attached to a university. I think this idea of a second look and creating a lot of value of students as well as other areas.

Evan: Just to add to that, this might be too outside of it but it sounds like a public open source data dump type of idea. A journal I heard that recently did that was Plas One Biology. It recently mandated that is submitting to that journal has to make all their data publicly available in one giant dump so that might be a model of sorts to look at. It's less typical because it's still a private journal than a governmental thing but as far as that working, that might be something to look at.

Chris E: Awesome. I think it's one of those ideas moving forward. This is another thing too that I want to be aware of is how much or how little I set the stage for who comes next year. So I think a lot of this is speculative and something that will be discussed with whoever is elected and how we move forward. Those are my pieces.

Chris L: Okay, thank you. Genesis?

Genesis: F&B is about down to \$10,000 in our special allocation fund. Travel grants funded about \$10,000. On Friday, I made my presentation to SAF about our innovation fund and Austin said it was received well. They were pretty impressed with what we're doing with travel grants. That's it.

Chris L: How about Joey's position? As part of our innovation fund, did they receive it well?

Genesis: No, not really because they didn't see a return on the investment on Joey's position.

Evan: What about the extra \$10,000 to special allocations? Was that well received?

Genesis: Yes. I told them by now, by the level we were funding, if we not had not had the extra \$10,000, we would be done.

Evan: And we were able to fund some above.

Genesis: Yes, that's what I told them too. They said, "Oh, you gave them them more money than they needed?" No, they didn't not need it. They were asking for a little because we only had a little bit of money.

Evan: That was specifically the one that give us a huge return on it.

Chris L: If there's an opportunity to go back and talk to them about that position, I think they're completely failing to understand how much work that is.

Genesis: I did explain that to them that he has encountered roadblocks and what last year's administration set up didn't anticipate the roadblocks he's encountering this year so he's essentially reinventing the wheel no matter what he does so there is value in the work that he does but to them it's what exactly can you produce with this funding for this position. Because for the Information Specialist, there is tangible things to show that the work she does is productive for GPSS and so is the travel grants. We can't touch our endowments so I don't know how that's doing.

Evan: Chris, what did you have in mind of the return he's giving?

Chris L: He's setting it up so that we can have an alumni association in the future. Even without the things that he's encountered, I don't know how anyone in any organization would set up an alumni association that wasn't set up beforehand is immediately going to start donating money next year. That's insane.

Evan: I'm just thinking, if we had a chance. Do we even have a chance to address them about this?

Genesis: When we do our budget presentation, I think we could.

Evan: If we can borrow five minutes to hear that out.

Chris L: We'll talk further about that.

Chris E: I was going to say, wasn't there a huge thing in there that said they created the position that he's actually barred from going and asking people for money?

Genesis: Yes, that's why he had to create the RSO and that's what I explained to them. There's a lot of things he has to overcome to be successful in his position. Since it's the first time, we can't be like "He raised \$10,000 at our alumni mixer." No, we didn't. We didn't make anything.

Chris E: Is there is a way for us to provide extra comment? I think that's pretty shortsighted on their part.

Genesis: There will be at the budget presentation.

Chris E: To say that we have a sales or growth position. Like at least give us two years.

Evan: I was thinking in terms of institutional knowledge that's been performed like email lists that's been organized and the framework's been set. As a budgetary committee, they'll respect frameworks.

Chris E: They have until December or something?

Genesis: What?

Chris E: The email list for our students.

Chris L: Yes, it was a struggle. Genesis, anything else? Okay, Elisa?

Elisa: The Diversity committee has gone through half of their \$4,000 budget for funding so we have \$2,000 left and we have 3 more applications in my inbox. We're hoping to have the rest. Most of the applicants come through the spring anyway or late winter quarter. We haven't denied many applications. We're just not getting a whole lot of them. The diversity forums have been really popular and we've been getting not a whole lot of people turning out but the people who turn out are really excited and we have a lot of people who come back to every meeting and taking the information back to their diversity committee. So far as that goes, I think having them every three weeks is beneficial. I'm working with Natalie right now, the Office Manager, to track the senator representation and attendance of the last five years of GPSS so hopefully by the end of spring quarter, I'll have a report to put together that I'll be able to share with the different GPAs and all the programs to show this set here is the senate representation that

you have had over the last five years and this is how well or how poorly your representatives have been reporting as far as attendance goes. So you need to rethink or congratulations, thank you for participating so well. That'll also tell us what programs we used to have that we don't have now. That'll just give us an overview too to work from when doing orientations next year.

Chris L: Thank you. ASUW is not here again. Elisa, are you going to ASUW board meetings in the spring?

Elisa: Yes and to a couple this quarter too.

Chris L: So health care summit or panel is coming along really nicely. We just secured the director of Odessa Brand's Children's Clinic which is a community children's hospital or the medical director I mean. He's also on the Washington Medical Exchange Board panelist. Laura and I are working on several others and also communicating very closely with various people in the School of Public Health actually. Some good stuff happening there. We have completed the international graduate student focus groups. We got a lot of great feedback from there. We're going to bring that to Denzil, Jeff Riedinger, the VP of Global Affairs, and Jerry Baldasty and proposed that we do a spring workshop where we bring together administrative units that deal with international graduate student and international graduate students so they can give feedback and talk about how to better serve international graduate students particularly units that deal with undergrads and graduates like CTL, FIUTS, which has somewhat of an infamous reputation among international graduate students for various reasons. So that's been great. The peer mentoring project is just sailing along. Tomorrow I'll be giving a presentation to the Graduate School executive staff along with Kelly Edwards from the Graduate School to discuss some feedback from their unit leads and talk about what exactly they can do for us in terms of data management. We also drafted an application, which if anyone wants to see it, I can share it. And application for mentors. We're hoping to roll that out at least the pilot part of it for the spring quarter. So we're hopefully going to be able to do that and at the end of spring quarter, do it for the next school year. Those are all my major projects at the moment. So I'll just end by saying, next week the State of GPSS idea that I have been kicking around since November. Hopefully everyone feels like I've been forthcoming for what I had in mind as possible. I hope I did my best to communicate it. This process of going through and trying to recover our mission has been one that been really important for the organization and for me personally, which I put probably put too much of my personal whatever into the success of the organization and the way the organization is perceived on the exterior so hopefully I shared enough so that everyone knows what the people I've been working with and I had in mind. Please don't hesitate to give me anything to include.

Chris E: Two items. One is a question /request for the international affairs students. Through our white papers for the federal, we're looking to changing just the immigration issue to just a need for H1PB visas to actually go in for more internally from Washington from an equity standpoint. We might frame it a little differently when we present to legislators this idea for access for international students to work while they're here. One, if can we can mine that data

that the confirmation that they're not allowed in any capacity to work except for non paid internships and then two, the interest on that. I think we do have some compelling arguments that are able to work for skilled gap needs to use graduate students who are here to get a full experience and set track records for this idea to make it easier to get a visa to work while they're a graduate student. That's part one. The second question is did the AAAS go anywhere?

Chris L: Yes, thank you for reminding me. I got three applications so far. We can send two. So I'm accepting applications until Monday. I might ask a few of you to help me go through them depending on how many we get and so it's just not me that's looking at them.

Evan: That's a specifically a science-oriented thing?

Chris E: I would be very interested in that and also incorporate how we look at that for SAGE moving forward and have at least one position open going into next year. So tying this leadership communication and science into SAGE.

Alice: Doesn't it seem like something that is appropriate for the Science & Policy committee to do?

Chris L: Yes, when are you meeting next week?

Alice: Tuesday.

Chris L: Perfect.

Alice: So you want to come?

Chris L: Yes. That will be appropriate and good.

Alice: How long is that going to take?

Chris L: Depends on how many applications I get. So far, I have three.

Evan: Are they one page applications each?

Chris L: Resume and cover letter.

Evan: So it shouldn't take too long I imagine.

Chris L: That's my report. Are there any other announcements?

Rene: What time are we meeting for exec next quarter?

Chris L: 5 pm. Any announcements? Then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Executive Senate Meeting
April 2nd. 2014
HUB 303

Chris Lizotte (President): I'll call this meeting to order at 5:09 pm. I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Are we approving the agenda with two 5's in it?

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): Motion to amend the agenda to reflect the correct numbering system.

Alex Bolton (Law): Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Thank you. Now I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes from the previous executive meeting.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): So moved.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Hearing none, the minutes are approved. The first thing we have queued up tonight is a letter of support for a Tiger grant that UW Transportation Services is applying to the Department of Transportation, which is for improving the Burke Gilman Trail. I distributed a copy in advance. It's essentially a loosely edited version of the letter that Melanie Mayock, who works for Transportation Services gave to me. I edited it a little bit to have it be more geared toward graduate and professional student needs. Alex and I are talking and I made the claim that graduate and professional students at UW come from out of state and we wanted to make sure that this was actually the case. I know for a fact that it is the case for the PhD track or research track students or graduate students in general are majority, are out of state. Like 60/40. I just have to check on the professional side and the Graduate School has that data so it's not hard to check. Otherwise are there any comments on that?

Alice: I thought it was good.

Chris L: I was hoping Melanie or someone from Transportation Services would come tonight to get some background information but she wasn't able to make it and she didn't get back to me so that's basically all the information there is. It's straightforward so I don't think there's much on that. We're just signing on that says we think it's an important project and you should fund it. So I guess I'll entertain a motion to endorse this letter.

Alex: So moved.

Genesis: On the agenda, it says it's only an information item. Should we have changed it to action?

Evan: Are we officially endorsing it?

Genesis: As a whole?

Chris L: I guess what I would like to know is who wants to have their names actually put on the letter?

Alex: I'll put mine.

Evan: Same.

Chris L: I know it says information only but basically I'll entertain a motion to endorse the letter which mean that...

[Computer froze.]

Alice: You froze just now, but since you froze Chris, can I make a suggestion?

Chris L: Go for it.

Alice: Rather than just have us endorse it as a committee or individual, can we put it on the next week's agenda and briefly present it to the senate or ask someone to vote or draft a very short resolution saying the entire senate would endorse it? So we can sign it as coming from the entire GPSS body as an official letter so we can make it stronger?

Chris L: Sure, I think that's a good idea.

Genesis: When do we need to do this by?

Chris L: We'll distribute the letter. It doesn't need to be an official resolution. It'll be a motion made at the meeting. By the way, who is sitting at the far back?

Alice: Let's go around and have everyone introduce themselves.

Chris L: Sorry, I can't quite see from where I am, which is 3000 miles away.

Genesis: Genesis, treasurer.

Alex: Alex Bolton, Law, executive senator.

Colin Bateson (Mechanical Engineering): Colin Bateson, Mechanical Engineering, regular senator.

Alison Kilkenny (Evans School of Public Affairs): Alison Kilkenny, Evans School, not a senator but potentially interested in running for office next year.

Austin Wright-Pettibone (GPSS University Affairs Director): Austin, University Affairs Director.

Elisa Law: Elisa, GPSS Secretary.

Evan: Evan Firth, executive senator.

Tina White (Communication Specialist): Tina White, Communication Specialist.

Alice: Alice Popejoy, Public Health Genetics. I'm an executive senator.

Chris L: Is Alan-Michael there?

Alice: No.

Genesis: He came by earlier and asked what time the meeting was.

Chris L: Has he been added to the exec listserv?

Genesis: Secretary?

Elisa: Alan-Michael as exec? I don't believe so.

Genesis: But he did know that there was a meeting today and what time and where. I spoke to him.

Chris L: I know Chris is going to be a few minutes late.

Genesis: I just talked to him. He was still in Tacoma 5 minutes ago.

Chris L: The Veteran's Bill was signed today so he went down for that. So let's move on. Next item on the agenda. Kyle Murphy was going to stop by. He was going to talk about the Metro campaign but he's not here. So I will entertain a motion to temporarily table this item and move on to the next one.

Evan: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Great, next up we have Austin. He's is going to give a quick update on what we've been doing over winter quarter and talk a little bit about encouraging interdepartmental collaborations through mini-interdepartmental events. So take it away, Austin.

Austin: Alright, so I'm just pulling up the interdepartmental events ones. That'll be a minute. In the mean time, Chris did you distribute the document I sent earlier?

Chris L: No, sorry.

Austin: I just finished putting together a report that details all the activities that GPSS has been involved in throughout campus and all the committees that we have representatives on as well as ones that we don't but we know what they're doing. So that's a wonderful 20 page report that you can read. I'm not going through the entire thing. Specifically, I'm not going to focus on the activities that we've been leading because we've been discussing a lot of those. What I'm going to do instead is give an update on what's been happening on the university committees and what's going on in the faculty councils and we'll end with what's been happening in ASUW. I know Evelina is suppose to be here but she is not. Then, I'll stop for questions and move on to the discussion on interdepartmental events. We have 37 committees that we have staff with volunteer representatives and starting with right now with the big ones is Advisory Council on Trademarks and Licensing, which is the President's advisory committee that deals with who can use university products and logos. It's currently discussing what's going to happen in terms of licensees in the Bangladesh event last year. The outcome of that is that there was a Fire and Safety Accord Agreement which is required all the licensees or use something that's more rigorous. There's discussion with various retailers. This quarter, they're talking with Columbia and we'll have updates with that accordingly. The Campus Sustainability Fund had another funding cycle. They're also going to SAF with a request of increase in funding later this month. They're moving into large, more capital-like projects. Their largest one is \$80,000 to get a new biofuel station, which should be really cool. They're really excited for that, but it's also one of their more riskier ventures. It's an interesting development and turn of events with CSF since we're starting to see them take much bolder moves on campus. I'm personally following them very closely and I would encourage us as an organization to follow them closely and support them in all the various ways. The committee in Disability Issues is currently getting started. There's a big push right now with disability issues on campus so the D center just started an advisory committee, the CDI is getting a charged letter signed by the President and Provost and I'll be talking to Diversity tomorrow about introducing some resolutions in support of disability activism on campus. We don't have anything on CUCAC. The Distinguished Teaching Award comes with which isn't really that relevant to us.

Evan: What is CUCAC?

Austin: My understanding is that CUCAC has not met this quarter. It's the City/University Community Advisory Council. They deal with how the university partnering with the city and how's it partnering with all the various neighborhood organizations.

Alice: Is that with when you were talking with Seattle PD?

Austin: No, that was the North and 45th committee. They have restricted themselves to the immediate surroundings for the UW area. More specifically, it's Greek Row. CUCAC serves as the advisory body that goes beyond the University District.

Alex: It's been going for 30 years. Like all capital projects comes to them. The university and the neighborhood groups appoints people to it.

Austin: We do actually have someone on there. They just haven't met yet. The Diversity Council, I'm actually really excited about the things coming out of that. There's one called UW Profile that is just released, which gives majority of the administrators on campus access to all the diversity information of the school so they can look at how many people from Vietnam are in the university and they can break it down into departments, like how many people from Vietnam are in Mechanical Engineering. It's a way to track the number of students that are coming from those underrepresented classes and start to develop strategies on how to get more students engaged. I've currently been in discussion with Michael Aguirre, who is our representative there with how GPSS can best leverage this and these are ongoing so I don't have any more information or detail on that. Going down, the Intellectual Property & Management Advisory Committee (IPAC) and Faculty Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC). With these two, I'm going to go a little in-depth on these because we're going to have more information coming at you guys later this quarter. The IP policy for the university are being completely overhauled in the wake of the 2011 case of Stanford v. Roach. on the clarification of president assignment versus promise to sign and in that whole overhaul, they're bringing grad students under the umbrella of IP laws. This is the first time that grad students have ever fallen into IP laws so there's questions whether the implications for that and whether it's good for grad students. According to our representative, it is going to protect grad students more so we should be in favor of it but we also don't want to sign away too much of our rights because the work that we're doing is for our learning rather than as a profession at the point that we're doing research as grad students. So more to come on that. IPMAC and SCIPC are preparing to come in and doing full presentations as Chris and I talk with them throughout the quarter and they develop these things.

Alice: Who on GPSS is following the IP stuff?

Austin: Will Scott and Sonja Gerrard are our two representatives respectively. They serve on IPMAC and SCIPC.

Alice: Do they do research?

Austin: Yes, so Will is in Computer Science so he's pretty familiar with these issues since they do open access and Sonja is a 1L specializing in intellectual property.

Alice: Fantastic. I feel like that would be something that GPSS as a whole would be more interested in hearing about.

Austin: Yes. Since there are ongoing discussions but once we have something more concrete to present, we plan to do so. Probably week 6 or week 8. Next we have SAB. SAB is the Student Advisory Board for the Office of Minority Affairs. So their mission has been to advise the President and Provost of Minority Affairs on issues of diversity on campus. Some conversations that I've been involved with that is how to get a grad student on SAB permanently since there are no grad students. All the represented diversity voice is from undergrads. That's a concern of mine. I'm in conversations with James, the chair, on how we do that. It's a little tricky given their structuring but we might try to go through GOMAP. The conversation has focused on religious tolerance and recently shifting into a discussion on the difference between an advisory body and an action based body and what's the proper balance for that in university affairs and how we can make diversity more of a conversation on campus. That's what you'll hear a lot from SAB and other groups like that on campus is inclusive excellence and that's a model that we're trying to move toward in the university is moving conversations away from those stovepipe organizations like OMAD or the Q Center or the ECC to how can the HUB start to engage in conversations about diversity. Then with SAF, we all know what SAF does and SAF is continuing what SAF does, which is to fund us or ask us to defend our proposals. The Student Regent Selection Committee just started on Thursday. We have 8am meeting this quarter so I know you're all jealous you're not taking part in that. We'll have something for the Governor by April 20th. For the University Bookstore Trustee committee, our trustee told me today that they're trying to re-envision what the University Bookstore customer rebate looks like. I haven't gotten any more updates than they're trying to change the experience for students. I can imagine the only thing good for students is that we're getting more of a rebate, but I doubt that's happening. They're also working with Health Sciences Management to figure out what's going to be the future of the south campus university bookstore because it currently doesn't get a lot of traffic.

Genesis: There's a bookstore?

Alice: Yes, it's in south campus center on the far side toward the hospital. They focus on medical stuff. They have labcoats and textbooks and it's specifically for Health Sciences. It's cool store. They have the cutest little parasite animals.

Austin: So they're debating whether the current location is the proper location for the bookstore. They might move it to a more high-traffic area such as the Medical Center so we'll have more for that in a couple weeks. The U-Pass Advisory committee, this folds into the conversation with online education this year. As we're increasing our programing for online students, should we also be charging them with the U-Pass fee? The people who are in charge at University Transportation Services say yes and the students say that's not fair because how many of the students are going to use that, especially with out of state but are taking online courses at UW? Another implication with this is how do we manage those people in Medical School who are doing rotations and won't be using it as well? Should we be exempting them from this program

or should we continue to have them pay for it? I think my understanding is that there is hesitancy since there is a lot more capacity to start creating all these waiver processes and they don't want to go down that path but the students who are advocating for it is saying it's unfair for students to be charged when they don't actually use those things or they don't have access to SAF fees. They're being charged that but they don't have access to campus so interesting conversation within that which broadens into online education, which we'll come back to in a couple points. UTC is the University Transportation Committee. If you see down in south campus, the Montlake triangle is closed off. It's a couple year long renovation project where they'll be redesigning that area to make it more accessible to people and connect it in with the new work that's been going on with Sound Transit. That's an interesting project but that's going to create a lot of traffic diversion and they're worried about that if you bike to school. We need to work to communicate with the people in the senate is to what are the implication for this when you commute? They probably already notice that. Something that would be more long term is implementing a bike sharing program on campus as well as throughout the city. There's two parallel conversations going with that. One is the city wants to create a bike sharing program. Is there going to be discounts for UW students? The other is, there's people in the university that wants to create a program within the university for all students to freely access bicycles. So that's probably a conversation that's going to be carried into next year and the year after that. I wouldn't be surprised if it comes into SAF conversations. Something we should keep in mind is what are the position we want to form? Should we be advocating for something like this? Do we want to support by putting dollars and where we get those dollars? Then the last one is the Emergency Planning committee. I don't really that interests anyone so I'm not going to go too into that other than they saying that they are protecting us and they are doing so very well. That's all the university committees that we have people staffed on. With the faculty committees, this is where things are important for GPSS and which I don't think we have and active enough role.

Alice: Sorry Austin. Going back to the appointments, there are 37 with the faculty and the university committees?

Austin: And ASUW and counting for redundancies that we have people on committees.

Alice: So those are 37 different positions on committees or 37 appointments of individuals?

Austin: 37 appointments.

Alice: Does that include ones that aren't filled?

Austin: No, those are ones we have appointed.

Alice: Do we have a number for ones we have not appointed?

Austin: I can get that to you.

Alice: I think it'll be helpful to know how many open slots we have on the various committees that are not currently filled.

Austin: It's a hard number to get because we have a list online but it's only a partial list of the committees on campus. I'll work on that but know it's a difficult number to get. So, faculty councils. There are 8 faculty councils but you can correct me as I go. The faculty senate has been dealing with a couple of big issues. Most notably is online education and intellectual property and faculty salaries. I don't know if GPSS came in support but last year, PACs came out in support for increases in faculty salaries with tuition dollars and from that we had a lot of conversations this year on what a proper faculty salary policy would look like because faculty are getting underpaid and we're worried about recruitment and retention of faculty members. I've been going through faculty affairs for most of the year and there's a working group right now to solidify that and will get that done by the end of this quarter. Jack Lee is the chair and will have a moratorium on that and President Young is in support of this as well. FCAS deals with all the academic standards for the university for the proposal and the vetting of university degree programs. They just passed a molecular engineering PhD program through the Board of Regents. They've also been working on changes in student regulations and working on joining in a subcommittee with the Center for Teaching and Learning as to how to jointly interact and bridge some of the divides that exist between academic standards and the actual work that the teachers and TAs are doing in classroom. Benefits and retirement, we can look at that if you're interested in it. Intellectual property, we'll come back to that in a couple week. Multicultural Affairs is paired with the faculty council on women. They've only met once this past quarter and they've been having a lot of trouble, which goes back to the issue that diversity is stalling on campus so we need to find ways to reinvigorate that. University Libraries has been dealing with issues of open access, which you'll note in a couple weeks we'll come back with a proposed resolution for an overhaul of the university open access policy with the option of what's called a green standard open access. We're working with the libraries right now to flesh out what that will be. University Facilities and Services, unless you live on campus, you're not going to deal with this very much. The only conversation with this is that University Facilities work with HFS to set the prices for all of the on campus housing and we don't have any student voices on this committee.

Genesis: Not even undergrad?

Austin: Nope. It's probably a priority that we haven't addressed. If you look at what happened at the Board of Regents meeting, Pam Schreiber came and talked about how they had a lot of students engagement and how students support those prices and there's no student voice to counter that.

Alex: Doesn't the RAs have something? They used to anyway.

Austin: Yes, they have an advisory body and that's what Pam's referring to.

Alex: I thought they elected amongst themselves?

Austin: Yes, that is true. So we do have student representation but the people who are elected among those also have their entire housing balance and salaries paid for by HFS.

Alex: Each floor used to have a rep that they met once a week. It used to be the process that they would go through them.

Austin: I don't know enough about what goes on in that side of undergraduate life to talk about that, but I can look it up.

Evan: But it should be populated with people that are living and paying those prices instead of the others.

Alex: That's a constituent too though. Current students.

Austin: The last two more in my update section. ASUW has been doing a lot. Currently the issue to note for grad students is the establishment of the international advisory committee, which I've been following very closely and have some major concerns about it but I'm working with Jeff to address those. The other one is just more of general statement. I don't think that GPSS is doing enough to pay attention to what goes on in ASUW. I would encourage us to start looking into how we can play a more active role in ASUW or at least pay attention the issues of ASUW because as it stands right now, and Chris feel free to jump in, it's my personal opinion that ASUW has more of the influence on campus. We can restrict it to senate and look at the number of resolutions that come out of ASUW senate and look at the number of resolutions that come out of GPSS and look at the breadth of those resolutions at ASUW. There are clear disparities and that's allowing ASUW to control the conversation around almost every issue.

Evan: Did you have any specific in mind?

Austin: The international advisory committee would be one. The TAs another that came up last quarter. One that came up yesterday was the Life Sciences building. I think it comes in a couple of different forms. You can say it's innocuous that they aren't including us in their forwarding clauses but that very innocuous statement that they aren't including us is pretty powerful that we don't have enough of a powerful voice on campus that they should be including us.

Alex: Do we have GPSS appointees on their senate? You're on their board but is there someone in senate too?

Austin: Kevin Shotwell and myself are the GPSS reps at UW.

Alex: As far as those mechanisms, do you feel that that's helpful?

Austin: Kevin is very engaged with ASUW but he's been engaged as an undergraduate as well and now transitioned as a graduate representative for ASUW so we don't have people who are, besides myself and I'm only a very recent joinee at ASUW senate, we don't have anyone who specifically works with GPSS and knows GPSS's issues.

Alex: They have one that comes to ours but she's been the one.

Alice: So how much of this disconnect is due to the fact that we had less than active representatives going in between versus an overall structural problem where we don't interface enough with ASUW as a whole?

Elisa: I think interacting as a whole is a lot more effective than one or two people being present at the meetings.

Alice: Sure. As far as getting information about what they're doing, is that the responsibility of our GPSS representatives on ASUW to come back and tell us what they're doing or should it be the ASUW representatives coming to our meetings and giving us updates? Is that written out? Chris, do you know?

Genesis: It should go both ways because there can be different information that's brought to the table. I sat on ASUW Board of Directors during the fall quarter and you get a you different sense of what they're doing because the Board of Directors is separate from the senate. They have a senate liaison. It's not the same format as our senate and the exec committee. So it's totally different in the way information is brought between our senate and their senate liaison and also the Board of Directors liaison. So I think it should go both ways. If you sit on the ASUW Board of Directors or whoever the liaison is should be able to report what they found out at the meeting or what they're currently working on.

Austin: So I can't do anything in terms of parli pro but I believe that I've over exceeded my time so if we still want to have this discussion, I would suggest that we move it on to a separate agenda item but I think that's going outside the scope of what I'm here to do.

Alex: Do you think this will be fruitful discussion in another meeting?

[General agreement]

Genesis: Did you want to talk about the forum, just put it out there?

Austin: So one thing I talked to Genesis earlier is the ASUW elections are coming up and full disclosure, I was asked to run in them. They're coming up and I think that's a really good opportunity for us to engage with ASUW and force them to start paying attention to graduate concerns by hosting an elections forum.

Genesis: Invite them to a senate meeting and talk about how they're going to advocate for grad students as well because we are part of their constituents. We can vote for them too. It's a fabulous idea.

Alice: That's amazing.

Austin: In senate meeting.

Genesis: I think having the candidates come and tell us why we should vote for them because we can.

Evan: Yeah, forces the issue.

Alex: I like it.

Alice: When is the deadline for their candidacy to be announced at ASUW?

Austin: That starts April 18th. The next step for this would be to talk with EAC, which is their elections commission and establish a date for when you want that to happen.

Genesis: Because our election's on the 23rd.

Chris L: Just to jump in real quick, Austin, I know you wanted to also talk about the interdepartmental stuff. For that we'll have to ask for a time extension because you have taken up all the time I've allotted. I also noticed that Melanie came in a couple minutes ago so we can either proceed with what you want to talk about with that or just give Melanie a couple minutes to talk about the grant so she can get out of here. So I'll entertain a motion to temporarily return to item four. We'll only use 5 minutes out of the 15 minutes anyway so we'll give a couple minutes to talk about what exactly we are considering endorsing.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? So Melanie, can you give us a brief feeling of what this Tiger grant is and from what you mentioned, it's kind of a last shot doing this before something?

Melanie Mayock: Thanks Chris. I brought a few handouts but not enough for everyone so some will have to share. So the Burke Gilman trail on campus is 1.7 miles all the way through. People walk and bike on it to get through campus and cross to get to the IMA, Health Sciences, etc. It's part of a regional network and it's crowded and very congested right now and there's conflicts with buses, bicycle, pedestrians and motorists especially at intersections. It's going to get worse when Sound Transit Light Rail opens in 2016 unless we improve the trail. UW Transportation

has a plan and construction has already started on a piece of it right by Rainier Vista, which Austin was talking about, to widen the trail all the way through campus and separated by bicyclists and pedestrians, various types intersection improvements including Ponderray. If you go down to U-Village area, there's that road with the big intersection. It's a big mess right now. The proposal is for the trail to go underneath the road there so it's completely separated and we don't have the risk of accidents. We've scraped together some funding for starting construction but we don't have funding to finish construction so that's why we're applying for the Tiger grant from the federal government. It's a 10 or 12 million dollar grant and the grant application is due in late April. UW Transportation applied a year ago but we didn't get it last year. Since Light Rail opens in 2016, this particular grant is really the last shot to complete funding and construction before the Light Rail opens. If you think about all the new residence halls on the west side of campus near Brooklyn and University Way and where they intersect the trail to all the way on the other side of campus near the other dorms and in between. To have a really state of the art and wider trail. We're getting rid of the tree roots and separating it between bicyclists and pedestrians, and to get that done before the Light Rail opens, which is going to basically double the amount of pedestrians and bicyclists on the trail. So we really need this Tiger grant. We're asking for lots of support for it like letters of support from groups like GPSS would be awesome. Individuals can sign on as well on our website. So that's why I'm here.

Chris L: Just to clarify, I drafted a letter and circulated it to everyone. We've looked at it and we're bringing it to senate next week and essentially have everyone who, in senate votes to endorse it so hopefully that'll help.

Melanie: Do you want someone there to answer questions?

Chris L: Yes.

Alice: Would you come?

Melanie: I think so. I'll have to double check my time but I can definitely send someone.

Alice: Do you think it'll be better for you if our letter had all the names of all of our senators in our departments or just the blanket GPSS as a whole signing it?

Melanie: I don't know. It doesn't matter.

Alice: It might be more dramatic to have a whole list of names.

Melanie: As long as it's clear since we're going to have a set of organizational letters so if it's letter headed.

Genesis: They can do it online right?

Melanie: Yes. Individuals can do an online endorsement.

Chris L: So any questions for Melanie?

Alex: Austin's point has me wondering about resolutions and whether or not it be better for our organization to start thinking of these things more as resolutions and do it formally rather than not quite as formal letters of support. It might help change that frame as an organization. I'm throwing this as something to think about.

Melanie: I happen to know that ASUW is not going through the senate. They're going to do it in their Board so that'll give you guys a one-up.

Genesis: What would the resolution be on? Just to approve it or saying that we support it?

Alex: Since I'm bringing it up, I'll probably have to draft something.

Austin: Kevin Shotwell will help.

Alex: If that's what people want, we can stick to this or do a letter. I'm not wed to either way.

Evan: We can decide on that in the future.

Chris L: Any other questions? Alright, thanks Melanie. By the way, I'm seeing relatives in Cambridge and they have cats and I'm allergic. I was informed that I was extremely loud so I muted my microphone. Sorry about that. I'll entertain a motion to add 15 minutes to Austin's agenda item.

Alice: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Austin: So shifting away from updates...

Chris L: Sorry to cut you off, Austin but the document that Austin was talking about, I'll distribute to everyone. I didn't want everyone to be expected to read it. It's got everything that Austin is talking about plus everything we did over winter. It's great reading. It's beautifully fonted and laid out so I encourage everyone to read it.

Austin: On that note, the federal government did just reveal that switching to Garamond will save you 400 million dollars so I've been using Garamond with the justification that it's objectively better.

Alice: It's less paper.

Austin: So shifting away from updates, we talked about this idea of creating interdepartmental events and there was a lot of support with it in senate. As we've been fleshing out what that means, the implications are much larger than we had originally thought of. To give you sense of it, Sanne, who's our Events Coordinator, is currently working about 10-15 hours a week. In order to make this shift, we're going to have to increase her to a full 19.5 hours, which means an increase in our SAF funding request. That's on top of us already asking for about \$100,000, which is already pushing what SAF is likely to give us. The big picture is, as an organization, there's going to be a shift of where we're prioritizing things. We don't know if Anya, who's our Organizing Director, has the capacity to do something like this will need significant support from senators as well. But going down to what it will look like, I had Sanne draft me a document that shows what are the things that she can do with her current capacity and what she will need to extend that capacity. So our current capacity, she believes we can host two small events, which will be about 50-60 people, per quarter or one large event per quarter. If we increase her capacity, we can do 3-4 small events per quarter or two large events per quarter. There are approximately 170 departments on campus that are staffed with graduate students.

Evan: Some have one or two.

Austin: You're right. Of the ones that tend to participate in senate, we have about 140 senators so that's 90 departments that are represented, which means that if we were doing two small events with maybe 2 or 3 departments in it, that's going to take several years to actually cycle through to get through all these departments. So we'll also need to start thinking about who are we going to start playing favorites with and how that's going to look with in terms of overall engagement that we're trying to build in the grad student community and what does that look like in our organization? Budget wise, it seems pretty tame. A large event is about \$1000. For smaller events, that's about \$400-\$500. \$1000 for 100 people and food, drinks and printing. I'm reading directly off of what Sanne gave me so I'm trusting her but we can go over the numbers more later.

Alice: I feel like it's a low estimate too.

Austin: And we need pretty significant lead-time so there's a lot of logistical ends so my pitch to the discussion is that I think it's a really great direction to go for GPSS since it's what people in senate want to see GPSS engaging with. So really big questions we need to talk about is do we have capacity to do this? How likely is it that we can ask SAF and expect SAF to give us an increase? What are the benefits going to be for the students and what is the long-term success going to be? With that, I open it up to discussion.

Chris L: I'll just kick it off by saying that this has been one of those things that is heard again and again at our senator meetings. Undoubtedly, I think there'll have to be some initial central

support but also to the extent possible this is the kind of thing where we can provide the opportunity and also ask of people that they take an active role in doing a lot of the legwork. While we do need to increase our resources and capacity to achieve this, it's also an opportunity to ask people to give more of their time than they are in order to do the things they've expressed that they've wanted to do.

Genesis: Would we be able to require that departments participate financially and put in some money because if we're going to host this and we're going to let them mingle with other departments then I think other departments should.

Evan: We can ask.

Genesis: Granted there are those smaller programs and departments that don't have a lot of money, but I think just putting something in.

Alice: I think that we could probably offer them the option for a department to contribute but I know from my personal program and others, it's not just that they don't have a lot of money. They literally have 0 dollars.

Austin: You're in SPH though right? In SPH, they have a social chair. That's who we'd be partnering with.

Alice: So if you're talking about the School of Public Health as a whole, that's 20 departments or something. Are we talking about programs or are we doing schools like the Law School? There is a difference.

Austin: You can do either one. You can go to Public Health and seek logistical support from SPHA and from within that, logistical and financial support. We can decide specifically which departments we want to specifically target and open it up to the larger ones, but we need core support. The more people we get to these events, obviously the better.

Rene: You have those academic councils and you have ways to ask for funds and support. It's an idea but it's not demonstrated. If you think about what you're spending your money on currently, maybe you need to do some rearranging of the furniture or sort some priorities. You're going to have to demonstrate that you're really getting something from what it is that you're doing on your own. I would incorporate that in there and expect to receive that \$100,000.

Chris L: That's our ask this year.

Rene: In addition to what you're going to ask for?

Austin: That's actually a point I want to emphasize. Within SAF, there's always skepticism of the increase that we're asking for and I cannot guarantee that we will get that entire increase.

Genesis: We're not asking for \$100,000. We're asking for \$64,000.

Austin: Did you do a revised downward?

Genesis: It looks like we're asking for \$100,000 because the innovation fund is included.

Austin: You're asking for that as a permanent allocation.

Genesis: Right.

Austin: We can talk about this more but that is a dicey game that we're playing and I wouldn't get our hopes up that we're going to get that increase so if we're asking for any more increase, then I think that we need to think about where we've already tried to grow, the success of that growth. Did we demonstrate real success in that or do we have the potential for success. Do we have the political capitol to make another ask?

Evan: The ones we asked the increase on in the two innovation funds has demonstrated a lot of success. They're the travel grants and special allocations.

Chris L: And the two positions.

Genesis: We're asking them to keep our Information Specialist and the Advancement Coordinator.

Evan: I don't know much about those but I assume.

Alex: As far as prioritizing and making this a priority, the idea of cycling through, I worry about a little since for that to actually work, there would have to be some sort of tradition with the student groups and they expect each year that we're going to build up toward this coming event and if that doesn't happen, I don't see there being much traction and there never gaining momentum back.

Evan: I think that we can also start facilitating them but for the departments that do have the capability to host it on their own can see that it's successful. Maybe the departments can then take over and help run and shift some of the funding burden. That way, we can keep the ones that the departments can fund going on a regular basis.

Alex: I imagine over time, just getting started too. Some senator would have to come to GPSS to get the ball rolling.

Evan: I'm pretty confident that some of these departments could. You said SPH might not be able to but I know that a lot in the College of Environment have a lot of these social gatherings.

Alice: SPH would but individual programs within it like Public Health Genetics or Occupational & Environmental Health wouldn't. We'd have to think carefully about whether we're talking about the whole Law School and the whole School of Public Health since that would be a 1000 person event as opposed to just like the School of Social Work, which would probably be much smaller. We'd have to get a really careful inventory of the different programs and figure out which ones makes sense together and part of me was like "Why are we focusing on having these parties if we don't even have representation in the graduate and professional schools in GPSS." On the other hand, this will be a really great way to actually get people excited about joining GPSS. People in those departments would be like "Why don't we have one of those things?" Well you don't have a senator. So I think it's a great idea Austin. I think it has a place to garner interest among other departments but we do have to be careful in who we're inviting and what combinations we're doing and when. That's tricky and that's something we can have a committee talk about with representation from all the different schools.

Chris L: I think there are a couple things worth noting. One goes along with the discussion about the disparity of departments being able to make use of this. One is that the reality is programs like the Law School wouldn't be particularly interested any way since they do a lot of events.

Alex: We'd do it.

Chris L: It really is for the smaller departments that wouldn't have the capacity to do it on their own but together with two or three other departments that they're interested in getting together with, they might be able to do that. The second thing is in terms of who's hanging out with who, that has to be generated from the senators or the people who are attempting to put this together. I don't know who people from different departments want to hang out with. If I was suppose to get Geography together with another department, I don't know who that would be. The point is we can't tell who they will hang out with. It's really going to be a question of who decides to make use of it and how they want to. The reality is it's typically going to be the smaller departments. Maybe at a certain point, the larger departments will want to get in the game or the larger programs or things of the scale of the entire School of Public Health with several departments within in it. The ideas have been coming from the senators from the smaller departments that don't get to hang out or otherwise have the opportunity for collaboration with one another in that particular way. We are at time. So motion to extend time?

Genesis: Motion to extend time by 10 minutes.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Genesis: I do want to say something real quick. In terms of money, we have that \$6000 for small events. I think that's a starting point without asking for more money. We can restructure the

way we do tailgating events and others throughout the course of the year. So there's that. Instead of thinking that we have to ask for more money, we can use that a different way.

Alice: We have really cool events that GPSS hosts but if we can start this off and get excitement for it by focusing on those events that we already have the capacity to put on around interdepartmental collaboration such as speed dating for researchers where you we sit for 50 seconds and talk about your research or something fun like that. That's the focus and we can demonstrate how successful that was and say "We put forward our own money and we tried this and people loved it." And have that be the basis of asking for money in the future.

Chris L: I agree with both Genesis and Alice. This year, we tried something out with tailgating. Next year, we can decide to scale back on that. Let's try this interdepartmental thing. I agree that it's not a question of asking for more money and also taking account of what we're already doing and focusing it more interdepartmentally.

Austin: To address Alice's point, that's the only way Sanne and I think it's feasible is to prove and model success and grow from that. To go back to the idea, we want it to be organic but the organic act, and not using it in the parli pro sense, but just an organic act that we're thinking on rather than constructing, we need to ask for some spark for that. There needs to be someone from the foreground that wants to do it and make it happen. Right now, that's us and in the future, I can see it being someone else but I think that if we say we had this idea but someone else be the spark, we're not actually going to make that actionable. We need to follow through on this and demonstrate this model for success and start asking people who we think would be good to work with ad start asking them. Eventually 5 years down the line, I can see people coming to GPSS as doing but I do think it's going to be a very significant investment on our part. It's a different direction for us to go. Chris, I have to disagree with you that it's the smaller departments that were asking for this because I do think we saw some of the larger departments like engineering and chemistry and yes, Colin was the person who brought it to the forefront and he is from a smaller department but I think we saw a universal interest in it.

Chris L: Yes, that's true.

Austin: When we first started proposing in the fall with the School of Medicine, they started talking about it with the School of Law and I think there are some really cool opportunities for us to bring in speakers who do interdepartmental research and talk about that but I think we are going to have to organize it in the end. We can't have any illusions about that.

Alex: Is part of the model, because you mentioned SPHA and SBA and the other student organizations and all that, are we trying to partner for the school that do have their own quasi-student government? Do we even know what schools have them or don't have them and maybe mapping that out?

Austin: I have a fairly good sense of that but I don't have a list that's written out but it can be certainly produced. The conversation has kind of been that it will work with the senators and then have the senators extend out to their social chairs and together we come out as a collaborative force.

Chris L: Any other discussion on this? I think this is something that has emerged and something that we obviously talked about in the state of GPSS. I think this is a good discussion that we had and a positive step moving forward to get the ball rolling at the very least so cool. So the next item is to plan next week's senate meeting so I got it up on my thing.

Genesis: It's on the smart board.

Chris L: One thing we do have is Regent Constance Rice is coming and talking at our meeting. It's been in the works for a while. It was contingent on the April 10th and the Board of Regents meeting being canceled. This meeting and the December meeting is almost always canceled. I just wanted to make sure. So anyway, she's talking about her experience with someone with two advanced degrees from UW. I want to say she has a PhD in Education and a degree from Evans. We got that as one of our anchoring things.

Genesis: Do we want a discussion portion for that?

Chris L: I was thinking that that's sort of rolled into her time but I'll go ahead and do that.

Alex: It may be labeled that.

Genesis: Do we have Melanie for the second part right after?

Chris L: Yes, thank you.

Genesis: Burke Gilman letter of support?

Elisa: We need to talk about elections and the GPA of the Year award nominations are open.

Genesis: Just call it elections update?

Evan: What are the election things that we have to do?

Elisa: Just reminding them the due date of April 8th and to get their information to the elections committee.

Genesis: Who's the chair of the elections?

Elisa: Seyda.

Alice: It's due on Tuesday the 8th so it's going to be after.

Elisa: Well, they can still run from the floor.

Alice: Do we need an agenda item for it?

Elisa: Maybe an announcement item then. If they're still interested, they can still run.

Chris L: I would like to do a state of the GPSS follow up. We have a working group together that is going to be digging into the recommendations as was asked by the senate so they'll be doing a brief presentation of these are the things that we've identified over spring quarter and obviously get some feedback and discussion on that. The other thing is on April 15th, GPSS will be hosting a panel discussion on the Affordable Care Act and its impacts on students health insurance. I have a catalyst survey open where they can submit questions on what they want to ask the panel. Maybe it would be good exercise in senate to have groups generate questions that they want to ask the panel.

Genesis: Do you want to open it up to their constituents or just to senate?

Chris L: We want to get questions from many people as possible but we can use some senate time to actually generate some questions.

Evan: We're just seeding some base questions.

Alex: We like it.

Genesis: So then should that catalyst survey link be sent out when we send out the senate email or after?

Chris L: It totally can be but we'll also solicit questions on the spot.

Evan: Alice, what we're you going to say?

Alice: I was just going to say on the Transportation Services letter, I thought we were going to vote as a senate to have people put their names on it.

Evan: Should we change it to action?

Chris L: Yes.

Elisa: Do we want to have a GPA of the Year award as a line item or just in announcements?

Genesis: I think you should have a line item to explain to them how to do it.

Evan: On a separate topic, why do we have a committee coordinating board if we have Austin? He was a single man committee coordinating board. He's done the work of 5 committees.

Elisa: I got an email from a guy named Frank, who wants to speak to GPSS about privacy issues. I don't know how we deal with people reaching out to us to speak to our group.

Evan: What's his connection to us in any way?

Elisa: That's what I asked him about. Usually we invite speakers who are talking about an issue that we've already identified. It was earlier that we talked about privacy emails. I was ask him for an overview of what he was going to talk about.

Genesis: He wants to sell his book.

Alice: He's an author?

Elisa: His talk is called Frank Talks about Privacy.

Rene: I recommend that you guys do some research on this because I got the same email so a lot of speakers are not necessary experts but I don't know where he's from.

Evan: Let's get some background.

Rene: Actually, the people that give a great presentation is the Public Records Office and the Office of Public Meetings. The two of them have a really cool presentation on record keeping on campus and its free.

Evan: We can invite them in.

Rene: Or speak to you guys.

Genesis: What's the practicum requirement, Chris?

Chris L: So at the end of last quarter, a student from the School of Social Work named Ivan Quevas came in and talked to me. He and several of his colleagues from the School of Social Work are concerned because their practicum requirement, where they're suppose to be apprenticing at an agency and it's unpaid but these agencies are using them as free labor and putting them in situations that they're not really equipped for and putting them in dangerous situations without any insurance coverage and there's just a lot of problems with it so I have to double check with them if they're at the point where he wants to come to the senate but he said it'd be really helpful that if senate is aware of this issues so when the time comes there can be support through a resolution or by assigning the issue to a committee who will look into further.

Basically having him coming in, if he feels ready and talk about it, answer questions and generate discussions.

Genesis: Besides Gary, who's the other senator? Was this through Ivan and not the senator?

Elisa: Greg brought it up first and connected Ivan with Chris and I. And the other social works student is Gary.

Alex: Has this been discussed at all within the school? Do they have a body?

Austin: I think it has been effective but echoing what Chris is saying, this is a really cool opportunity for GPSS to take a stand on the issue of unpaid work. That can be brought up in this practicum discussion.

Evan: Are there other examples of unpaid work?

Alex: Law School.

Chris L: Chris hasn't come in yet has he?

Genesis: Nope.

Chris L: I was wondering if he wants a legislative wrap up.

Alex: He kind of gave that last time.

Genesis: The session's over right?

Chris L: Yes, but he has some time tonight for a recap.

Alice: Chris, why don't we get an update on SAGE and if he wants to add additional stuff about legislation, then he can.

Chris L: Actually, he might not be back but I'll be back because I'm coming back a little bit earlier. So he wont be back. He wont be coming back until later that afternoon.

Alice: So you can give a SAGE update.

Chris L: Sure, it'll actually be short.

Alice: Perfect.

Chris L: Anything else?

Alex: What's the ACA panel?

Chris L: Affordable Care Act.

Elisa: There was one more thing. Chris, did you get the email from Yasmeen about the student bill of rights?

Chris L: Yes.

Elisa: So it's students advisor relationships and the possibility of a student bill of rights and Yasmeen is proposing that we should write a resolution to support other departments writing their own bill of rights and was wondering whether that was something we should push to the Academic and Administrative Affairs committee.

Chris L: Keeping in line with the flow, it should come first to the senate and then go to the committee. Does she want some time to present?

Elisa: She hasn't heard back on what we should do about it. I'll ask her to speak at the April 23rd election meeting?

Chris L: Okay.

Rene: You might want to check if you guys did approve a resolution for the bill of rights. You might just want to pull that out.

Evan: How long is it?

Genesis: 90 minutes.

Chris L: If Yasmeen does want to come and give an overview, then the senate can assign it to a committee.

Evan: We should do our own research on it first.

Alice: Yes, let's wait.

Chris L: Okay, anything else to add?

Evan: Looks good to me.

Chris L: My name's on there a lot. Sorry. Someone else want to sponsor one of these?

Evan: No, it's fine.

Alice: What about the Social Work one? Do you have to be on there?

Chris L: Ivan's not a senator right?

Alice: Put Gary on there.

Chris L: Okay, he'll be surprised to see his name.

Alice: He'll be stoked. He likes to talk.

Chris L: I'll entertain a motion to approve this agenda then.

Alice: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Wait, we don't have to adjourn the previous meeting. With that minor change, any opposed? Great, thank you. Elisa, I will send you the link to the catalyst survey momentarily.

Genesis: I thought it was going to go after.

Chris L: You know, I'll send it out separately. Just as something for senators to send to their constituents. I'll take care of that. I'm not mixing.

Elisa: I'm already sending stuff about elections and GPA Award in this email. Do you want me to send that to you to be a constituent email?

Genesis: He's going to put the catalyst survey on its own.

Elisa: Yes, but he's saying that he wants to keep senate and constituent stuff separate but I'm saying I'm putting constituent stuff in this email already so he might as well add it in.

Chris L: That's fine as long as it's signposted what is what. So I will send you that catalyst link then.

Alice: Chris, where are with the ad hoc group at the last meeting for deciding things for communications and emails?

Chris L: We have volunteers and it looks like were going to meet for the first time next week.

Alice: I signed up for that and I didn't get that email.

Chris L: Oh, sorry about that. I will be sure to do that.

Alice: Can you add me because I think I can actually make that time. I have way less class this quarter.

Chris L: We haven't decided on a time but there is still plenty of time for you to join in on that. Okay, we'll move on to executive senator reports.

Evan: I have nothing.

Alice: I want to applaud Austin for his amazing work that he's been doing and I think it's really cool.

Alex: Just for Chris, I will second that.

Evan: I will third that.

Alice: Also, maybe just because before next meeting, we'll have submitted anyone's elections packages, I'll just announce that I'm planning on running for GPSS president for next year. Most of you know that but I feel that I'd like to meet with people individually or tell me what I'm doing right or wrong, I'd like to do that.

Elisa: Good luck.

Alex: Along those lines, I'm running for vice president.

Evan: I'm not running but will still be on executive senate.

Alice: I actually had a question about that. Rene told me that we're supposed to reelect executive senators every year but we didn't do that this year. I wasn't sure that that's right. She was pretty certain that she was right but I wasn't sure.

Evan: I'm pretty sure it's not in a bylaws. It's one of those things where it's like why don't we do this but it's not in the bylaws yet. You have an indefinite term.

Alice: Or the president can choose to unseat them if they don't attend the meetings without notifying the president.

Chris L: Sorry, I didn't hear what the question was.

Alice: It's about executive senator appointments. Are they indefinite until they step down or if the president removes them?

Chris L: That's been the practice. That may or may not jive with what's in the bylaws.

Alice: Okay, because Rene seemed to be quiet certain that they are reelected each year.

Elisa: It says here that the terms of the four executive senators will be concurrent with their current senatorial term.

Alice: The senatorial term is one year.

Elisa: No, your personal senatorial term.

Alice: Oh, then if you remain a senator then you keep your seat. Got it.

Evan: That'll be important since if you two get elected, we'll have to find two more executive senators. That'll be fun.

Alice: It'll be an opportunity. I think its good that people from exec are running for the officer positions.

Genesis: There are some people who aren't in exec who are very suited for an officer position.

Alice: Oh, any officer position. I agree.

Chris L: Any other executive senator reports? Then we will move on to officer reports. Chris, is not here so Genesis.

Genesis: Okay, big news. I got my dream job so I'm working for the city of Tacoma and I'm working full time so I'll be spending 10 hours on Wednesdays for my office meetings and senate and exec and Monday afternoon and evenings. Then I spend the rest of my time in Tacoma. So that leaves a lot of my committee meetings happening on Wednesdays and Monday. So it's still being fleshed out now. Besides that, I'm available by email a lot and by phone as well since I'll will be sitting at the computer all day.

Alice: What is your job?

Genesis: My job is management fellow. I'm working with the City manager on special projects of his choosing and of my choosing and I'm also assigned a district in the city of Tacoma. I oversee the district of Hilltop. It is the ghetto. It's being revitalized right now.

Evan: Like Lake City transition?

Alex: But much worse.

Genesis: So that's what I'm doing. So committees. F&B's going to meet next week. Science & Policy, we're still dealing with that but we know when our summit's going to be. Sanne's been working really hard to price out food and alcohol and everything for that. We have the Burke room reserved for that all day.

Alice: Do you have a poster yet?

Genesis: Tina is working on our poster and should have it to us by next week. The planning for the Spring Social is well underway and the poster will be available soon.

Alex: Do we have a lucky date?

Genesis: May 2nd. It's a Friday but nothing was available on campus on other days so hopefully we'll get a good turnout.

Alan-Michael Weatherford (Comparative Literature): What's the typical turnout?

Genesis: So this year we had big turnouts compared to the past. We've been using Husky Cards this year so we know how many people attended. Fall Social, 700. The capacity of the Burke is 350. We could've been in big trouble for that. The Valentine's Day mixer, we had 250+ and we were planning on 200.

Alan-Michael: That's impressive.

Genesis: Our Budget Specialist decided to step down today. Natalie, our Office Manager, is helping fill in that spot so be nice to her. We have a lot of applications in the queue for F&B. I think we're going to finish funding soon, like in this month. In May, we need to revise some of our policy. That's all I have. I also had to revise our budget for SAF. SAF loves us. SAF is so happy to fund us.

Elisa: I also got my dream job. Starting on Monday, I'm working 30-40 hours a week on top of everything else so I'll be over there on the weekends and Mondays and Tuesdays all day. So most of my GPSS hours will be on Wednesdays and in between classes on Thursday and Friday.

Chris L: What is this?

Elisa: I'm designing a traveling exhibit for the National Parks so it's a year and a half contract job and it includes a book and an online oral history database and a lot of traveling to Washington DC and the national archives to do research and hiring videographers and meeting people around the country. It'll be really cool. So couldn't say no even though I really can't do it right now but there's that. Because of the schedule conflict it creates, Austin is going to sit proxy for

me on the ASUW Board of Directors and we have a representative to sit on GOMAP in my stead. Diversity committee meeting is tomorrow to plan the next three forums. We'll give Tina space to do the poster design for all three of those as she's doing Spring Social and other things. Our funding is not running out but we're still getting a lot of applications since we're the only ones with money left. We'll probably get some last minutes applications so I'm not really worried about it. As far as the budget goes for our forums, we're totally fine so we'll be able to have at least three or more. Natalie and I, as I mentioned earlier, are working on putting together a report about the representation of GPSS senators, like what programs have been represented the last five years and what programs haven't and how well it's been represented based on their attendance. It's been a big project but the goal is to send a letter to all the departments and programs and say, "Hey, you've never been represented. Here's a brochure. This is what we do." To the people who have been represented to say Thank you for always being here or thanks for being here but your representatives are not performing their duties, as they should. It's a good way to connect to all the GPAs and a good way to help set the stage for all the orientations for next year and the incoming secretary to get a robust roster in the fall.

Alex: What are GPAs?

Elisa: They are graduate program advisors. It's their position to appoint senators. I have to have a confirmation from them.

Alex: Like an administrator?

Alice: Yes, within each program. They can who oversee the election or appoint someone. It's up to the discretion of the GPA how they do that.

Elisa: It depends. So it's really important for GPSS to have relationships with the GPAs and that's why we try to create contacts with them. It's difficult to maintain that and they change over. That will be a really great thing. Mackensie, our archivist, and I had a meeting at the end of last quarter to get a retention schedule from the records management here at UW and because we have government standing and we're a student organization, we thought that we might have some special rules with records but it doesn't seem like we do. So we can push everything in the office that is 6 years old to archives and Mackensie will be printing out a report and we'll be putting together a couple of books of our essential documents, resolutions, minutes and staffing documents. That's it.

Evan: Chris, it's your turn.

Chris L: I guess I'll start off by echoing the sentiment that Austin is amazing. He's had a hand in everything I'm describing and there is absolutely no way that it wouldn't happened if he didn't so feel free to buy him a beer.

Genesis: He's not old enough to have a beer.

Chris L: Then a root beer then. As you probably know, I'm leaving tomorrow to go to DC as part of SAGE. We're meeting up with our brethren of universities that is part of the consortium and coming up with other strategies. Then Monday and Tuesday are our hill visits and we'll have some good stuff for that. Basically our priorities are research funding, immigration reform for students and student indebtedness. So we'll be creating white papers with the federal legislative steering committees. I'll be back in time for senate meeting on the ninth so I'll be leaving next Wednesday morning to get back to that. Coming up soon, we have the aforementioned panel on the Affordable Care Act and its impact on student health insurance. Laura has been doing a lot of work on that. We have a great panel. We have the Medical Director of the Odessa Brown's Children's Clinic and who's also a member of the Washington Health Exchange Panel. We have two representatives from the Washington Health Exchange Panel. We also have Associate Director of Finance at Hall Health. We have a student who is trained as an in-person assistor so there will be a really good discussion. School of Public Health is helping out a lot with outreach and getting the word out for the panel. Tina is also designing a poster as we speak and as I mentioned, people can submit questions to the panel and this will be moderated by our very own regent, Rogelio Riojas. who is CEO of the SeaHealth committee in the King County System so just a great event. We have been working very hard on international students stuff. Austin has been as well. We're meeting with Jeff Redinger and Denzil Suite to talk about how to move forward from the data we gathered last quarter from the focus group and we're going to appoint a few people on the newly created international student advisory committee, which is really exciting. Joey and I are talking with the Graduate School and the Center for Teaching and Learning about a near peer career panel. In other words, bringing people who are 3-5 years out back for a career event. This will actually be complimentary to what CTL and the Graduate School does. The Graduate School does a panel where they bring in employers and CTL does something in the fall that I can't remember exactly what that is. It would help us make use of our alumni network and trying to get our online network up and running. We're shooting for late April - early May. I'll talk to Joey and that is something we'll be looking forward to. Austin, am I forgetting anything?

Austin: No, not anything that hasn't been including in the report.

Chris L: Winter was a very busy time getting things figured out and what needs to be done and getting priorities straight. The state of GPSS and the working group leading up to that is a big part of what I did last quarter. So that's what I got. Any questions for any of the officers? Then okay, I'll move on to announcements. Are there any announcements?

Evan: Nope.

Chris L: Then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Executive Meeting Minutes
April 16th, 2014
HUB 303

Chris Lizotte (President): I'll call this meeting to order at 5:08pm. We've got a lot to do today so let's do our best to address everything in a timely manner. I'll entertain a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

Elisa Law (Secretary): I'd like to make a motion to amend the agenda to add Seyda from Elections committee to item 4 so she can make an announcement.

Chris L: Is this before or after the Student Tech Fee?

Elisa: Before.

Chris L: How much time?

Elisa: Five minutes.

Chris L: Is there a second?

Alex Bolton (Law): Second.

Chris L: Any objections? It shall be added. I'll also entertain a motion to move the vice president's report to follow the executive session so item 5a. Will someone make the motion?

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): Why?

Chris Erickson (Vice President): Because I'm leaving at 6.

Alex: So moved.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Thank you. I'll entertain a motion to approve or amend the minutes from the April 2nd, 2014 senate meeting.

Genesis: So moved.

Chris L: Any objections?

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): Can we clarify that Alex Stone speaks since Alex thereafter is unspecified. Can we specify somewhere in there that Alex who is speaking is Alex Stone.

Chris L: That's actually pretty important so yes. So this is from April 2nd?

Alice: I'm looking at March 5th. Well I guess it's already been approved from March 5th so nevermind. Alex Stone wasn't here last time.

Elisa: Alex, do you want to go through those minutes with me and I'll make the changes?

Alex: Okay.

Alice: Is that legit? Are we allowed to go back to the minutes after we've approved them? I feel like that's against the law.

Chris L: I don't think it's against the law. So Elisa, you will look into what we need to do. So is there a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes?

Alice: I objected and I withdraw my objection.

Chris L: Any other objections? Then it is approved. So Seyda, you're up.

Seyda Ipek (Physics): So there was a problem with the elections packet. Originally, the sentence in the packet read, "Officers earn a rate equivalent to a TA or an RA with a tuition waiver and including health insurance." That is wrong because officers do not get a tuition waiver. Their tuition is paid by GPSS. I'm changing the elections packet to read, "Officers earn a rate equivalent to a TA or an RA and get graduate appointment health insurance, plus their tuition is paid by GPSS. I checked with Rene and Genesis. The GPSS budget pays it. The first version with the tuition waiver was a problem for fee-based programs because they aren't allowed to get tuition waivers so one of our senators, Dawn, thought she couldn't run but, now that she can run, she wants to resign from the Elections committee and run. However, the bylaws say that senators in the Elections committee must resign 35 days before the elections, which is past but the Judicial committee suggested..."

Elisa: The Judicial committee, everybody was on that list. They had made a recommendation that the wording in the elections should be changed, that the bylaws be suspended, the 35 day bylaw and the Elections committee has to have four members bylaw, to allow Dawn to run. That's their recommendation and an email tonight to all the senators make it known how that process has happened so that there's no confusion that an Elections committee member was able to get clarification on a wording in a packet that someone else would not have gotten. Just to make it really clear.

Chris L: Do we have the power to do all those things?

Elisa: Yes.

Chris L: Then I will entertain a motion to...

Alice: Can we discuss?

Chris L: Sure. Just to get a clarification, do you need our approval to change the elections packet?

Seyda: No, I don't need it for that. I need it for Dawn's case.

Genesis: To allow Dawn to run? We need to make it clear that we're not suspending the bylaws to let Dawn run. We're just suspending the bylaws. I think that should be reflected clearly in that we can't say that we're doing it for Dawn. It has to be that we're just suspending the bylaws.

Seyda: Her's is the only case because other people in the committee don't want to run and other people can run whenever they want.

Chris E: Is she not currently allowed to run from the floor?

Seyda: No, because she's in the Elections committee.

Chris E: So what would be suspended is that rule that says if you have not resigned from the Elections committee within 35 days, you can't be allowed to run?

Chris L: And the requirement that the Elections committee has four members.

Seyda: We are at four members so if Dawn resigns, we will be at three members, which is not unheard of. Apparently, there have been Elections committee with two or three members.

Chris E: We have to do two anyway, right? If she already resigned.

Seyda: Right.

Alex: It's contingent.

Alice: Has she officially resigned from the committee?

Seyda: She sent me an email saying that she's going to resign and run.

Alice: That she's going to?

Seyda: Yes.

Alice: And since that email, has there been communication with the Elections committee?

Seyda: I've been emailing people like crazy to figure this out.

Alice: Within the Elections committee?

Seyda: Within the Elections committee, people don't reply but she can resign. I think the Elections committee will be fine. Rene told me that it's not a problem but in the past the bylaw that says four people was suspended. People just went for it. The only thing I'm asking is if she can run or not.

Alice: Has she been included in the emails with the Elections committee after she sent you her email?

Seyda: Yes.

Alice: So effectively, she hasn't been resigned yet if she's still included in the Elections committee.

Seyda: I've CCed her because the decision affected her running but I didn't think about it that much. We haven't met to discuss this.

Chris E: In your mind, would you consider that Dawn had resigned the Elections committee with the idea that she will run?

Seyda: Yes, that was very clear because Chris and Elisa. She talked to them after the last senate meeting and they told her that she could and should run.

Elisa: We said that the tuition is paid, not wavered.

Chris L: Yes, let's clarify that. We didn't say that she could and should run. I told her that I did not believe that she couldn't run. Her understanding of that is incorrect. The way it's stated is correct and she understood it as it was.

Seyda: Even though she was told about the 35 day bylaw, she forgot about it or did not think of it.

Chris L: Because she assumed she wouldn't be able to run.

Seyda: Yes, that's true.

Elisa: So I have one more thing. Alex, you're running. You need to resign from Exec 35 days ago.

Chris L: No, it's just the Elections committee.

Alice: It's pretty normal for exec committee members to run for office.

Seyda: It's just the Elections committee because we make this packet. I understand that it's an important bylaw and that's why I'm going crazy to get it right.

Alex: Being on the Elections committee, why is that there? Is there certain insights you get by being on it?

Genesis: Because you prepare the ballots.

Seyda: My understanding of the 35 day bylaw is that the Elections committee prepares the elections packet and some person says or chose to put something in way that changes it and only helps them. Exactly like this situation, Dawn realized the tuition part so she could have known about it and adjust it. And 35 days is enough to make a new thing and give people enough time to adjust to the situation. The Elections committee formed 35 days ago so it was just on time.

Alice: I know these minutes are public and I'm just going to say what I'm thinking because I think it's important. On the one hand, I personally like Dawn and I think she's done a lot for GPSS and she's been active. So I'm personally inclined to say, "Sure, why don't we just suspend the bylaws and let her run?" We should just do that because that's the nice thing to do but in my role as executive senator, I take three issues with it. The first is that a member of the Elections committee didn't understand something in the elections packet. I think it looks strange that we would have to suspend the bylaws because the member didn't understand the stipulations in the elections packet. That's the first thing. The second is that we would have to suspend two bylaws to essentially make an exception for one person. We're saying that that's not what it is but that's what it is. I don't like that. The third is a more specific issue that someone running for an officer position would decide to do so only if and when they knew that it covers their tuition.

Seyda: That's not the situation. Her department doesn't allow a tuition waiver so she couldn't be a student if she was an officer and you can't be an officer if you're not a registered student.

Chris L: We need to extend time because we only gave ourselves 5 minutes for this.

Alex: So moved by 5.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Alice: Can you clarify that wouldn't have been allowed to run versus she wouldn't have had her tuition covered?

Chris L: So the way the elections packet was worded is that officers are provided with a tuition waiver. That is incorrect. It's effectively been the way things have worked. It hasn't had to be clarified partially because we haven't had so many fee-based programs before. I don't think it's fair to say that she was looking at it opportunistically. She saw tuition waiver and understood that to mean, "I will not run because my department will not accept something that is a tuition waiver." In reality, what GPSS does is it pays the tuition of whoever the officers happen to be whether they're in the Law School or a tier one graduate College of Arts & Sciences. It doesn't matter. So the wording of the elections packet is incorrect. The reason it hasn't been updated is functionally, it hasn't mattered until now because we haven't had 47% of our students in fee-based programs. So the last aspect I would push back against. So the first two, I would agree that if she had been confused by that, I do agree that as a member of the Elections committee, a better course of action would have been to investigate it and see what it meant and have it clarified rather than assuming that it meant what it did at face value.

Alice: And if she truly did intend to run at that point in time, don't you think she would've asked for that clarification?

Chris L: I don't want to speculate on what she would or would not have done. In any case, that aspect I do agree with.

Evan: Point of clarification on your second point, you said there were two bylaws and Seyda mentioned that there is plenty of time to make a new elections packet? I heard that come up but the function of the EC says to submit the elections packet containing the elections rules and the laws at least two months before the elections.

Seyda: The Elections committee was only formed a month ago. We are not following all the bylaws as far as this election and as far as any elections goes.

Evan: My point is that we would have to suspend three bylaws instead of two.

Seyda: I think we would have to suspend many bylaws but I think the 35 day bylaw is an important one.

Elisa: I take Alice's points but you should be free to decide whether you want to run at any time. The only reason is because she's on the Elections committee. I don't know why, if it's very clear that it was a tuition waiver, why you would investigate otherwise. The way she brought it up was, "Oh, I wanted to run but..." She wasn't asking me to clarify that comment. I told her it's not that way and then she was very surprised. That's how this came up. That makes me think that she had intended to run but saw that and didn't question it because it's the way it's been for so long.

Chris E: So I think this is a pretty easy case from my standpoint. It's a clear case that our bylaws don't act as a guide for good governance for our organization. They're just a pain in the ass and super cumbersome.

Chris L: I would agree with you.

Chris E: So this is the thing. The whole idea of not suspending bylaws, we had our wins and losses. That hasn't been a strong suit this year. The second part is any time a bill is passed in Washington state, the rules are suspended so I don't think it's that big of a deal.

Alice: The rules in the House are different than a state constitution.

Chris E: I have the floor, I believe. Thank you. So it really works down to the fact that what is the real pain in leaving this up to the senate to say if they want to vote to suspend the bylaws to let Dawn run who wasn't in that matter of fact then that should be within their prerogative. That would be the most impartial, to leave it up to a vote in the senate.

Seyda: That was going to be my last suggestion that maybe I can make a motion at the next meeting to suspend this bylaw so people can run if they couldn't. Maybe that would work so she could run from the floor.

Chris L: We're also at time again so I'll need another extension of time.

Genesis: So moved by 10 minutes.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Okay, Elisa.

Elisa: I think that's fair. We can say that there's been a mistake in the elections packet. We've rectified that to make it more clear and we move to suspend the 35 day bylaw or any bylaw that would disallow someone to run based on this mistake or misinterpretation. And not say that it's for anyone in particular. Just say that this is the problem and if anyone would like to run they can.

Seyda: So people are going to ask the question and they'll learn that it's only for Dawn and then there will be an extension of 5 minutes. Then the elections are going to run too late.

Alice: We have the authority to suspend the bylaws to allow her to run and not bring it up in senate?

Chris L: Yes.

Alex: We would have to say we did it.

Seyda: You can suspend the bylaws and the Judicial committee says it is okay.

Chris L: The Judicial committee has made these recommendations.

Alice: I think that makes the most sense, not that I'm particularly comfortable with all of this but obviously if we vote to do that, that makes more sense than bringing it to the whole senate since that can severely bias the election. Since we have multiple people running for that election, then it'll be like, "Well we just suspended the bylaws to allow this one person run. They must be really important." Or it could go the opposite way like, "No, you were on the Elections committee. I'm going to vote against you," and not have it be about the actual candidates and about the principle of the thing. I think it's our job as exec to figure this out before it goes to senate. That being said, I think that rather than say it at the meeting, we can send an email to all senators about it so if there is someone that wants to run based on that information, they have that information now and run at the meeting.

Seyda: We are definitely sending that information tonight. I only waited to send that information to make sure that tuition is paid by GPSS.

Alice: Also, this is slightly off topic but were all senators sent emails with the candidates election materials?

Seyda: They are on the webpage.

Elisa: I sent an email saying that the information was on the web page and to get that information there if they wanted to run.

Alice: Because it said in the packet that all the candidate material will be sent out.

Seyda: All the candidate materials are on the webpage too.

Alice: As per the election's packet, I was suppose to be sent out on the night of the due date so maybe you can send it altogether.

Seyda: Yes, we should.

Alice: And say by the way, we made this clarification.

Chris L: So this is what I would say. Chris is right. Adhering to our own bylaws is not a strong suit this year but looking back and saying what we did or did not do correctly is irrelevant at this point and I have no interest in enumerating the ways in which we did or did not. Nor do I have any interest at this point in evaluating which bylaws do or do not serve the purpose of our

organization. Those are tasks that need to be done but they're not for us to do right now. What we need to do and the issue of this situation being that there was a piece of information that was incorrect. That prevented someone from making a decision or it forced their decision in a certain way and we should consider rectifying that situation based on our actions tonight. The bylaws that we have, even when we screw up or forget something or don't abide by something, every time moving forward, I think it's our duty for whatever we're doing to make sure that we do our due diligence and our best to be in accordance with the bylaws. In this particular case means voting to suspend the relevant parts to allow for this individual.

Genesis: No, not to allow this individual to run. To allow anyone from the floor who misunderstood the elections packet to run.

Chris L: Fair enough.

Alice: But anyone who misunderstood anything is allowed to run from the floor unless they're on the Elections committee so it really is specific to the Elections committee since anyone is allowed to run even if they understood it or not.

Genesis: It's a benefit to her.

Alice: Yes. That's the point. I don't think it's fair.

Chris L: I understand all these points. I think the issue at hand is that the information is incorrect.

Alice: Who's responsible for that?

Chris L: I'm not interested in that.

Chris E: I'd like to make a motion for the Judiciary committee to write an email explaining the situation in the context that bad information in the elections packet or a misunderstanding led to someone not resigning. I don't even believe the elections packet was out 35 days before the elections. So that's another part but I believe that to truly explain to the senators that if they decide that they want to suspend the bylaws that would allow a person that was not eligible to run from the floor to do so.

Chris L: So your motion is to put this to the senate.

Chris E: And tied to that is having some form of information given to them that explains the situation.

Elisa: That's the recommendation of the Judicial committee anyway to make it all public to the senate, to tell the senators what happened and that the Judicial committee recommended and this is what exec decided and this is what happened.

Chris E: I guess I'm making the motion to follow the recommendations of the Judicial committee.

Chris L: No, you were moving that we will not take action on this other than to take it to the senate. Is that correct?

Chris E: Correct.

Chris L: Is there a second? Seeing none, the motion dies. I'll entertain a motion to suspend the relevant parts of the bylaws that currently prevent a member of the Elections committee from running for an officer's position.

Elisa: So moved.

Chris L: Is there a second?

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objection?

Alex: I'll withdraw my second.

Chris L: Then the motion is still on the floor. Seeing no second, the motion dies. So we have taken no action on this.

Seyda: If you take no action, the bylaws stand.

Chris L: Someone could bring a motion to the senate.

Seyda: That was my first idea but now I think it's a really bad idea since it's Elections Day and people are going to be making presentations and what not.

Chris E: Is the intent to let the bylaws stand so she wouldn't run? If that's the case, I would love if you would entertain that again so we could vote on that. At least there has to be a vote and we can see where the chips falls. If they don't want her to run, I would like to see people vote no.

Chris L: You can make that motion if you want but I'll need a motion to extend time.

Alice: So moved by 7 minutes.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Time has been extended by 7 minutes. So Chris, you are welcome to make that motion.

Chris E: If anything, I guess we'll just motion to extend but I'm happy to let you guys have this conversation after I go but I have a couple things that need to get done before I have to leave in a couple minutes.

Chris L: The floor is open.

Alice: Could we request regardless of what decision is made here in exec or not, that from the Elections chair, an email be sent out clarifying to all senators what happened?

Seyda: That is going to be done, no matter what.

Alice: With all the candidate information?

Seyda: Yes, and the elections packet on the webpage is going to be changed.

Chris L: If there is no further discussion or if there is no motion, we'll move on the next agenda item.

Seyda: Thank you for your time.

Chris L: Chris, I believe I moved you after the exec session correct?

Chris E: I think I'm after the Tech Fee.

Chris L: So next item is Tech Fee.

Alton Lu (Student Technology Fee committee Program Coordinator): Thank you for meeting with me. I'm just going to skip over most of the winter report because you guys are very busy. Just some housekeeping stuff though. You guys have two members from GPSS, Kevin and Jenn Huff. They're both really wonderful members and they're the most discussive in meetings and it's wonderful having them. We have several issues in STF in meetings and getting things done. These are things that I just want to discuss with you guys to see if you have any ideas on how we can fix these or what STF or GPSS can do to solve these issues. The first biggest problem is the committee appointment schedule. GPSS appoints members from mid to late fall quarter. That means that we don't have fall quarter to meet at all. That means that we're shoving 100 proposal meetings into 1 and half since we have to finish and vote on the proposals. We're just trying to figure out a way to get appointments earlier. Then the elections causes issues with that because I don't know if you guys can actually appoint members earlier than that. That would be a wonderful thing to get members appointed earlier.

Chris L: Do you know if Jenn and Kevin are interested in continuing next year?

Alton: I hope so. I can talk to them about that but they might be graduating as well.

Chris L: We are making it our policy to do as many committee appointments as we can before the beginning of the school year so we can certainly prioritize STF.

Alton: If we can get appointees earlier, that would be a huge help in making STF less stressful as it gets later in the spring quarter. And the second problem we have is absent members. From ASUW, we have a member named Elizabeth McKean. I've never met her and she doesn't respond to my emails at all. In a situation, we would like some way to replace so we're figuring out what bylaw changes we can make about this but we don't want to just arbitrarily decide who to cut. So in this situation, it may be members who missed a certain number of meeting or don't respond enough and also about members that don't exist. So right now, both ASUW and GPSS has one open spot and finding appointments right now would be extremely difficult for all of you so we want to know what sort of leeway that STF has in finding another member that can come up to you guys and you guys could approve them. If there's any way that we could start doing that since if something happens like Elizabeth McKean who doesn't show up, perhaps earlier in the quarter I could cut her and we could have another member instead of having this open spot that is wasted.

Rene: Did you let ASUW and GPSS know? If you can tell everybody that if someone doesn't show up after the first or second meeting, put it in your notes that you need to let them know earlier. You should say something because I think people can try to get replacements. I'm glad you're doing this now but everyone's being a little late.

Alton: This is for next year so we can make things smoother.

Austin Wright-Pettibone (GPSS University Affairs Director): Regarding GPSS appointments to STF, there's been a lack of interests on graduate students to take part in not just STF but any budgetary committee. So it would be helpful to get a description of what activities STF does and send that out the UAs for the purpose of recruitment. That way, we can do targeted outreach and then another point is that SAF finds their own members and refers those to the UAs.

Alton: Is that something that GPSS would be okay with?

Genesis: Yes.

Evelina Vaisvilaite (ASUW Representative): I'm the ASUW representative. Are you looking to get that member replaced this year?

Alton: No, it's a bit too late now but we'll figure things out for next year.

Evan: Was there a question of if there was a member that you guys had wanted, if we can approve them this late in the season?

Alton: No, it's for next year. Say a member doesn't show up, what sort of leeway do we have in trying to find a new member to replace them?

Chris L: That's a good question because since we do appoint them, they're our appointees. My suggestions would be, as Rene said, tell us and we will remove someone if they aren't meeting their obligations.

Genesis: If STF makes bylaw changes, does GPSS have to approve them?

Alton: Yes.

Genesis: And do you anticipate making bylaw changes before the year's out?

Alton: Yes. And this is so we can get your point of view first. The other part is sort of tangentially related but some members can't participate anymore. So we have a Nina Dang who just got a job. That's wonderful but she doesn't have the time to participate anymore so in a situation like this, she may resign. If we do find a member, let's say in winter quarter and you guys would be willing to approve?

Chris L: Yes.

Alton: The third point is reaching quorum. The bylaws state that we need about half of the ASUW members and one GPSS member present for a meeting. Just last week we almost missed quorum. We had 2 ASUW members there. They came in 15 minutes late. We also had 14 proposal authors there at the meeting and if they didn't come, we would have to send them away and it would be a huge hassle and there would be anger among those people. I was wondering what sort of things we can do to have a meeting but no actual voting so we can hear them but not necessarily vote or make any decisions about it so they don't have to come back and us to reschedule their appointments. This is also difficult because if we don't reach quorum, and let's say that there are no GPSS members there, they don't get the background except from the minutes and they don't get the leeway to ask questions or other information they might need from the proposal author.

Genesis: I think in that case, for F&B, we didn't have quorum when we began but we heard one of the applications because they were already there and we knew someone was on their way. I think when you're not there for the meeting and you're just going to read the application materials or the minutes, you lose that ability to ask the questions. You gave up that opportunity so now it's up to you to do your homework and vote electronically. That's the way we do it.

Alton: What it is we will do is a bylaws change that says that no voting is allowed but we can still hear proposals if quorum can't be reached so things can go smoother. That's what we think. We also wanted to talk about incentives. So STF is a really boring committee, I guess. People don't really want to go. I don't know why all you come here all the time but what sort of things

can STF do so we can insure that members come to meetings and actually want to participate? Right now, we only have a few members that participate very heavily but a few of the ASUW members don't say anything so it's just like having a body there. There's no input.

Genesis: Is there a way you can recruit specifically from tech majors? Maybe it would seem interesting to them.

Alton: Actually, one of the best thing about Jenn is that she's doing Anthropology stuff and dealing with a lot of equipment revolving around those things and we've had proposal that we had no idea of what they were except for Jenn and she was able to tell us all about it. What we want is a way so we can get a diverse group of people. Most of the committee is Business and Computer Science majors. They only care about computers and 3D printing. The machinery to observe rocks and that sort of thing is not really their forte.

Rene: I was going to suggest that you guys do a diagnostics with a couple of your officers on how you structure your meetings and I'd be happy to help you. Sometimes when you go by the format that you have and in some instances, it doesn't make sense or if you don't have enough participation from members, it doesn't make sense. The reason why these guys are all sitting here is because they have something to do. Maybe you need to think about the roles instead of them just sitting and thinking. Do you still have faculty in your committee?

Alton: Yes, we have 6.

Rene: And how many times have those faculty members been rotated off? Maybe that's something that you also need to think about is the same people that's been there for a long time. Perhaps a retreat with whoever you have. Once you guys get together you can do that. Maybe you're locked into protocols that doesn't make sense.

Alan-Michael Weatherford (Comparative Literature): I think she's exactly right and I have two points to consider that piggyback off of that. One is what type of projects are you beginning and then are you finishing them and making sure that people in general are beginning new things and having closure? This beginning new things and having closure will really help you retain people. And then, what is your turnover rate? Are they just sitting there like dead eggs after a while? Are you bringing in new people to keep your organization much more organic?

Genesis: One recommendation I have might not work very well but SAF makes people read about the units that are coming in to do their applications and then you have to talk about these units so you can assign tasks to people and when you come to the meetings, you have to know about this to make them the intro for the presentations and make it more interactive so they're not just sitting there waiting to say yes or no for the applications.

Alton: Does SAF ever have people just not reading?

Austin: On which phase? Generally for the presentations, they're pretty good. For the budget readings, it is as what you would expect.

Genesis: When do you think you'll have bylaw changes to us?

Alton: I think in three to four weeks. I think we begin to vote on proposals in two weeks so after that we can start discussing our bylaw changes and other administrative things.

Genesis: Okay, we have two meetings in May so keep in touch when you should come.

Alex: When does ASUW send their appointments?

Alton: Late November.

Alex: So you're asking both to switch their appointment times?

Alton: Yes, I'm meeting with ASUW tomorrow and talking about the same things I talked about right now.

Chris L: Any other questions for Alton? Thank you for coming. Moving on, Chris. Your report.

Chris E: The session ended and it was good. WSA passed a lot of things in their top four priorities. It is easy to say that this was the most successful year that WSA had ever. I'm happy to be a part of that group. The Dream Act passed. That's a really big thing. The in-state veterans and 1669, the fee-based programs bill as well. Thank you to all of you for your help as well as the senate. Those two pushes we did at the end with one on the committee hearing day and again to get that to move through the rules. The process was helpful and spot on when people did make the call to action. We just spent six days in DC talking with our SAGE group as well as some staffers. I couldn't have been more proud to be a part of the group from UW. We have our wins and losses and we hold ourselves to a high standard and know that we can do better but it is amazing how much taller we stand to our peers when we go to those places. We specific things like doing our own white papers. We don't stay at the same hotels because Dupont's cooler than where they were staying. It was very great thing to see that that didn't come off as pompous or elitist. What came out of that was us being approached by many campuses to say that we're doing it right and setting a good example. Really great stuff. I was really a tag-along in the group than some of the pros like Kiana and Matt after being there for two, three years now and keeping the class act. I can't say enough about our federal leg staff of Christy and Sara who were not only helpful to us but also came along on the SAGE days and put that together. I think in lieu of elections, we're not doing anything but we'll do a year-end wrap up.

Chris L: So next on the agenda, we'll be moving into the executive session to discuss a salary of an employee so I'm going to need Doug, Austin, Dawn and Tina to leave the room.

[Executive session began at 5:55pm.]

[Executive session ended at 6:20pm.]

Chris E: I would like to make a motion to give a \$1 per hour salary increase to the GPSS Policy Analyst for the term of spring quarter 2014 only.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Chris E: I would also like to make a motion that the Diversity committee best situated to take care of it would work with the officers on the issues of how salary increases and other personal matters can be best processed in light of many considerations that we've talked about.

Alan-Michael: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? The motion carries as well. We are moving right along. The next thing we're going to talk about is open access. Austin has been working diligently on so why don't you kick us off on that, Austin?

Austin: So within your packets, you have two resolutions drafted. One is one that we've written and one is written for us by the Director of Information Resources and Scholarly Communications at the libraries in consultation with the faculty council chair of University Libraries, Joyce Cooper, and with the input of Betsy Wilson, Dean of Libraries.

Chris L: I'm sorry. Could you clarify which is which? Okay, ours is the serif. Theirs is the sans serif.

Genesis: I don't know what that means.

Chris L: This one with the bold text at the top is the one we've drafted. The other one is the one they've drafted.

Alice: Who is they?

Austin: Director of Scholarly Resources for Libraries. However, that's getting a little ahead ourselves. Going back to what we're doing in open access, in 2009 the faculty senate decided to pass a resolution in favor of greater support for open access publications and that is currently the extent that the university has policy. We believe however, we being Juliya Zikina and myself, who Juliya is our representative in the Faculty Council on University Library. We believe that the university has the obligation to the preservation and the dissemination of public knowledge and creating an open access policy that is robust, that is in line with the advances being made at the

federal level as well as those being adopted by our peer institutions such as Harvard and Stanford. What we've done here is drafted a resolution that is fairly comprehensive and proposes a pretty big uplifting of the university's open access policy. Basically what it would do is create a repository mandate for the university whereby any student, faculty or staff member or an affiliate of the university that publishes an article using university resources or funds would then have to deposit their article into ResearchWorks. After a set period of time, that article would be publicly available. If the publisher had a policy that prevented the opening up of the information, then a waiver can be signed.

Evan: I think sometimes, they don't necessarily have a policy but have an extra fee or payment.

Austin: What another provision in here is to support the creation of an open access author fund. Some things that we've run into and the reason you have two solutions before you is that Tim and Joyce are concerned that this resolution we put forward is too comprehensive and will hit dead in the water in faculty senate. So we're currently revising our strategy and it might come to some consensus agreement with the libraries that would downplay our policy to make it more amenable to the faculty senate with the overall goal being that we want the buy-in from ASUW, GPSS and faculty senate to then entice the administration to adopt an open access policy.

Chris L: I'll just point out that the draft that we have, a lot of the back clauses actually call on the university to do something, which we cannot really do. We cannot resolve that the university do something.

Alice: We can resolve that the vice president be directed to advocate on behalf of this.

Chris L: Yes, or recommend. That might be one of their concerns.

Austin: A good point. Their concerns are more that it's too broad ranging and there will be haggling over the details. So the more likely route for success is seeming to be that we're going to be producing a series of white papers for the chairs of faculty councils and we'll be meeting with them throughout the rest of the quarter and we'll get someone more toned down resolution hopefully pass through GPSS. Then we'll introduce one simultaneously to ASUW. If we can prioritize to at least passing this out this year, then we can enter next year and have ASUW do the same thing, then Joyce said the faculty council will be more likely to push it to their overall senate.

Evan: Are there specific clauses you really want to keep or ideas in here that they were sticking points that you were recommended to drop?

Austin: In terms of keeping it, I would like to keep this idea and whatever we end up with will be fairly similar to this idea in the long run but it's just a matter of the route we're going to take to get there. The key things that would have to be in the resolution is the establishment of an author

fund, the movement towards a repository for a green standard of open access and the author waiver. The other one is endorsing the student statement of the right to research.

Evan: Were any points sticking points or was it just in general too broad?

Austin: It was in general seen as too broad and she was concerned that we had not done the proper research. Those concerns were swayed during the course of the conversation but she wanted to see a white paper now.

Alice: I have a question about the part of this one. I don't know if I read it over your version or the faculty one but about students not having student needs met for access to scholarly articles. I was just wondering about that part because maybe there's a thing of literature that I have not accessed but as far as when I do research, it's been amazing going through the UW Libraries. For the record, I'm in support of full open access but I've found that the UW Libraries, if they don't have an article already online, I can request it and they'll email it to me within 24 hours. So where is this coming from?

Austin: So the library where Juliya was at with this is because the cost for subscribing to these publications have been increasing, I don't have the hard numbers so I can't quote anything definitively but the libraries had to scale back on its subscriptions so we're losing journals because journals are going up. So some of the smaller ones are being watered down and we have the large publishers that are consolidating their work and charging more which is dampening down the work being done by the smaller publications. The concern is that because those smaller publications are being driven out and the publishing fees are increasing for students to access the intellectual material being produced, the authors that are only published in the smaller journals are being left out.

Alice: Is there any discussion in addition to this to get the university to allocate more funds? I think it's atrocious that these big conglomerate publishing companies are able to charge that much but I think it's the university's duty set some funds in place so we won't actually lose access to those. Is that a joint effort?

Austin: The provost has a standing commitment but nothing written formally to continue supporting libraries to the extent that they need. However, in 2008 they had to draft a policy to scale back and I'm not sure to the extent which they enacted that policy but I believe that there was some. You can correct me if my information is wrong.

Alex: That sounds right.

Alan-Michael: So this ResearchWorks is the interface where this scholarly work is sent out. I'm wondering what is exactly considered as scholarly work? Is it journal publications or is it iTunes videos that UC Berkeley actually does that are just presentations of some guy giving a lecture and puts it on there. In that case, it's not exactly scholarly because it's not peer reviewed.

Austin: The concern is specifically around peer-reviewed. However, the term scholarly work does go beyond that. You're right.

Alex: What are you thinking in terms of timeline?

Austin: To get something passed through our senate, I think we can do it by the end of the year.

Alex: Are you going to do a hybrid of the two?

Austin: I'm thinking of a hybrid. So we'll have our white paper done by the end next week. So based off of that, we can work on revising it down. The initial thought is after the meeting today, May 21st is the last senate meeting of the quarter and I think that would be an appropriate time to introduce it. We could push it forward to May 7th but that's a tighter timeline.

Alex: And hope ASUW does something and hope the faculty senate works with us next year?

Austin: So I brought it up in Board of ASUW and we'll bring up again and try working with Michael Zangl, the senate vice speaker. I don't know the workings of ASUW as well so I might be having a my information wrong at this point but I'm working with Michael to get it on the senate agenda before the end of the year.

Alice: Most publishers have rules that don't allow you to publish your work publicly in other place so they have exclusivity of distribution.

Austin: What currently happens to open access right now is that for those publishers that don't allow it, there's the waiver policy but the majority of publishers do allow some sort of access. What tends to happen is they request a year or two of holding on to it and then it gets published.

Alice: So there would be that lag period.

Austin: Yes. The overall goal is have that knowledge freely available.

Alice: I know you talked with the libraries people and working with them. Is there any sense that they want to include some sort of clauses to stay committed to providing libraries with enough resources to continue access? I really appreciate this and all the work that you're doing but my only concern is that the university will say now you guys have open access so you don't need money to keep your access for journals that we do have to pay for.

Austin: Tim's opinion, which I agree with, is not necessary. The provost has signaled her commitment to this and it appears to be a standing commitment.

Evan: This is fully publicly available, this ResearchWorks? Is it publicly accessible? Is it tough to get into or is it actually a workable, searchable database?

Austin: No, you can access it through the library's page.

Alan-Michael: Were we asked to advocate on behalf this?

Alex: No.

Chris L: Austin, what are our next steps?

Austin: The key stakeholders that we've identified are the Faculty Council on Research, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, SCBB and the chair of the faculty committee. In the next four weeks, I'll be attempting to sit down with all of them as well as give the presentation to at least the Faculty Council on University Libraries and potentially the other committees as my meetings with the chairs progress. We'll be producing the white paper and hopefully meeting with Betsy Wilson, the Dean of Libraries, and Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research to get their buy-in as well.

Alice: Are all those committees which we have GPSS representation or no?

Austin: Yes.

Alice: Is there any way for all of us to get together to talk about it before you meet the councils individually?

Austin: Before I meet with the council for sure but before I meet with the chair, schedule depending.

Alice: Does it makes sense for you to make presentations for each of those committees when we have a GPSS representative on each of those committees?

Austin: Yes, because Juliya and I know more of the ins and outs of the policy and we'll be able to answer the high level questions that the faculty have.

Chris L: Any other discussion on this? Then we will move on. Thank you Austin. I will admit that open access has been Austin's project. I have only been tangentially related or involved and since Austin is capable of doing 500 things at once and not sleeping for days at a time, which I'm not so I can't do that. The next document that you have is this one. It's GPSS prioritizations. This comes out of our winter quarter focus groups with the international students. So through our focus groups and through a meeting that you had with three international students to really focus in on the priorities, actually why don't you describe the process since you know better than I do.

Austin: I included this in the special things but what we did was we had our four focus groups. Backing up to the entire timeline of it, in the fall we identified stakeholders and we met with the various assistant deans throughout the campus of what the priorities were for GPSS to consider throughout the year. Through that, we came up with international students as one of the key unifying factors. Then we met with Jeff Riedinger and Denzil Suite, who are some of the senior administrators who deal with the issue and they recommended that we gather some more data and we took that to establishing a series of focus groups in conjunction with the Office of Educational Assessment and supported by Denzil's office. Out of those focus groups, we established an initial set of data that comes out to about 60 pages or so. We culled through that and identified some key trends. Then we brought in some additional international students to work with us some more on prioritizing some of those trends and we had some simultaneous conversations going on with the Odegaard Writing Research Centers. We had a conversation this week with the Director of Expository Writing. I have one scheduled next week with the Director of Center for Teaching and Learning. What started out as focused specifically on international students has broadened to the prioritizations you see here which goes far beyond its original scope. It includes projects that while having a direct impact on international student experience, will also be beneficial to the entire student body which is what we set out to do initially.

Chris L: No unit on campus to my knowledge, academic or administrative, has ever done this comprehensive of a study on graduate international student experience. Largely thanks to Austin, we're really striding ahead in this department.

Austin: It is definitely something we can add to the accomplishments of GPSS, that we were the first unit to work with understanding the experience of international graduate students.

Chris L: We have a meeting with Jeff and Denzil on Friday to talk about these.

Austin: So we want to run down through these priorities and get your sign off on them and answer any questions you have. So the three umbrella categories we identified were the academic and campus need administrative priorities. We did that for the reason that it fits very well with the already established architecture for university support for international students. The administrative priorities are done primarily through the Office of Student Life and the Office of Global Affairs as well as FIUTS and the International Student Services which both falls underneath Student Life and Global Affairs. For the administrative priorities, the chief one is that we are trying to centralize the bureaucratic structure by establishing one administrator who deals with international students. At the moment, it's very evident within the make-up of the international advisory committee that was just formed that we have Jerry Baldasty, who is the Senior Vice Provost. You have Denzil Suite, who is the Vice President of Student Life and Jeff Riedinger, who is the Vice Provost of Global Affairs and we have Era Schrepfer as the Director of FIUTS. They are the administrative support for this one committee. What we want to do is to say that this is great that there are four people working on this but who's the person that's

responsible for it ultimately? For the past year and a half, it's mainly been Jerry but it does go outside. It's not his sole purview. He has other responsibilities so we want someone who is responsible for this. We've identified that as the number one issue underneath that everything else can be mitigated. It's a high level of concern that while we'll be bringing it Jeff and Denzil, we'll also be bringing it to President Young and the provost. Chris will be doing that next week. Underneath that, we're working to create a university advisory council similar to what the diversity council has now in the way that it's formed that works specifically to deal with the international student experience. So while in the long term, we hope that it plays a similar function to the diversity council in managing the work being done in support of international students of this campus. Initially what we're seeking from it is to bring everyone together and figure out what needs are unmet and centralize the information and make a comprehensive report next year.

Alex: Who would be responsible? Would it be a GPSS committee or an administrative thing?

Austin: So it will be structured very similar to the diversity council. I'm still playing with who's chair. Whether Jerry would be chairing it or we would have co-chairs with Denzil and Jeff. I like that model a little more because it loops in the non-academic side of things that international students have to deal with so we'll be playing that out a little bit more and getting a dean or a representative thereof from each of the colleges as well as FIUTS, ISS...

Chris L: And GPSS and ASUW.

Austin: Then underneath that, clarifying the role of GOMAP and FIUTS is a fairly important one. Right now, FIUTS is known by the administration to be the organ that deals with international students in terms of support for them that is non-administrative. Yet, their focus is programmatically almost tailored exclusively toward the undergraduate so there's a huge unmet need for international graduate students. They've currently been going to GOMAP and what I would like to explore is the funding model for FIUTS and GOMAP and see if there are graduate dollars being put behind FIUTS and whether we can work to divert those to GOMAP and expand their some of their funding.

Chris L: To clarify, GOMAP is not charged to dealing with international students. International graduate students are going to GOMAP because they are perceiving that there is no other place to go.

Austin: And they really like GOMAP.

Chris L: And it turns out well. They aren't going to FIUTS because they are perceiving it to be undergraduate focused.

Austin: Personally I have some issues encouraging GOMAP to take on a bigger role of dealing with international students. I can go into more detail if you're interested but I think it is an easier sell at the currently moment to expand the role of GOMAP.

Rene: What about ISS?

Austin: ISS deals with only the administrative parts.

Rene: But graduate students don't go there for anything?

Austin: They're only charged with administering visas and legal requirements.

Alan-Michael: Which apparently isn't that good.

Austin: They are also underfunded at the moment and have no room to expand. The last one is strengthening the international student advisory council which the forum has not met. That's another concern. Another one we identified is campus priorities. This will be mostly under Denzil's purview in Student Life. The number one concern they have that would impact all students is more thoroughly training the GPAs. This one is specifically a concern of the international students. They don't have a broad training for dealing with international students which means the students are having to come up with a lot of the information themselves, which is inefficient and it is the job of the GPA to support the students so we're looking into that. Strengthening the orientation is an ongoing difficult project because orientations are split between FIUTS and departments. We're not sure yet how that will work. I have somebody working on a light memo for that but I don't think it'll be ready by Friday. Number 3 piggybacks off of what the College of Built Environments is doing, which is integrating international and domestic students by giving them coffee cards to go and meet so the international students can ask questions in a safe place. That has some success and I'm really excited to see if it will be expanded to the university level. It will have minimal funding but it can have a big impact. Number 5 is starting a fund that would protect international students who are effectively losing programmatic funding. This one is big. Chris Erickson and I are at slight disagreement over this as to whether it's the most appropriate. We could move towards having a separate fund for international students who are losing their funding or whether it's adequate enough to train the GPAs and the consequences of graduate students losing their funding. Right now, if an international student loses funding, they have to vacate the country if they aren't able to provide for their tuition. This could serve as a model to buffer that but it would be a hard sell in the overall budget scheme. The last one is folding the international student fee in the university's operating fund. This is something that is a huge issue on the graduate level and has virtually been, in my conversations, non-existent in the graduate level. Most international graduate students are unaware that the fee exist and the ones that are see other issues that they are concerned with. We have included this because it's a priority of ASUW and we would like to support the undergraduate in their attempts to abolish the fee.

Chris L: PACS will be likely to make a recommendation on this and as of right now we're at a loss to express our ambivalence. This is what we're hearing from international graduate students and we haven't brought this to the whole senate. We're trying to figure that out because PACS will make a recommendation.

Austin: To note, if you do agree to support this in its current incarnation, then we would be likely to come out in support of getting rid of the international student fee

Chris L: Getting rid of it but not as a fee but some how maintaining the funding it's providing.

Austin: I would consider that. Then the last one is academic priorities. They're all pretty pressing needs. The first one is more ambiguous and I've tried to make it more tangible but the idea is we need to support international students in the in-classroom experience. An easy, low-hanging fruit of that would be advocating for randomization in group projects. So if there is a group, rather than allowing students to choose who they work with, we would have a random list assigned through Canvas who would then dole out the groups. What happens now is that international students pair with international students and domestic students pair with domestic students. That happens because domestic students don't want to pair with the international students. This would be a way to more forcibly integrate the international students but in a way that doesn't really harm anybody.

Alan-Michael: In what context is this happening?

Austin: In group work.

Chris L: Particularly in the Evans School.

Alice: Would this apply to everyone? Because in a lot of classes and seminars we have group projects and they pair us based on our level of expertise and experience. If there could be some clause for situations that might warrant that.

Austin: The central administration can't mandate any practice academically. They can make a recommendation that faculty consider it.

Rene: That's the same issue that is part of a diversity issue. So it's part of practices and how people feel versus mandating academic things that the professor does. It's very complicated since it's pointing out reality. It'll be fun to see how they have that conversation.

Evan: I think that's an interesting way to handle it. I wonder who's in charge of that.

Austin: My idea with this is that we are trying to encourage faculty to recognize the university as a global university, which means we're trying to encourage them, like in Built Environments, having people who are teaching architecture to teach not just American architecture and using culturally relevant examples and rewarding the faculty who are doing so.

Chris L: That is something that came up a lot in the I School.

Evan: That's a good idea.

Austin: The other one is shifting the conversation of writing on campus. This is a huge personal concern of mine that has a lot of support from students I've talked to. I have a beautifully worded memo from the Writing Center. The general idea is that the way we grade writing now in the context of dealing with international students is discriminatory. We need to change that. It comes down to if you think of how language acquisition is acquired, it takes 1-2 years of conversational fluency and it takes 5-7 years to achieve academic fluency. In the span of a masters program, if the student hasn't studied before in the United States, all research shows that there is no way that the students can reach academic fluency in the time that they are here studying for their masters program and yet we're grading them on the basis of their academic fluency. What we're advocating for is a holistic grading rather than grading by point bearing categories which would shift it from grammatical and syntactical concerns to concerns based on the strength of their ideas and the way they present their argument. Also having a mark but read through approach to their writing which would help international students who are struggling with grammatical and syntactical errors by marking those errors when they impede one's ability to understand but reading through it and focusing more on the holistic approach.

Chris L: We're past time so we need to extend time.

Evan: So moved by 5 minutes.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Great. Just TA training for international students is known to be lackluster.

Alice: Is that for all TAs or for just international students?

Austin: So the current model is working towards strengthening the CTL's training for international students specifically and departmentally relevant TA training programs through partnerships between each department and CTL.

Alice: So does that include non-international TAs?

Austin: Yes.

Evan: Do you want possible syntactical errors pointed out in this document?

Austin: Yes.

Evan: In number 4, integrating domestic and international students instead of student and possibly administrative priorities which we clarify the role versus clarify the roles.

Alan-Michael: On your academic priorities, whatever conversations you're involved on with points two and three, I would love to be a part of because I frequently teach the TA training for foreign language methodology so I have experience in that part. Also where we shift the conversation around campus on that, I love the idea but the idea that's coming out of this one sentence, I'm kind of iffy on so I would love to know more about this because I work with tons of international students. The majority of us are international students and we teach language and we have a lot of experience in that.

Austin: Where are you seeing concerns and what would you suggest?

Alan-Michael: I think the balance here, if you're developing the holistic model of realizing that grammar and syntactical are very necessary but also logical comprehension. They both have to work in tandem and it's using a methodology that will work on both of those at the same time versus using one that is favoring one over the other.

Chris L: I think the concern right now is that grammatical and syntactical errors and ideas so even bringing it back more.

Evan: So perhaps just indicating that the goal is a balance.

Alan-Michael: It's funny because this was exactly in my lesson today.

Alice: Then maybe than staying away from grammatical and syntactical errors because then you'll also get pushback from every scientist on that. Precision is the most important you can have in scientific writing and if you don't get that right, it doesn't matter how well you present your research.

Alan-Michael: It's only in so far that grammar and syntax has a logic.

Alice: Rather than say let's focus the attention away, say shift the conversation to achieve a balance between or an integrated holistic approach.

Alan-Michael: Whoever you're talking to please CC me.

Austin: Do you have a specific revisions of the wording that you would like?

Alice: I think Alan-Michael's probably the best person to ask that.

Austin: So then do you have other questions broadly for this?

Alex: My only question is I haven't gotten a real sense of the pushback of the international fee. Have we heard a lot of that?

Chris L: I have heard practically nothing about the international student fee on the graduate level.

Rene: Have graduate students talked about the culture? I don't know if anyone talks about culture and I don't see it in here. What do we do with that?

Austin: Yes, I was trying to go at it under number 3. Number 3 was labeled as on-campus experience but trying to word a heading, I had to settle on the wording but the idea behind it is to reduce the stigma and the discrimination that is directed toward international students.

Alice: Maybe cultural sensitivity?

Austin: That's not going to be strong enough. I want to shy away from ambiguities in terms of next steps. Cultural training will have no metrics where we can measure its progress.

Rene: If I'm an international student, where do I go if I don't feel good?

Alan-Michael: They don't know.

Rene: That should be something measurable. Where do you send that person for the boo-boos?

Alan-Michael: Notice that when they do get appointed, like the ISS, to deal with the visa work they get referred to their department so they get wafted back and forth.

Austin: Which is what the GPA training will hopefully help in.

Chris L: This is marked as an action item so that the executive committee will endorse these priorities as GPSS international student priorities but I don't want to cut off discussion so if anyone wants to extend time to ask more questions.

Alice: Can I move that Austin will continue working on these on a further draft with Alan-Michael with the considerations we talked about including language to address cultural issues with international students somewhere and we see this before we vote to strictly endorse this language.

Austin: Keeping in mind that our timeline is Friday.

Chris L: I don't think we need a finished 100% document.

Alex: What's Friday?

Austin: We're presenting these two to Jeffrey and Denzil.

Evan: I'd be okay with either A) approving the email for endorsing trusting that they'll finish up on their own.

Alan-Michael: I'm saying that if it's before Friday I can't do that. I have a conference tomorrow that I'll be gone for all day.

Chris L: I'm happy with going in saying that our executive committee is broadly supportive. I'm comfortable saying that. It would be nice to say that it has the official endorsement.

Austin: I don't think it will be a topic of conversation. The agenda we have for them is very loaded.

Evan: So you think were okay without a full official endorsement?

Chris L: Yes, broad support of it and we'll vote on it at a later time.

Alice: I made a motion.

Chris L: Is there a second?

Evan: What are we moving for? Just to bring it back to us and we officially endorse it later?

Alice: With the inclusion of language about culture and evaluating on balance rather than focusing on things that we talked about.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any objections to that? Then it passes. Alice, you're up.

Alice: Cool. This is going to be less than five minutes. It was brought to my attention that, and we may talked about this, but that across the country, hospitals are merging with catholic hospitals and they're sort of happening under the table without constituents knowing about it and slowly the ethical and religious obligations or terms of the contract that were left ambiguous are left open for catholic hospitals or health care conglomerates to say we're not going to offer birth control or abortions or any sort of sexual health or not letting gay partners see their partners when they're in the ICU and things like that. The UW Medical Center is in a wait stages in a contract negotiation with Peace Health which is a catholic health provider and they're not really clear how it's going to be. SPHERE, the Students for Public Health and Engaged in Reproductive Rights Efforts. They're a really cool interdisciplinary group with people from Public

Health and they're working with ACLU. The university had said that they're going to let the ACLU review their contract before it gets finalized. The SPHERE group is trying to get support from organizations on campus to say that we want to make sure that when the university finalizes the contract that there is language in there that they won't be susceptible to any of the discriminatory practices that have come about from the previous precedents of these mergers. A lot of people are concerned about it because UW Med Center is a public institution. It's a legal grey area to how it plays out. There is a letter that is drafted that they want us to sign on to but I also think that if there's interest in the senate, maybe someone can come up with a resolution that they could send with their materials. So I was requesting that we add SPHERE to be our GPSS Spotlight and present on it and then we can vote as a group to be included on their letter and/or have someone work with them to draft a resolution.

Chris L: This was brought to my attention at the beginning of the school year. I will be the first person to say that I don't think religious institutions should be involved in any aspect of public life and definitely not health care. I have no problem being on the record for saying that. Unless things have changed since the beginning of the year, it is not a merger. Merger is not a correct word to describe the relationship. They are contracting with Peace Health to provide services in underserved parts of the state. I've spoken about this with the provost. Unless something has happened which it very well could be, nothing about anything of what UW Medicine offers will change with this relationship. So I would, if they do come, request that they bring any relevant updates or news because the partnership was announced earlier on in September or October and to my knowledge, there is no contract being finalized unless there were things that are being worked out.

Alice: What Beth told me, it sounds like there is a contract but they're signing for their partnership. What she said is that this is how all the major mergers started with catholic health care providers and hospitals. They start providing a few services and over the course of 5-10 years, it turns into a full blown merger by piecemeal and under the radar. Something someone missed in the contract and they're like, "Hey so you have to abide by this now." I also saw your email but something that Chris said is that we don't want to seem reactionary. If the university isn't doing anything to change their policy, it potentially might be why they're stalling on their contract so they're trying to make sure that that doesn't happen. We just want to be supportive of them and if they're getting pressure from Peace Health they can say, "Hey, look. We have all this support backing us so we're not going to go through with this." Unless it is to support our university that is trying to provide our current services. If they're not going to it and it's not even a merger is not valid. We can strengthen our own university's position to help make sure that doesn't happen by providing them with a little bit of leverage and frankly some reinforcement that we're keeping an eye on this.

Chris L: Another thing they're providing on this is the training of medical students.

Elisa: As far as the spotlight goes, there were two senators who had expressed interest in having a spotlight but I haven't heard back from them in a little while. There was never any confirmation. If you have a definite plan, I'll contact them and let them know. Does this have

anything to do with Jess Snow? She was interested in speaking and is in Public Health. Is she speaking on that topic?

Alice: She might've been one of the people but the name doesn't ring a bell. I doubt it because it was happenstance that I ran into my friend on the bus and she was in SPHERE.

Chris L: Any other discussion on that? Thank you for bringing that back to our attention and we should let them tell any current knowledge of the situation.

Alice: Just because I'm going to email her and confirm that she does have the spotlight, is there anything you said that you wanted to know updates since the beginning of the year? Does anyone here have questions or clarifications that might come up in the meeting? One example I gave to her is we would like to see examples of other situations where this has occurred either with a catholic health provider or another example of how it could happen piecemeal so we could understand how this might happen.

Chris L: Ideally with a university hospital.

Alice: Ideally. Is there any other information I should ask her to be prepared to have at the meeting?

Evan: I would say maybe make sure to have her phrase it under the general tone of supporting our university and our rights rather than an anti-university thing because if it doesn't come up early, I imagine the entire tone will be why is the university doing this versus the university is on our side. Let's support them.

Alex: Who is the letter aimed toward?

Alice: I'm not exactly sure who the intended recipient will be but I can find out.

Chris L: That is a good segway to making the agenda. It seems pretty well under way. So officer elections, 30 minutes. Candidate forum.

Genesis: We talked about this last time about bringing ASUW candidates and having them talk to the senate and have them asking questions for the candidates and I've been in contact with the elections committee for ASUW. They're going to come.

Alex: At this meeting?

Genesis: Yes, after we do our elections and everything.

Rene: All of them are coming to the meeting?

Genesis: It's going to be a lot but he said they're coming directly from some event.

Alice: Are we going over room capacity? How many are there?

Genesis: 15.

Chris L: We should allocate 45 minutes for officer elections.

Genesis: I think this will be 45 minutes as well if everyone has a lot of questions.

Austin: For point of reference, the normal ones are hour and half so were already condensing them.

Genesis: But it depends on whether or not the senate is involved in asking them questions or whether or not they care.

Rene: They officially all file in on Friday. You guys are thinking it's 15 but it could be more. If you have them cut down and most of them will or have their campaign managers, I would let them have a minute to introduce themselves and have GPSS ask them general questions and say thank you and leave.

Genesis: Maybe a few handful of questions will be moderated.

Chris L: I think we should really limit them in their time severely. Maybe everyone gets a minute.

Genesis: I'll talk to Brian after we confirm that they're on the agenda on how it's going to go down. 30 minutes, we're good?

Chris L: Yes. I don't know that we really have anything else.

Genesis: Elections results I guess?

Chris L: Yes, of course.

Elisa: So should I email Dawn and let her know that we haven't taken any action on her item and that if she wishes to bring it to the senate she can?

Alice: I feel like that's Seyda's responsibility, not ours but personally I think I can reach out to her. I was going to anyway and just say I know you wanted to run but couldn't this year but I encourage you to stay active because you're a really valuable person and should consider running after next year.

Chris L: She's gone after next year.

Elisa: We haven't decided anything so she could make a motion at the meeting.

Rene: A senator could move to suspend the bylaws.

Elisa: She could make a statement. I just want to make it clear that she has that option.

Genesis: I don't think you should tell her that you're sorry you can't run. I think it would be inappropriate.

Elisa: I just want to say that these are your options now. You can make a motion from the floor. I think she should know. I'll tell Seyda to tell her.

Alice: Also, since she approached you initially, I don't think it'll be inappropriate as a friend.

Genesis: I think it's a conflict of interest. We should remove ourselves from this.

Rene: I would recommend that you guys deal with the bylaw part of it and you're done.

Genesis: We're taking this to a personal level.

Chris L: I recommend that as well.

Genesis: What else do we have for next week? Are we doing SPHERE for Spotlight?

Alice: Yes.

Chris L: I think that's all we have time for.

Rene: I have one suggestion. There's a lot of waiting time for your poor senators. I would have crews bring snacks and bring them for the second half of the meeting so they can keep munching. Usually the food goes before you reached the 50% mark.

Alice: Are we allowed to have alcohol at meetings?

Genesis: No.

Chris L: I think that's it. I'm glad we're doing the ASUW Candidate Forum. The timing is unfortunate. By our next meeting it's too late for them.

Genesis: Yes, since May 7th is their presidential debate.

Chris L: And clearly two weeks ago was too early. Unfortunately, that is what we'll have to deal with and we'll have to anticipate that people might not want to stick around.

Alice: I think it's important to interview ASUW candidate personally, but do we have a general consensus or a reason to present why it's important to GPSS senators?

Genesis: Because graduate students can vote and ASUW always has a seat on big thing going on campus and we should be able to have a say.

Alice: I completely agree. I'm just asking in the interest that a lot of people might not care.

Genesis: I think we can explain that in the beginning. I don't even know that a lot of grad students know that they can vote.

Evan: A lot of Austin's words from the last meeting is especially pertinent.

Chris L: If there's nothing else to add, I'll entertain a motion to approve it.

Alex: So moved.

Alan-Michael: Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections? So next week, we'll have new leadership. This year has gone by fast. Now, executive senator reports.

Alex: The committee's meeting tomorrow.

Alice: The working group.

Alex: 4:30 to 5:30pm so we'll have some more stuff later.

Evan: Have we heard anything more about the presentation that came up about Social Work? I think people were talking about starting a working group.

Chris L: There's been email chatter. I'm not 100% sure what the follow through's been. There's been some so it's starting to develop.

Alice: So should we just say that the stuff we've been working in our working group is tabled to the next meeting as far updates goes in light that we have a charged agenda?

Chris L: The plan for the working group was not necessarily give updates every single meeting unless you need feedback.

Alex: We figured last week since it was the first meeting after we created it.

Chris L: Okay, Genesis?

Genesis: F&B special allocations is out of money next week. We still have almost \$3000 for departmental allocations left. Travel grants is open and we're making decisions at the end of May. I'm on my fifth revision for SAF.

Chris L: Anything else?

Genesis: That's all.

Chris L: Elisa?

Elisa: Diversity committee is planning our forums. They will be April 30th, May 15th and May 31st and two weeks apart from each other. They will be allyship, veterans and how to start a diversity committee. We still have a bit left but applications are trickling in. Archiving, I need to talk to Genesis about printing our books and what budget that comes out of.

Chris L: I'll segway with my report with an update with ASUW. A resolution was recently dropped in ASUW and it concerns divestment from companies that are currently profiting from operations in Israel. So this was long time coming. It's been talked about in other universities and now its at UW. We talked about this a little bit at the student leader lunch we had. Michael thinks its going to be a relatively civilized discussion as much as discussions in ASUW senate can be as opposed to UCLA where they had a 16 hour meeting. So they had a 16 hour meeting. To say that it was charged was putting it mildly.

Alice: Were there fist fights?

Chris L: None reported but some strong emotions flying around. We will, unless someone brings us to senate, we won't take this up expect that we will probably need to instruct our ASUW representative to have a vote assuming it gets there. It may not make it to the floor but if it does he will have to have direction from us. I would much prefer that he has some from us and us being the senate. So we will have to figure out how to address that. Yesterday, we had a panel discussion on the Affordable Care Act. We had 6 really great panelists. We had UW Regent Rogelio Riojas moderate. We were on The Daily today. Unfortunately attendance was not the greatest. We know we got the word out to every corner on campus that we possible could. Sometimes people don't walk in the door even though it's not going on. I think the event was successful and I'm happy with it. Laura worked her butt off on it. She did quite a bit so give her a pat on the back. The information was great. UW-TV taped it so we'll be putting that on our website as we get the footage. Hopefully we can if we have time, we can do some signposting on where specific questions are so they don't have to watch the whole thing. The peer mentoring has stalled because I was in DC and had a snafu scheduling the working group. We are hoping to get our application in time for people to apply for fall and work with Ellen Taylor at the Counseling Center to get a spring time training for mentors and get that moving as quickly as possible. At the very worst, it will start in early fall next year. I'm happy with how it worked. It's

been one of my personal priorities to have this on this campus. It doesn't exist anywhere else as far as I can tell in the form that we're considering. I think it's something that I would've benefitted from as a younger graduate students so I'm glad it'll be around for future generations. Coming up, we'll be holding an alumni panel. It's in loose partnership with The Graduate School and the Career Center. It'll be at Cultivate in Elm Hall and it'll be really cool. Joey's been working really hard on that. The idea is what we're calling near peer so 3-5 years out. Going forward, we'll have a trifecta of graduate focused alumni career events. With the Career Center doing one in the fall, the Graduate School's is in the winter with employers coming for graduate students and ours is a young alumni thing. So that's what we're thinking. Austin as you heard is working on open access and graduate student priority and intellectual property which is being revised right now at the university level. Right now it concerns faculty who do outside work. It will involve graduate students in the STEM field particularly so we'll be monitoring it very closely. It may not happen until next year but we will be on top of it. The senate improvement working group is humming along which is fantastic. SAGE was two weeks ago and it was good. I agree with Chris. We really went into those offices and were well oiled machines. It's largely thanks to Matt Souza with his experience in DC and he's been a SAGE delegate for three years so he was our anchor for those meetings. There was a perceptible difference in quality when we were in the UW team and when I was in the mixed groups. We were just better. I ran for and lost two elections for board positions because I can't stop being involved in student government and so they like me so much that they created a position just for me. So next year I will be SAGE's strategic planning chair for the year. This is not our last meeting but on my mind is the fact that the year is coming rapidly to a close and this job has been maddening at times and has made me want to tear my hair out but I would do it again in a second and if I were sticking around next year, I would do it in a second. Next year I'll be doing fieldwork. I'll be giving a more heartfelt goodbye speech later on so this is just a preview. Are there any announcements?

Austin: I have two. President Young is coming to SAB next week.

Chris L: What's SAB?

Austin: The Student Minority Board for Office Affairs which deals with diversity issues on campus. He'll be asked questions about divestment if any of you are interested in hearing his response.

Alan-Michael: Divestment?

Austin: From Israel. More broadly, we should keep in our minds how we want our senate representative to act in ASUW. While he does a very good job at managing activities within ASUW, he is very focused on ASUW and not the graduate student involvement.

Chris L: Any other announcements? Then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Genesis: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Executive Senate Meeting
April 30th, 2014
HUB 303

Chris Lizotte (President): I'm going to start. I'll call this meeting to order at 5:02pm. Before we approve the agenda, I'll note one thing. Item number 6, suggested bylaw changes, I was originally going to have actual bylaw language but I don't so I'll keep the item but keep it really brief. It's just going to be me talking about some more general suggestions. But with that, I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): So moved.

Alex Bolton (Law): Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections? Okay. I'll entertain a motion to approve or amend the minutes.

Genesis: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Okay, we'll move on. First thing is I wanted to show you the project that I'm working on. Show you where we're at, at the moment. So tomorrow the Graduate School, in their bi-weekly email, will send out a blog post that I guest authored that will announce the launching of this initiative. The student committee came up with a snappy name of Grads Guiding Grads, which is G cubed. This is actually on the GPSS website now, under services. A lot of the content still needs to be filled out, which I'll be doing tonight. The important things to notice is that we'll have an intro page where people land and over here we have the page to apply to be a mentor. I'll show you the application in just a minute. This is still under construction and it doesn't need to be live yet since we don't have a mentor core but this is where you apply to get mentoring. This is a list of other on-campus resources and we need to change the order of this but this is the introduction and background on why we decided to do this and what some of our research showed in terms of the availability of these kinds of services and that kind of stuff. Esra Camci did a crack job at packing the website and putting everything in so it fit in with our general aesthetic. I'll also note that even though right now it's hosted on the GPSS website, our long-term vision is that we would love to see this to eventually take on a life of its own and not be a GPSS project persay. Assuming this survives that long, this is several years down the line to begin with but we're off to a strong start with support from both the Graduate School and the Counseling Center. Just to show you the application we came up with, we had a lot of conversation about what kinds of qualities that we wanted people would be able to indicate of what is a good balance between too much or too little information, privacy and that kind of stuff. We got a whole folder for the working group if you're interested. Here's the application. Currently, it's a Google form, which is using UW Google tools so people can access it if people

don't use UW Gmail, which is nice. So the first step is first name, last name, department or program and gender identity, which is both optional. We have a pretty broad range of choices and one is prefer not to say so you could just not answer it. By the way, if anyone has suggestions, feel free to shout them out.

Austin Pettibone-Wright (GPSS University Affairs Director): Does it have to be a list?

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Sometimes fill in the blank works. Although you might need it for statistics.

Chris L: Statistics and in terms of being able to efficiently process what data we're getting. We did make degrees sought a mandatory question because even if people don't want to say what department they're from, if people do want to be paired this way, we want people to be paired from similar programs. This is the breakdown that I came up with unscientifically. Research based masters, generally the kinds that lead to a PhD, professional masters, like an MBA, the Built Environments degrees, other professional degrees such as JD and MD, research based PhD or practice based PhD, which would be a PhD in Social Work, PhD in Education. That's kind of my loose unscientific breakdown. Current stage in program. Obviously programs have wildly different lengths so we decided to go with relative to how long it takes to complete your program. So for a business student who is in a two year program, it will be different than a PhD student. Just again, it's to get an idea of where people are so if someone wants to be paired with someone who's early in their program, middle of their program or late in their program, they have that option. Then we have our whole list of topics around which people can indicate that this is something that I have particular knowledge, expertise or experience in and I would be willing to talk to people about it. It's optional. People don't have to do this. People requesting a mentor don't have to indicate what they want to be mentored about but it's another tool to match people. I feel like it's a fairly exhaustive list and there's an "Other" option. If anyone has suggestions...

Evan: Have you sent those out looking for suggestions?

Chris L: Other than it being workshopped in the working group, we talked about it with the Graduate School executive staff.

Evan: I meant like to us.

Chris L: Yes, I'll send it out. "Are you fluent in a language other than English?" There could be possibly important for people that want to be mentored in their native language. Then there are a couple of essay questions. This is not the limit of the space. When you built the form, it will expand to meet the space. The answer doesn't have to be as short as the answer boxes. One is "Why are you interested and what are your expectations?" We're not thinking about this as an application process. We have no idea what kind of responses we'll get in the first place but we're not thinking in terms of a competitive process. We just want to make sure we get people who have some sense of empathy and genuinely wanting to help other people. We have also

talked about how this is a valuable opportunity for professional development for people and a lot of what the Graduate School is offering is support for developing that aspect of the program. We want to make sure that people aren't doing this because it will look good on the resume. There is easier things to do that will look good on a resume with less work but just to make sure. Then the kind of mentor relationship. We thought of it initially in terms of long term being somewhere between 3-9 months and up to a year or possibly longer of 1:1 meeting somewhere and talking. We also came up with other formats that will be good. One is drop-in sessions where someone just comes in and they just want to talk to someone once and that's it. We're looking at spaces where we can do that. For example, the space in the Research Commons is one, in Allen Library. The Center for Teaching and Learning can be another alternative. Kelly Edwards from the Graduate School suggested Skyping being an option, which is there. I wouldn't want to do that but the option is there.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): I would.

Chris L: Well there you go. And there is another category. Finally, "Are you willing to be contacted by more than one student?" You know so are you willing to mentor or give advice and feedback to more than one student. Then anything else you should or like to tell us. That's pretty much it. The next step is to get some print materials. That's not as high priority right now because pamphlets are the kinds of things that we'll leave at the Counseling Center or Hall Health and places where people can read about the program and read about the being mentored side rather than the mentoring side. I've asked Tina to design a logo to make the G cubed thing really cool. That's pretty much what we got. I'll be filling the website tonight. The content is created but it just needs to be inserted. Are there any questions?

Alice: What is in it for a peer mentor? Especially since people are busy. Is there a plan to advertise this or compel people to participate as a mentor?

Chris L: So beyond doing something to help other people, we have two main things. One is a monthly meeting of all people who are all mentors in the program to get together to debrief about their experience. Then also more targeted, more formalized professional development activities having to do with mentoring relationships, which is something the Graduate School already does so it will be fairly easy to incorporate that. We might not be able to implement this immediately but the Graduate School has a lot of for credit things for teaching, but having like a one credit mentoring thing offered by the Graduate School. That could eventually be a program requirement. If you do this once a year, you have to take this one credit thing. We're not quite there yet but it's a possibility as well.

Alice: Have you talked to anyone with working with Psychology or the School of Social Work to incorporate this as part of their practicum requirements in terms of having that fulfill their hours?

Chris L: No. I'm sure a lot of the students will prefer to do this than what they're doing right now, but that is a good thought. Since a lot of that stuff is governed by the national accrediting

organizations, like what kinds of things qualify for practicum, it may not rise to their level of criteria.

Alex: What's the timeline before it goes live?

Chris L: The application for the mentors is going live tomorrow. We're forging ahead and we'll be accepting applications until May 20th. So were shooting for a late May-early June with an option for the summer depending on how much interest we get and people who say they can do it over the summer, but definitely for the 2014-2015 school year and it will be on a rolling base.

Alex: Is there a plan for a kick-off or anything?

Chris L: Right now, we're working with Ellen Taylor to nail down a date for a very basic training. Essentially what she calls gatekeeper training. It's training to know this is the point where I need to refer this to a professional and this has gone beyond my capacity to deal with. Along with that, we'll have a social aspect and the Graduate School has agreed to kick in some money for snacks and stuff. It depends on their schedule but looking at the week of May 25th at this point. Okay, moving right along. You have in your packet a very drafty version of a resolution on the topic brought up by the presenters at last week's senate meeting. I shared the document with Beth, Alice. So this is not meant to be voted on in next week's senate meeting. This is for and information and preliminary feedback. We're not trying to rush this through yet. On a side note when I do get around, probably around next week's senate meeting for a series of bylaw changes and anyone else, by the way, who has proposed bylaw changes should think about those now so we can look at them. I would really like get exec out of the business of reviewing resolutions and have the be the work of internal committees. That's how most legislative bodies work. That's how ASUW works and I think their model work really well actually. For example, if you look at the ASUW resolution on Israel, it says refer to the committee for presentation, style and format so what they do is they bring it in the full senate for a first reading and you'll have to correct me on this but it has to go to a committee to come back?

Maxine Sugarman (ASUW Personnel Director): I think you can use fancy language to get out of it but generally it goes to the committee and then it gets passed and we rubber stamp it.

Chris L: I think that's a better model for GPSS to move toward. It may be longer than a one year change but I think it's a good place. Nevertheless, we are here as the executive committee and we have this in front of us so this issue came up in the beginning of the school year. My understanding was that the deal, to the extent that there was a formalized deal, was done. The affiliation had been made. There were oral promises and maybe a couple written statements. I'm not entirely sure and I'll have to go and look but the UW administered health care would not change as a result of this but this group of students, SPHERE, are apparently concerned enough to bring it forward. So Esra and Joseph wrote the resolution.

Alice: Did you see the minutes or did you find out what they talked about in the presentation since you missed it? The update on that was basically the affiliation has been started but not finalized and that there is a contract and that ACLU is going to review it before it get finalized but what they're pushing for is specific language in the contract that no students or people affiliated with UW will have to follow those directives because some of the Pharmacy students and medical people are worried about is if they get assigned to residency or get trained at an affiliated hospital that they won't be allowed to offer care so it's a clarification and doing it in writing as opposed to an oral agreement. It is in the formalization process right now from my understanding.

Chris L: That's good to know. That would be a good "THAT" clause to add because I don't think it says anything about a pending legal agreement.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): That's what we really want in this right?

Chris L: What?

Chris E: We want to say you talked about this but we want to see it in writing.

Chris L: Yes, I guess it doesn't say that either. Right now the closest one is, "THAT the leadership of UWMC should make a formal explicit unequivocal that can and should be clarified to say in writing in any pending legal document forthcoming." Yes, that should be added to this.

Alice: I had a question. Beth is sending the letter before we vote on this resolution. Do we have the authority to just tell her to go ahead and add it since no one was really opposed to it at the meeting or do we have to vote on it as a senate to have GPSS added as a supporting organization?

Chris L: I think we can vote on it as a committee to endorse the letter. One thing I'm not sure is whether we want to specify that. We are empowered to act on behalf of the senate between senate meetings.

Alice: All of the discussion on that issue during the big meeting were clarifications from senators from Ecology and Medicine talking about the issue as it concerned them and everyone seemed to be pretty supportive. There wasn't anyone asked questions on why we were doing this. It was always people being like, "Yes, and we're especially concerned about this and we're thinking about this and we've written our own letter." I feel like we were implicitly given the authority to endorse it.

Chris L: They just want us to add our name to the letter?

Alice: They want to add us as an organizations but she said if we wanted to do our own resolution and add to the packet they were sending, they would appreciate it. It's suppose to be

the first week of May. That would mean that we want this voted on next week but I don't know what that would require. It would have to go out in an email right?

Chris L: Right and this is not going to be ready by next week, but we can vote as a committee to add our name in support and then as soon as this is ready, and beyond the ones that I came up with off the top of my head of people that they want to support it, that would be great.

Alex: Do you have major problems with it as it stands? I don't understand why it's not ready to send to the senate.

Chris L: Two things. One, the points that Chris and Alice brought up. I want it to be specific about whatever contract is pending and also make sure that the statement is delivered in writing. That could be added to those clauses and we can add another "THAT" clause. THAT any legal arrangement between two parties makes explicit the UW's commitment to such and such.

Alex: Is there a reason we can't do that at the meeting? We've done some work to set up a resolution. I think the senate is expecting something back. Timewise, if we hold off on it, it wouldn't make sense to do this.

Chris L: That's true. The only other thing is I want some kind of citation on the third whereas clause. I have no doubt these situations exist. We just would want a citation.

Chris E: This might go down a longer path but I would be comfortable if we went to the senate next week with the idea of endorsing the letter. It's a lot easier. I know we can act on it in the senate if we endorse the letter, but also if the opportunity is available, I'd hate to assume what the senate wants since it shifts. One thing I also want to know is they talked about maybe not issues but other contracts have been signed in other places. I'd be interested in finding out how that worked out. Did these things become an issue? Were employees made to do certain things or was it a non-issue? Or did they say they were going to do it and it wasn't enforced, which would call for a little stronger language. I think the letter is good and this intent that we can be stronger with a resolution where we could add things. We wouldn't be hurt by being a week or two late.

Evan: Just to address that, I think I remember that there were previous precedents but not at a larger public institution so as far as their research, there wasn't anything that was directly comparable where they can go back and reference these historical things. It's mainly at smaller ones.

Chris L: If I remember correctly, there was Swedish.

Chris E: It was talked about.

Chris L: I agree. I would just want this whereas clause to have a citation.

Evan: Are we going through to bring up specific things to bring up right now?

Chris L: Well, Alex brings up a good point that it would be more timely. We do have our new system in place, where even though it would have to go out, Yasmeen has provided us with the means to make amendments up to 48 hours before the actual meeting. We do have some more flexibility than we previously had to make the changes that we're talking about right now. One possibility is to send this out and then tell people that this is live, allow people to make changes and some combination of us to go and make the changes we've been talking about and do what Chris suggested where at the same time we vote on the resolution, let the senate vote on being a signatory to the letter.

Alice: I think that's a good solution. I agree with Alex. These senator have worked hard to get this together so even though it's not perfect, acting on it immediately would not only be timely for us but for the packet that's going out. That being said, it might be going out really soon because she said before May, which is tomorrow. I do think from the discussion in the full senate, it was very clear that people were supportive of this widely. That's why we have executive senators, to represent the opinions of the senate and it's my strong opinion that they would support this. If I could tell Beth tonight that you can add our name to the letter whenever you need to send it. I would like to make a motion to allow Beth and SPHERE to add GPSS as a supporting organization to the letter, send this version out tonight and then put it live online as Yasmeen said with the email explaining to senators that this is live and can be editable 48 hours in advance and bring it up for a vote at the meeting next week.

Chris L: Why don't we separate that motion out?

Alice: I want it all in so we can move on.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Alex: Yes. While I think the tone of the conversation of the senate did seem like that, there was no direction that we were voting on it. I think if we were voting on it, they would bring up concerns and I feel leery to set that precedent of us voting to signing on to the letter. It was more like a presentation for me at the meeting. There was discussion on it but it didn't feel like it was an action. All we agreed to was to set up a working group. I'm concerned about it. To me it looks like exec is trying to go on its own.

Alice: I think it's totally within the purview of exec to take discussions and the sense we get from the senate and take action on things. That's why we have an executive committee. I mean, point well taken. I agree that if people didn't get the sense that action was being taken in general, that would be an appropriate response, like let's go back and ask. But it was discussed. I asked her directly, "What can we do as a senate?" There seems like there is a consensus that we're

in support of this. What can we do to support you? Then she said add to the letter and there was head nodding and Chris asked if there was anyone in the senate who wants to draft a resolution and several hands went up. That to me personally, feels comfortable but if you don't, then we can bring it to a vote.

Elisa Law (Secretary): Would it be possible to just approve it as the GPSS Exec committee? Since there never was a vote, I agree with Alex. I would be wary of putting a senate stamp on it without having an actual vote happen. Can we say GPSS exec approves this?

Chris E: If the Executive committee endorses this, our name will be going on the letter. That's what we're voting on. If we vote, then we're voting to put GPSS's name on that letter. Then also I believe to bring the resolution up in the next meeting. I would say that I agree with a lot of sentiments especially with the timeline. From my understanding it's later in May but with that I'm definitely encouraged to call for a vote.

Chris L: Is there any more discussion on this?

Alex: Is there precedent in the last few years of exec during the regular school year and senate not doing it and exec do it instead?

Evan: I can't remember.

Chris L: I can't remember either. Definitely in the summer.

Evan: On the other hand, if it would be useful to sign on as GPSS Executive committee, that would be great. I don't know if that would have the same weight.

Chris L: Alice, when did she say she wanted stuff to go out by?

Alice: That's the only reason why I'm suggesting we do this. It's not to set a precedent or have it be a formality. I don't know the exact date and I would like to be able to tell her that she can add us right now. I understand the concern about it as a precedent setting thing. In this circumstance, I felt like there was overwhelming support so that is why I don't have any personal leeway about it but I understand that people do.

Evan: Would people feel more comfortable, if we did do this, to inform senate later on? Does that make anyone more or less comfortable?

Chris L: I totally appreciate that. We want things to be as timely as possible. On the other hand, Elisa are you looking the minutes right now?

Elisa: I'm looking them up right now. Unless there is a notion that there is sense of urgency, I'm hesitant to push this through just because we think it might be urgent. If you can find in the minutes that gives a pretty strong notion of a due date, let us know.

Chris L: Toward the end of the presentation, I asked the timeline and they said end of May, to which I remember the response was, "Okay, cool. We should have plenty of time to address that at the next senate meeting.

Evan: I remember that.

Alice: Really? Okay, that's not what she told me. She said the beginning of May. If that's the case then I don't need to pursue this.

Chris L: Would you like to withdraw or amend the motion?

Alice: Can we table this and see if she responds to me in the next 45 minutes and vote on it? Can I make a motion?

Chris L: Sure, you don't have to table the motion. You can just withdraw it and bring it up again. I would still be in favor to get this out into the world. I'll entertain a motion to add this to the agenda and send it to the senate tonight.

Alex: So moved.

Evan: Point of information, do we want to make our exec corrections to it first or are we just going to assume its going to happen?

Chris L: No, let's do it in the system that we have set up. Unless you want to move that. I wouldn't just say no.

Evan: I think it would be nice to see if there's anything we can do to make it better before we send it out.

Chris L: The motion is to put it through the process.

Chris E: So it's eligible to be addressed in the next meeting.

Chris L: Right.

Chris E: Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections?

Alice: I think we should go in and do those corrections. For example, a lot of these “THAT” clause, we don’t have the authority to say like, “THAT these ethical and religious directives ought not limit...” Isn’t it THAT GPSS believes or supports or encourages. There are just very basic things that we don’t want to be under discussion because that’s just boring. There’s specific things in here that are not only stylistic but policy-wise, it will be more efficient for us to deal with.

Chris L: Is that an objection or is that an exhortation to do this between now and then?

Evan: Is part of the process have us going through it before the senate does?

Chris L: No, this is sending it as it is and then we would, based on the discussion we had here, in the time that is now available.

Evan: But those then come up at the meeting.

Chris L: No, everyone can see it up until 48 hours before. So as long as those changes are made.

Evan: Then does it have to be discussed at the meeting?

Chris L: No, not if the sponsor takes them as friendly amendments.

Alice: Oh, right. That was the idea to put it online. We can accept anything and people can make amendments. Then that was not an objection.

Evan: Thank you for the clarification. I second that then if it already hasn’t been.

Chris L: You are too late. Any further objections? That’s what we’ll do. I totally agree for the first “THAT” clause.

Alice: I’m happy to go in and do that as soon as it’s live because I love editing resolutions.

Chris L: We will ask for the citation for the third whereas clause.

Evan: Can I throw in a few? We don’t need to continue to re-reference the abbreviation for the ERDs. Things like that. You would only need to reference it once. Has for the last whereas clause, has the communication been vague or not recent? I thought that something had come up at one point that they asserted this but we haven’t heard it in awhile. The final one is the second to last “THAT” clause, it has LGBT and maybe we should change it to LGBTQIA.

Elisa: We haven’t done the public platform for editing resolutions yet. This would be the first one. I think in that resolution, it was left up to the people putting the resolution forward’s responsibility

to make it live. Then we would share the link with the senate listserv. I just want to make sure of that.

Chris L: You are correct. I'm a co-sponsor so I will take responsibility.

Chris E: Due to time consideration for the agenda item and the withdraw of the motion to discuss this later, I move that we move on to agenda item 6.

Alan-Michael Weatherford (Comparative Literature): I second Chris.

Chris L: We'll just move on if there are no further discussion. We're up to six. Like I said, I don't have any language so I'm going to keep this extremely brief. Basically I think we all have ideas. One of my major ideas is the process that I just described of how I think resolutions should move through the senate. That is one I'll be introducing. Austin and I have been talking about clarifying the roles of the UAD in the bylaws as well as in the job description, which makes sense because the position of the UAD is only in its second year of existence. What I would suggest is for our next exec meeting, for everyone to bring and possibly do some vetting so that we don't have a huge marathon and session from hell but proposed bylaw changes that makes sense based on your experiences this year. Another thing I'm going to propose the elimination of the committee coordinating board entirely. I think the senate should fulfill that function. Things like that.

Chris E: So one of my biggest things with the bylaws is that even though we all mean well, the people before us meant well. I'm really tied to this idea that we need to give the freedom to next year's officers and do the job as they see it and what works best for them. Within that, we can make a large amount of suggestions but I think this is best addressed is at the beginning of next year, the officers go to the senate and say this is a list of bylaws we wish to suspend for this next year. That way we're not changing the constitution at all. For this year, it works best for us to not work in this frame. The senate can say yes or no and you can keep what works for you and it's renewable every year so some people might not like them or might not. It's the decision of the officers and senators for next year to decide what is important to us. That would be great if we can help with that. Maybe that works in the transition stuff, but I really have a non-want to dictate to future people what works best for them because very numerous times, that good intent has made it harder for us.

Chris L: Agreed.

Alice: Since Alex and I are going to be the President and Vice President, we've actually been talking with Natalie for about a month and a half and Doug also briefly about our ideas next year. This is also an issue that has come up in the senate improvement working group that Alex and I are both on. There is a Catalyst webpage that we would like to talk about and show people the webpage with all the discussion areas. One of the discussion areas on that Catalyst page is what do we do about the bylaws. We wanted to open it up to all senators and I would encourage us as a committee to post all of your ideas in that discussion group so we have that all recorded.

The senate improvement working group had the idea of doing a bylaw overhaul, not a complete overhaul, but looking at things that make sense and pulling suggestions from all senators on the way it functions and what makes sense for everyone moving forward so that these bylaw changes would come from a group that spans the entire senate rather than the Executive committee, which I think would sit well with people. It would be helpful for us because the senate could vote on bylaw changes this year before the summer. Then we could make our plans for next year during the summer based on those decisions and recommendations made by this year's senate. And I agree with you that it's not great to be prescriptive about what people should do in future generations but because that was what's done last year and the previous year, I think we can do a good job of ironing out the pieces that don't make sense so it will be easier for future generations in regards to how they operate.

Chris L: Agreed and agreed. I think there's a way to combine both of those approaches. Three of next year's officers are sitting right here and you do have input already into this discussion. And I do agree that the senate should be involved. I had totally forgotten that there's a whole category for bylaws in there. At the same time, I do agree with Chris that there are probably some bylaw changes that we can all agree on, that we can just do before the end of this year and there are some that can wait until next year. So there's not a sense of urgency that we have to get every single change that we could ever think of by the end of the year so agreed, agreed. Also, one more thing. While the senate is an excellent point who should have input, there's going to be a lot of things that the average senator is not going to occur on the effect of how we operated with the x part of the bylaws.

Evan: I definitely agree with Chris's idea. I want to caution that the only hurdles to that is you get new senators coming in there so you lose the institutional memory so that might've been the idea to do it at the end before the institutional memory runs away. You want to gather their knowledge. It might just be my experience but the bylaws that end up getting changed are the ones that we run into conflicts. So at the beginning of the year with fresh senators who wouldn't have run into those conflicts just yet so you may not know which bylaws to change. On that note, and Alice's comment about the Exec committee inspired this, the groups that I have seen running into bylaws more often than the senate as a whole are committees. I wonder if we want to put the question to committees who frequently might run into these bylaw committee restrictions or hurdles than the senate as a whole. So maybe targeting them directly before the senate's out, we can have input and something on the board.

Chris L: I think that's great to make sure we gather the knowledge before the end of the year, but they don't necessarily have to be enacted until the beginning of the year. You lose institutional memory but at the same time, you lost those people and you have the new group. So you see what I'm saying? It is important that we get the input before they leave. However, the changes don't have to be codified until the beginning of next year. Some of them could be before the end of the year but not all of them, but you're right. It is crucial that we do crowdsourcing.

Alex: I like Chris's idea of trying to make sure that we're not holding people back. I think it's good way to frame it too when we are working on these that that we are not directing people on what

to do and how to do it, like micromanaging to death. So people come elected with these ideas but they can't do anything since they're trying to address bylaws that they are suppose to do. If that is something we want to look into, if the idea of suspending it each year, the current bylaws aren't built for that. We should build them so they are brought it up to be not too specific and built it to so if we did need to suspend it, we could.

Chris L: Bylaws can always be suspended.

Alex: I know, but I mean setting it up like a dynamic bylaw with a base and more fluid parts if that's something you want to do each year. In general though, our approach on bylaws needs to be very broad. We have to trust the people we elect.

Alice: Could I suggest, in the interest of time and memory of this conversation, that we move it to the Catalyst discussion? That is a thing we set up and the the senate improvement working group wants to work on, that is less work for us and it's also a way to have this input directly translate without me and Alex paraphrase what your input is on the bylaw changes. So if you can go to the Catalyst page, make your comments and get that conversation started so the senate improvement working group can take this on as the bylaw editorial process. I move to move this discussion to Catalyst and continue with everything.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Are there any objections?

Chris E: I would like to make a motion. To jump directly to agenda item 11a and then directly after revert back to item 7.

Chris L: Is there a second?

Alex: Can you speak to it?

Chris E: Yes, I just want to get my report in before I have to go.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Genesis: I'd love to go. I'm dying over here. Can you explain why you leave all the time?

Chris E: I have a class.

Genesis: I just wanted clarification.

Chris E: So Vice President has been pretty easy going now. We have Alex in and we've been meeting and we'll do some transition work. I met with Ana Marie very recently to go over how we can move forward with the inner joint higher education committee, which will hopefully happen next fall. I'm meeting with Margaret Shepard next week to figure out how best to do that, especially with some new implications between Washington State and UW around the Medical School. There's some awesome stuff there so whether we do it on our own or continue with the vision of having it all be graduate student specific will be a part of that. I also met with the joint federal and state committees and there was some intent that we will probably end up bringing Senator Barbara Bailey with the Legislator of the Year award for her work on Veterans and Dream Act this year.

Chris L: Alright, then we'll go move on to item 7. If anyone doesn't have the link to the Catalyst site, just ask Alice, Alex or me. I will need to go put all your ideas and if possible, reference the actual part of the bylaw that you want changed, but that's where you should go.

Alex: We're hoping to engage more of the senate.

Alice: Elisa, we also talked about it at the meeting, the improvement working group meeting, of trying to make it more prominent in the email that you send out either tonight or next week to the meeting to just like, "Hey everyone, do you want to improve senate? Do you want to make GPSS better? Please go to the Catalyst website." Make it pretty apparent rather than just a line because frankly people don't see it. So just to highlight that's where that conversation can happen.

Elisa: Yeah, just send me the blurb that you want to be said. I'll put it in color and all that.

Alice: I would just say that. Want to make GPSS the best it could be? Go to this website.

Elisa: Anything you want added to the senate email, you should send to me. It's hard to keep track when people just say them so email it to me and it'll go out.

Chris L: Okay, item 7. ASUW Divest Israel resolution. This was dropped on April 15th as they say about legislation. So basically this is for information. I'll tell you what I intend to do so far is to invite the pro and con sides if they want to make a presentation to senate. At the very least, I believe the senate needs to inform our representatives in ASUW on how to vote on this because it will come to a vote on the ASUW senate. We have two representatives on the ASUW senate and I would be uncomfortable either allowing them to vote on their own or the executive committee to dictate how they vote. I would be uncomfortable telling them how to vote on my own. So I think the senate should instruct them at the very least. If any of the students who are active around this, either for or against, want to introduce a resolution to GPSS, I will make it clear that they may not do that without a senator to sponsor the bill. They can't just drop their own resolution with us. They would have to solicit support or a sponsor to introduce to the senate. So those are the steps I'm going to take in the near future. I just want everyone to have

a copy of this. I think it's well written and well thought. Regardless of whether you agree with the statements that it's making. As Michael Kutz said to me about it, it show a pretty sophisticated understanding of how the consolidated endowment fund actually works and what the UW would actually have to do to divest so it's fairly sophisticated in that regard.

Alice: Point of information, what does Caterpillar Ink do for us? What's our endowment with them?

Chris L: They are a company that makes earth moving equipment.

Evan: It's probably because of all the construction going on.

Rene Singleton (SAO Advisor): Just as an advisory, if you have a discussion for the meeting, you might want to anticipate lots of people and a longer time of discussion that you may or may not be prepared for.

Austin: 16 hours was UCLA.

Chris L: I have not invited them yet so I don't think this will come up next week. I have not extended the invitation to them so unless they can do it right now..

Austin: We anticipate the piece coming up in ASUW either this week or next week.

Alice: So if it's this week, that's before we're able to discuss anything.

Austin: It hasn't yet gone through first readings and it likely will not. It's a crapshoot as to where it will go. I'm not sure if it will necessarily go to second readings.

Chris E: So I can't speak specifically at this moment whether he would support or be against working on this resolution but there is a second year senator from the Evans School named Adam Yahyaoui that is involved with the palestinian groups on campus. If people have questions or I would want to cite him as a very good resource if there was resolution or however that might work out. I'll have no problem sending him an email and following up on that.

Chris L: We can have an internal discussion without the sponsor or opponents. It is the kind of thing where we're not going to become foreign policy experts overnight. My feeling is that since this will very possibly come up for a vote in ASUW, GPSS needs to instruct its representatives, if not have an opinion, at least instruct its representatives on how to vote or to abstain on this. We can talk about how to facilitate that discussion when we do the agenda, but thank you for pointing that out. I know Adam. He's a great guy. I'm sure he'll be helpful in that regard. Is there any further discussion on this?

Austin: If it becomes known that we're talking about this, then the information from both sides will start flying very fast at us so just a word of caution.

Chris L: In senate or as an Executive committee?

Austin: I think Executive committee.

Chris L: Okay. Are you saying that you think we'll be lobbied to render an opinion?

Austin: Yes.

Chris L: Seeing as we have none as a committee, unless someone makes a motion to create one, if that happens I would encourage everyone to simply tell them that we as individual members of the Executive committee are not in a position to express the opinion of GPSS, the opinion of the Executive committee. You're free to express your own opinion obviously but it would be appreciated if it is clear that this is your opinion and not reflective of any larger body in which you are a part, until such an opinion is formed. Any further discussions?

Evan: I was going to ask, you said there was a for and an against side so I was going to ask what the against side was but we'll be hearing of it.

Chris L: Kevin Shotwell, who is our very methodical representative along with Austin to the ASUW senate, has given me contact information. I just haven't followed up with them yet. Okay, so the next item is the transition planning brainstorm, which at the time when I put that in the agenda, I didn't know what I meant by it, but what I mean by it is that I would like to take a few minutes to talk about the things we would like to make sure that we do before the end of the year so the new officers feel sufficiently prepared. On his way out, Chris left me a note. At the end of last year, a faculty at the Evans School had a connection with someone named Bianca who does executive leadership training and she did a session with some of the incoming and outgoing officers.

Alice: Was it Dorothy Bullitt?

Chris L: Dorothy Bullitt is the faculty member.

Alice: That's who Kiana recommended.

Chris L: Last year, when Adam contacted her, Professor Bullitt referred him to Bianca. This year, maybe she would be willing to do it on her own or pass it to Bianca. Anyway, that was not free. It wasn't hugely expensive but I think we have money in the budget so that's not a problem. Is there anything else that people would like to see especially since we have three of the incoming officers sitting here, is there anything that people would definitely like to see happen in addition to meeting with your current counterparts and doing all that kind of stuff, but things that we can do collectively as the group of incoming and outgoing officers.

Alex: Could you explain more of what you did last year?

Chris L: So last year, besides this session with Bianca...

Alex: It was outgoing and incoming?

Chris L: Yes. To be honest, it was very ad hoc. I'm sure Genesis and Elisa can attest to that. We had one officer who was graduating from Law School and planning a wedding and we had another officer who was getting ready to go to Africa for a year and also graduating from Nursing School.

Genesis: I think if you guys prepare what you want to know for the transition and have that ready and talk to your outgoing person will be helpful instead of waiting for information to fly at you. That would be helpful. Otherwise, what do I know of what to talk with you? When I started talking with Doug, I knew I needed to know because I didn't have a good transition period last year so if you already know what you want to know for the positions.

Elisa: I think, like Genesis is saying, it should be between the two officers and less as a body but I don't know, maybe one meeting with everyone there would be great but most of what needs to happen should happen between the two officers. Every outgoing officer will have some kind of report hopefully or specific things that they want to impart that they didn't know going into it that they wished they did.

Chris L: At our next meeting, we'll elect two new executive senators.

Alex: When?

Chris L: Before the end of the year, I guess.

Evan: Sooner will be better.

Alex: We're not done until June 16th.

Chris L: Right, so we'll have executive senators elect I guess. But I would personally highlight the importance of the executive committee as a body over the summer and to the extent that, Alan-Michael and Evan, the two of you can be present and support the officers is really important and whoever comes in.

Alex: My understanding is I thought we do the executive senator elections in the fall. Would an incoming senator be eligible to run in the spring if their term starts in the fall? Like, someone who will be elected to be senator next school year.

Alice: I was elected in the spring.

Alex: Even though you weren't a senator at the time or you were?

Alice: I was a senator.

Alex: I'm just wondering because if someone was going to be a senator.

Chris L: I mean they could've been elected the day before.

Genesis: He's saying that for the Law student, he won't be a senator until the fall.

Alex: But our election is next week.

Alice: I appreciate your point that they wouldn't have an opportunity to run for exec but I also don't think it's appropriate to have brand new green senators on exec because the point of it is to be a vetted person to help advise the officers and I don't know if I want someone who didn't know what was going on.

Evan: Also, we need them over the summer. Last year, we went through three exec senators before we landed on this current group so we have to not do that. There was a lot of effort and ramp up time of getting people involved so it might behoove us to spend this week getting a good solid couple people rather than running from the floor to get good solid executive senator. I talked to Dawn who might be available. Maybe we can consider others who ran for executive senator if everyone is comfortable for that.

Alice: Committee chairs.

Chris L: I would highlight the importance of summer as a time for Executive committee to meet and work on stuff. So for example, if it's the bylaws that get talked about but not voted on, you would think through that stuff. It's really the time you have to think about how the year would go. Once the year starts, you're in it. When I became an executive senator, I found summer to be valuable in that regard.

Rene: FYI, before I forget, you really do need this current exec to set up all the meetings for summer and for fall and vote on it now so it can be set in OPMA so if you guys connect with each other on when you want to have it, otherwise it's going to be a whole year of special meetings so if you guys do that between now and your next meeting, that would be terrific.

Genesis: I was going to bring that up to because the rooms. What happened to us last fall was that last exec decided not to schedule all the meetings ahead of time so that's why we lost HUB 145 in the fall quarter. That's why we were all over the place.

Rene: That's why I urge you to do exec and senate early.

Alex: So we need to do that in the next meeting.

Genesis: Yes.

Alex: How often do we usually meet in the summer?

Chris L: The minimum, as required by the bylaws, is once a month. I would recommend twice a month if possible or twice in June maybe once in July. That's what makes scheduling tricky. Or you schedule your meetings and if people are out of town, they're out of town.

Alex: We'd be okay with that than usual.

Chris L: Yes. My recommendation is twice but the minimum is once a month.

Evan: I would say that ideally those can be informational meeting too. If you don't reach quorum, it's okay. You can just discuss your plans.

Alice: I was wondering about the office staff. When does their term end and begin?

Genesis: That's the last day of school. It's up to the next round of officers. So for this budget, we have for the summer Office Manager, Archivist and Executive Assistant for the President.

Alice: So three positions.

Genesis: Yes, so it's up to you guys to decide when they come on board.

Alice: Should we start thinking about that now?

Genesis: Yes, if you want.

Alice: I hear what you're saying of having a meeting where everyone's sitting there and the Treasurer is talking to the Treasurer elect about specifics and everyone's just sitting and waiting there and that's probably not useful so I think 1:1 are cool. Actually, Chris and I have Monday lunches set up now for the rest of the quarter. I also think there's value in having the entire team, not just the officers currently but everyone who works in the GPSS office in the same room with the incoming officers and if we have new exec people at that point. If we had everyone together to talk about not only what worked well but what didn't work well and having really candid conversations about what you guys think what would've worked better for you and what you would like to see moving forward just so we can get a group perspective and get a feel for things.

Elisa: Even if that wasn't to happen, each of the staff should be submitting a report with those things on it, like what worked and what didn't and what I wish I knew by the end of their term. Whether or not that gets done, that's not under anyone's purview to enforce that.

Chris L: Unless they re-apply, then you can dock them. I think a staff and officer meeting would be valuable time well spent.

Alice: I would also love to get to know what everyone in the office does. Each officer isn't reporting specific responsibilities of the job. If everyone could voice in a group setting what was frustrating about the job, what turned out to be really important versus what's in the bylaws, that kind of discussion would be helpful so that everybody who's coming in understands all the other moving parts and what the nuances of those situations are because with those 1:1, you're going to have a lot of this and that and that awareness stays siloed and I think something that we talked about is the emphasis on community and making it like an office feeling. There's the front desk and you walk in and people are there and you talk to them and know what's going on. I know everyone's schedules are crazy and I know that's why this year you have different hours but I feel like as much as possible I'd like to see that more office feeling stronger than it might've been in the past years.

Evan: I think that's a good idea. I could be totally wrong here but if we're not discussing GPSS specific, like stuff relevant to senate as a whole, you might want to make it into a special meeting or not even a GPSS meeting but a gathering at a bar and get a whole group around food. If it's not staff relevant, it might be easier to do it that way. I could be wrong.

Rene: I'm smirking and laughing because I know you guys are at different plans. All the outgoing people are going to be sputtering around trying to get things done and the incoming people are more enthusiastic. Outgoing people have had the relationship with the staff and the incoming people have no staff. You can do your best to try and get together but don't get disappointed if something does not happen. It's called transition for a reason. I can already hear the incoming/outgoing and where everyone needs to be so I'm just bringing this up so everyone knows that's what the deal with this is. If you don't get a part of it, don't feel bad. You have lots of records and documents. Do the best you can and be patient with each other while you go through the process and you'll be fine.

Genesis: As for my staff, there will be reports. There's been reports for every single quarter on what hasn't worked and what did and no matter what happens during the transition, there is written documentation. And it's helpful to other officers.

Alice: Chris, and as far as bringing someone in from the Evans School, Kiana gave me Professor's Bullitt's information specifically so I would want to meet with her personally to ask, "Tell me how to be a leader." Maybe I can ask her if she'd be willing to work with the incoming officers and exec. I don't think we need a professional to come in with the transition meeting. We can run that on our own. In the interest of your guy's time, I don't think we need to bore you with someone telling you how to run an executive committee if you're not going to be on it next year. Is that fair?

Chris L: Yes. Last year was less about that and more about management styles. It was kind of nuts and bolts of what's your leadership style.

Alice: Do you want to do that with outgoing people as well? Do you agree that it makes sense to do it with incoming?

Chris L: It might make sense to do it with the incoming. The thought behind outgoing as well was to get the perspective of what worked and what didn't.

Alex: Maybe it didn't work because of your work style.

Evan: Genesis said it did not help.

Genesis: Seriously, it was useless.

Chris L: Okay, any further discussion on that?

Alice: Who is in charge of planning that? Is that me or you? Want to talk about it on Monday?

Chris L: Yes. We'll talk on Monday. Any other discussion? We'll move on to planning the senate meeting.

Elisa: Jess Snow, the senator from the UW Department of Rehab Medicine and Occupational Therapy, will be doing the spotlight.

Chris L: Wait, it says Department of Rehab Medicine.

Elisa: Yes, that's correct.

Chris L: I thought you said Occupational Therapy.

Elisa: It's Rehab Medicine and the Occupational Therapy program. She wants to focus on the occupational therapy portion.

Chris L: Okay. We need to discuss the PeaceHealth.

Alex: The senate improvement working group will have Alice give a presentation on the Catalyst survey.

Chris L: Okay, before or after the spotlight?

Alice: After. I was going to say after the PeaceHealth resolution because if we're talking about doing stuff online, it's a nice dovetail to the Catalyst working group.

Chris L: This is true. Although by that time it would already have been dealt with online.

Alice: Oh right. Okay, cool.

Chris L: How much time?

Alice: 5 minutes.

Evan: How are we going to have our senators vote on the divestment thing?

Chris L: Do we want to have a discussion amongst ourselves? I can invite them but I don't know if they can come or not.

Genesis: I think we should gauge the senate's interest on this issue and see if they want to hear more you can bring both sides. What's the timeline on that? If we invite them to the next meeting, that would be the 21st.

Austin: The first reading is on Tuesday.

Evan: I guess the question is should we talk about what we have here or invite both points of discussion?

Chris L: I can invite them. There's no guarantee that they will come.

Evan: Do we want to do that given Rene's warning?

Rene: I'm just saying that respective to what side you're on, people are going to know about this. There's a lot of student supporters on both sides. If you want to support your friends that are coming to talk, you're going to come. You'll have one or two extra bodies.

Evan: Do you think that will happen irrespective of inviting people to speak?

Rene: It could. It may or may not.

Alex: Is there a precedent to bring at a senate meeting to vote on a directive for our ASUW rep to vote a certain way?

Chris L: No, not that I can think of. Actually, this is the most engaged we've been in ASUW.

Genesis: Is there a way that we can tell both sides that it's an informational thing. It's not debating each other. It's just to give us information.

Chris L: Yes, and I'll limit them to one person per side.

Genesis: And maybe a specific amount of time they can speak.

Evan: Very strict adherence to parli pro.

Alex: Wouldn't we be voting to give them direction?

Evan: Yes, it's an action.

Genesis: We can ask them to leave right?

Rene: Are you having an informational session where you're just inviting the public to a forum to hear both sides?

Evan: Yup. We need that but we also need to decide as a senate on how to inform our ASUW representatives.

Rene: I would have you as exec give that. I guess you would have to do that before the meeting. If you don't know yet, just tell them to not take action until that.

Alice: Just a suggested format, give the author or the person presenting the resolution two minutes to explain what the resolution is and give someone from the opposition two minutes to respond and introduce it that it came up in ASUW and we're going to have to inform our representatives. We're going to have a presentation and a quick rebuttal from the senator to those individuals, limit their responses again and vote on it and make sure they know after their question and answer period is over, like when we're deliberating, please don't speak after their turn.

Chris L: The thing thing about Struggess' rule on parliamentary procedure is that, I believe unlike Robert's rules where every person is restricted to two minutes speaking and you can only speak a maximum of two times on a topic. I don't know if Sturgess has similar rules so we cannot prescribe such a format unless the senate moves to do so.

Evan: If we make one item for presentation of the resolution at 5 minutes, one item of the presentation of the opposition at 5 minutes and then one item for questions at x minutes. All those be discussion or information. Then a final item that is action by the GPSS so it's self limited so that there is the possibility of extending them but the presentors themselves cannot extend time.

Chris L: That is legitimate.

Alice: Didn't we limit the time responses of ASUW in the ASUW forum at our last meeting?

Evan: o one questioned it. I think if they wanted to question it, they could've. No one was going to question it at that point because it was a friendly debate.

Alice: Let's just keep that noted that we're not allowed to do that because I had no idea.

Alex: Has there been discussion within the senators in ASUW with our representatives?

Chris L: Yes, I've been in touch with Kevin.

Alex: Has there been other pieces of legislations that we've done this?

Chris L: Nope, this is the only one.

Alex: Do we give them much directions at the beginning of the year?

Chris L: The reason we are now much more in touch is because an incident came up that our representative introduced a piece of legislation that caused a lot of controversy and we did not feel that it was reflective of the values of GPSS. That is in my memory the first time that any of the leadership was in touch with them. First of all, we haven't filled that spot consistently over the past several years. Second, that to my knowledge is the first the that the leadership has interacted with that person to any degree. We always had the Secretary as a representative to the Board of Directors but that's separate. This all came up because of that incident.

Evan: How much time should we have there?

Chris L: 10 minutes.

Alex: Do we have an action item?

Chris L: Yes.

Evan: It could be directive to GPSS's ASUW representative.

Alice: Does our representative not attend senate meetings?

Evan: Technically it won't matter since we'll direct them but yes, they should.

Alice: No, I asked if he does.

Chris L: He does not regularly.

Alex: Is he a senator?

Chris L: No.

Genesis: I think it would be beneficial for him to hear the conversation.

Alice: Is that not required of our representative at ASUW?

Alex: I think the Secretary is more the official representative to ASUW. Then we have two ASUW senate positions.

Chris L: Any graduate and professional student can be an ASUW senator but we, as GPSS, may appoint two representatives in ASUW senate.

Alice: So shouldn't that be a senator?

Chris L: No, it's like any other external university committee appointment. They don't have to be a senator.

Maxine: They would be representing the opinion of GPSS whereas any GPSS member or graduate student who wanted to be a senator could vote.

Alice: I see the value of having GPSS appointed person on faculty and university but specifically for the ASUW since all other graduate students have the right to be senators, shouldn't that make sense that our representative from GPSS at least attend meetings or be a GPSS senator? Otherwise it can be any random graduate student.

Chris L: At the moment, it's not a requirement.

Rene: Historically what you're talking about was the case but if you look at how hard it is to get these time commitments to be appointments as grad students, that's why that was annulled so that it could be someone that had the interest to do those. Senators are tasked to go back to their constituents and that's all they can do so that was why it was opened up a while ago. If you go back into your bylaws and see when the switch was made, some of those appointments, you can have grad students representing because of the time commitment. People can't just do that. ASUW senate meetings are 2-3 hours and they're weekly and then GPSS meetings are 2 hours. That's a lot of time and that's why it's opened up.

Alan-Michael: I used to sit at ASUW meetings and I couldn't.

Alex: Full disclosure, I was the GPSS senator for ASUW.

Evan: Chris, do you want to take GPSS at the front and just say for GPSS senators?

Chris L: That we also cannot do since anyone who comes as a guest can speak. Is there a version of executive session of the whole senate? So we cannot.

Evan: Can we put it in the title without enforcing it?

Chris L: I smell what you're stepping in.

Rene: There's a discretion both of Sturgess and in Roberts to use a discretion of those things. If you're in a meeting where you know you will have more people, the chair has a plan and you have preferences. First senators, then community members and you guys can help each other make a list and raise your hand and you keep a tally list. Another approach is to have lines, where people can line up and they can speak for awhile. It's a great way of soothing the crowd. So undergrads, their senate uses some of these methods for some of the stuff if it's a hot topic or not. The last time you guys had a hot topic was the graduate union activities and you had 200 people in the room so you can give Chris suggestions and he's going to use discretions and you guys will have to support him with that.

Evan: Chris, can we have the line thing?

Chris L: Yes, it's totally legitimate. Adam would use a speaker's list.

Rene: But you don't know who's in the room.

Chris L: I do, as the chair of the meeting, I can prevent people from just shouting out. I can maintain order. I can't not recognize people who asked to be recognized but I can do crowd control.

Rene: If the crowd is a little anxious, exec officers are expected to help out to the soothing of the group. You can take a recess. You can say, "We're going to a recess and step outside. The plans is ABCD." and go back in. There's a lot of flexibility. There can be two passionate people that are there and rest are quiet. You don't know. It's hard to tell. You'll be fine.

Genesis: It's better if we plan for the worst.

Chris L: I was little disappointed when we brought extra snacks before the ASUW forum and a lot of people walked out.

Alex: It kept some people.

Chris L: It wasn't the exodus we had that one time. Is there anything else to add to the agenda?

Elisa: Adjourn.

Alex: I don't know if you want to do it in your report or in announcements but getting people thinking about Executive committee?

Evan: I might just make an announcement.

Chris L: I have a time for it.

Alice: This is awkward but is there going to be acknowledgement of the election results? Do you want to do that with the executive senator announcement?

Evan: We can do a Previously on GPSS.

Chris L: Anything else to add?

Alice: So are we not doing that? The acknowledgement of election results. Just a slide for people who had to leave the meeting.

Evan: That's important. One slide with a quick rundown of the elections results. That's it.

Alex: A lot of people left after they voted.

Chris L: Anything else?

Alex: Do you have the time?

Chris L: 83 minutes. Then I will entertain a motion to approve this agenda.

Genesis: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Okay, executive senator reports.

Evan: None.

Alice: I was going to recap of what we talked about in the senate improvement working group. I don't need to say much because it's on the Catalyst webpage but there's some good discussions going on. One thing is about the wiki. If you guys haven't been to it, it looks nice, I think. It's the gpss website slash wiki and we talked extensively on why people weren't given access in the past and ways to get around it. We think, as the senate improvement working group, the wiki can circumvent the inflexibility of the GPSS website. There could be really interactive links to and from and that could be a way to really keep things going with archive and doing stuff on it. That was one thing that was hotly contested on last year and I want people, like exec to be supportive of this and participate in the Catalyst discussions.

Evan: I was curious, who is your institutional knowledge?

Alice: Russ and I also emailed Trong. He has the backend password in a lockbox and he said I'm going to hold on to that unless someone needs it. I have his personal email address so I can be in touch with him.

Chris L: The website is meant to be fairly static. We don't update it as much as we need to but the wiki is meant to be updated on a minute to minute basis and a website is not so it's a good complement.

Alex: That's the discussion we had on seeing as a complement to the website.

Alice: We really talked it to death. We came up with the idea that you guys had discussed previously but we confirmed to have an email address for each committee.

Genesis: We already have those. F&B has one.

Alice: We do? Does S&P have one?

Rene: Yup.

Genesis: It just sits there.

Rene: I can give you guys the stuff.

Alice: So using those, that there could be a block to the wiki. One concern that came up and one that I think everyone should be well versed in this that anyone can come and deface it. They thought through this process very thoroughly and they were initially planning it and it got derailed in the full senate meeting. There are two different places that people can be blocked access. The first is the UW net ID access. It's only routed through UW ID and it's restricted to the list of senators which gets automatically updated every year. So if you're a senator, you use your UW net ID to get added to wiki to view it and once you're there you can create your own username to make edit. Any senator can do it and it's tracked by individuals so you can revert to a previous version and there's someone who approves the changes from senate, exec or an officer and for people who are not senators, they use the committee email login to get past the initial first pass and they create a username to access the wiki as well. So that is what we discussed with all the information from Russ and if we lay it out plainly like that, we won't run into the same problem we did last year where people were confused.

Evan: So there is no way for non senators to access the wiki?

Alice: So that was something I was curious about but we didn't get to it because we belabored it. I think it should be open to the public because it would fulfil a lot of our public meeting requirements, like having our minutes up there. The only thing is that there would be working documents that we would want the public to see. Frankly, I don't think that many people are too interested in looking around some committee's working document. I would personally like to see it open to the public and the user login will be the pass at which you would control it.

Evan: There may be a way to implement every step we talked about after the edit click and there's also a way to implement that on certain pages that are still under discussion internally, but Russ will probably say yes or no.

Alex: But you need a net ID to see it.

Alice: No that wasn't it. We can work it out. We can move it to the Catalyst. I just wanted everyone to know that this is a thing for certain and all other discussion things. Please contribute.

Chris L: Who is Russ, by the way?

Alex: He is on the state leg committee and he's a senator. He came and volunteered, after we did the first presentation to the senate and he brought the wiki to us and is its main advocate. Then the only other thing is that we want the discussion to be on the Catalyst site before we make any decisions so please go the Catalyst site.

Chris L: Especially with bylaw suggestions. Any other executive senator report?

Alan-Michael: So I have two things I'm working on. One is the men's sexual health clinic at Hall Heath and I also, I took up the performance evaluations to see what we can do to make sure it's not gender biased or discriminatory whatsoever. As far as men's sexual health, I found out very quickly that I'm entering into a field that I have no knowledge about so I get easily lost in the jargon. It would be very nice if I can get someone to help along this side. I can only use the language so much. So I met with the Director of Hall Health. His name is William Neighbor. He actually mentioned joining both your concerns and mine together at the next meeting that he has coming up. He's going to set a date and shoot us an email but he was wondering if we would like an agenda item there so we can talk to the committee. He said they were very interested and that men's sexual health is something that is cropping up as of late so I'm right on target with bringing it on. He just said we would have to account for funding and what to actually consider under men's sexual health. It's quite a linguistic game so that's why I'm asking for something to work with and figure out what are these concerns and what are they called. He said there's a big difference between a physical exam and preventative care examination. So we just have to get the people to get it done. Any recommendations that you may have for people to get in touch with. I was thinking of reaching out to the people in senate that work in Public Health.

Chris L: Do you mean like medical terminology?

Alan-Michael: Yes.

Alice: in the School of Public Health, there's Health Services and Health Administration. Those people might know. Actually, Beth Vodicka is a PhD in that program. I can forward you her email address and you can ask her. Health Services would probably be good.

Alan-Michael: William Neighbor talked about crafting up a survey to be sent out to UW's graduate community to see needs and perhaps draft up some things that can be put under men's sexual health. So for the other thing, I got in touch with Natalie, who works in the office and she gave me a lot of information on the job descriptions and however that staff salary increases haven't been part of the conversation because we are hourly and our budget is established at the beginning of the year including how much is allocated to pay for each position. So given that, that means we only have to account for, if a salary increase is made after the time, I think this is quite easy to get done. I was wondering who would be the people to review this. I was thinking of contacting some people like Jennifer in the Q Center to review over some documents because i know she's done work in policy.

Chris L: That's awesome. Thank you for taking on these two initiatives.

Alan-Michael: That's all I have.

Chris L: That's pretty good. Any other executive senator report?

Alice: Since we didn't finish the thing about SPHERE, I haven't heard back from Beth. Could i request that we, in the event they have to send the letter before the next meeting and Beth asks me that GPSS signs on, that we vote now to say yes? That we hold off on actively informing her until the full senate meeting and bring it to the vote then if she hasn't asked for final confirmation. Is that a fair compromise?

Evan: I lost you.

Alice: Say tomorrow, she says we have to do it now, can I have exec's permission to say yes considering the very positive discussion and lack of opposition we had to the idea of a resolution at the last meeting. In the event that I don't hear from her, I hold off on saying anything to her about it and we bring it up as discussed at the next meeting for the resolution to vote on it and in support of the letter.

Evan: I'm still hesitant in doing it without the exclusive approval but I'm still in favor of if we can sign on as GPSS Exec committee, that way we have something to put there rather than nothing at all.

Elisa: I agree.

Alice: Okay.

Chris L: Do you want to make a motion?

Alice: It doesn't matter who sees the thing but a committee versus the entire graduate and professional school is a pretty big qualitative difference and I guess I don't understand the opposition since we have the authority to do.

Alan-Michael: I understand what you mean but you're going to risk the senate getting angry that we done something on their behalf and that might come to bite you in the ass. So I would be wary of that.

Elisa: I think the topic is sensitive too. If it wasn't so contentious or had the possibility of being contentious, it would be within our purview and I would be more comfortable voting on behalf of the senate.

Alice: Is it contentious though?

Alan-Michael: With the religious dimension, I would say yes.

Alex: What I would feel comfortable with is if you do get an email back saying we have until Friday or something, since we talked about it so much here, you can send an email and we voted over email. We've talked about it and if we need to, at the very last minute, get our name on it, I would be okay doing an email vote. It does go against letting the senate vote on it but at that point we'll know whether or not to have our name on the materials that has to be submitted.

Evan: Is that asking exec to vote on behalf of the senate?

Chris L: This is what I'll say. While I fully support their position, it's incumbent on them to tell us what they need from us and not give us a vaguely defined timeline. In that respect, I don't feel like it's our responsibility to tie ourselves in knots to meet their needs when they haven't articulated those needs to us. That would be my main objection. We're not even sure what we're being asked to do. We don't know when we're asked to do it by. If they said it last week, we need this by.... then I would be much more in favor of voting on behalf of the senate but they haven't and it's their responsibility to do that.

Rene: Didn't you ask senators to talk about this with their constituents? If you sort of tell everyone to do that and they do that and come back, that;s very harmful. Remember you guys have power against the whole senate.

Alan-Michael: I think it's wise to wait because of that bit of information and because they haven't given us clear expectations yet. If they try to sign us on now, we'll say we had not heard back from the whole senate.

Evan: If you'd like to do the same proposal but with just the executive committee, I would be okay with that just to have something but if you'd rather wait as a whole that is cool too.

Rene: If you have that piece of legislation ready for the next meeting and if you need to, bring it to the floor and do it right.

Chris L: We're doing that.

Alice: It's just that they have a separate letter to sign on as a supporting organization, which is separate from the resolution that we're also writing in addition. The reason that I brought it up is to have us vote as an organization is we talked about it in support of it and saying additionally what their concerns were and what their specific departments that was more or less effective and what they were doing about it, which is why I thought there was overwhelming support already. But all of these points are taken. Honestly Evan, I think that if it does say GPSS Exec committee, that's still an endorsement from GPSS and if we were going to take that action we may as well make that decision to vote for GPSS. I think it's just a technicality that gets around speaking on their behalf but if it's an endorsement, might as well make it GPSS. If they haven't given us a solid deadline, we don't have to put ourselves in a bind. The only reason I brought it up is because I don't think it's contentious. I don't think anyone in the senate would actively say that we should merge with a catholic institution and have the services currently given by UW Medical Center be restricted by ethical or religious directive. I personally don't think that so that's the only reason I felt comfortable voting on it.

Alan-Michael: I think with me, the formality of having it voted upon, then no senator can go back and say you did this without asking us.

Genesis : We have the public record as well.

Alan-Michael: Yes, as long as you have that closure, then I think it's fine but without that, it's a recipe for future trouble.

Elisa: The endorsement could be easily taken down or reversed.

Alex: And make GPSS look bad.

Chris L: Any further discussion on that? Moving on to officer report, we already heard from the Vice President so Genesis.

Genesis: I haven't heard back from SAF on my presentation in my fifth revision. Our social is on Friday and our Science & Policy Summit is in two weeks and we have three panels for that. That's all that I have.

Elisa: Archival books are going to the printer. GPA of the Year Award, things are flowing in now so it's awesome. Is there any particular way you would like those to be presented to you since the exec committee votes on it.

Genesis: Can we just get the top three that gets the most nominations?

Elisa: We've been getting a lot for a few but the statements for it are not robust. I think that quality of statement should be considered a factor.

Genesis: How many are we talking about?

Elisa: At this point, 10-15.

Genesis: I'm going to object that. I'm not going to sit here and read 15 nominations. I would rather we look at people who get more than 1 or 2 and look at the top three or five.

Elisa: I'll make it a summary. I'll go through them and present them to you in a way that makes it more manageable.

Alice: Chris did it for the Science & Policy committee. He had a decision to make about the people to send to AAAS. Instead of 15, he said these are my top three. They're my favorite and I think their statements are the best. I trust you to make that determination.

Elisa: There may be someone from my program which means it needs to be out of my hands.

Genesis: Then you would need to give it to another officer or exec.

Chris L: You can have an A list or a B list.

Genesis: But just so we have a list and not have a us read all the nominations or applications.

Elisa: Sure. Diversity forums are all happening this month. Allyship is this Monday, How to Start a Diversity Committee is the 15th and Veterans is the 29th. That will go out to the senators this evening.

Chris L: And an all grad student email. Okay, ASUW left I guess.

Genesis: Who is she?

Rene: She's the F&B Director and a sub for Evelina.

Genesis: ASUW had a report last week but Evelina sent it to my Facebook so I didn't see it. So she did have something but it's too late to read since it's irrelevant.

Chris L: Sounds good. So peer mentoring project, getting that off the ground has been my major undertaking these past few days. We still have some kinks to work out and we're admittedly pushing out fast to meet the deadline for the Graduate School since we don't get another crack at this blog post for two weeks and we like to get it out sooner rather than later. I think we'll be ready and we've got a great steering committee and a great working group. Honestly, not all that much to report other than that just basically I'm really grateful to the senate improvement working group's work and really carrying forward the work from the last senate meeting of the winter quarter which was potentially one of the most important things we did this year. It really will help bring us go forward. I hope when we come forward with bylaws suggestions that we keep in mind that side of collecting the knowledge and information from people that's been around to make sure that the people actually going to be living in it can implement it, especially for the budget, which necessarily has to get voted on the year before, you would inherit it and say I would never had done that and like this thing of the committee coordinating board. So keeping a balance of that. With internal committees in general, Alan-Michael you made me think of this but totally awesome work that you're doing for men's sexual health and our hiring processes. In a perfect world, committees would take that on. I'm hoping that and I'll talk with Alice on this that changing the way we talk about things in the senate and by changing the process we do resolutions, that committees will have much more reason to exist on their own without having them to generate all of their own content so they can be given things to do from the senate like resolutions to look over and do these kinds of things. I think it'll be hard since as graduate students, the commitment varies wildly depending on what we're passionate about. We don't meet weekly like the ASUW senate does so we don't have the same consistency where they see the same things over and over again. They can't read something one week and already having it read through the committee unless you want to start meeting every week. My point is that I think we're really in a good place to take the changes that the restructuring committee recommended but they didn't really think all the way through the implementation. We're in the place where the implementation is starting to make sense and it's largely because of the senate improvement working group. That's all I have. I don't think I have any other news or announcements other than I made 6q in karate on Sunday.

Genesis: So the spring social is this Friday. If you can volunteer and you already haven't signed up, we would really appreciate it. It will be just as big as the fall social and we'll need as much help as possible. Chris and I are going to be bartending to control the flow of alcohol. What we saw in the Valentine's Day Mixer was ripping up their tickets and making it look like they had a whole ticket in their hand and it got ridiculous. Some people I had asked to leave. This is something for the incoming officers to think about and how you're going to control this. If you guys haven't signed up to volunteer, please help us out so we're not here until 11.

Chris L: Any other announcements? Then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Evan: So moved.

Alex: Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Executive Meeting Minutes
May 14th, 2014
HUB 303

Chris Lizotte (President): I call this meeting to order at 5:00pm. I'll entertain a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

Alice Popejoy (Public Health Genetics): So moved.

Evan Firth (Oceanography): Second.

Chris L: Any objections?

Yasmeen Hussain (Biology): Point of clarification, may I see the agenda?

Chris L: Yes. Now, I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes from our previous Executive committee meeting.

Evan: Can I make a motion to change my name to Evan Firth from Evan First?

Alice: Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? Now, I'll entertain a motion to approve the amended minutes.

Evan: So moved.

Alice: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Then we'll move on to Adam. You're up.

Adam Yahyaoui (Evans School of Public Affairs): I appreciate you guys giving me some time to come in and chat. I think it's important that we did have the opportunity to have that discussion last week in the student senate. I just wanted to ask you all some questions about the format and the rationale behind how everything was set up. Then I'll go from there.

Chris L: Ask away.

Adam: Just the rationale behind the format. Just to elaborate, in discussion with some people in our group, we didn't understand why other people were brought in to speak to the details of a resolution written for ASUW written by the authors who were available. I wasn't sure how folks from the outside could speak to the resolution and I just wanted to get some clarification on that.

Chris L: When you say folks on the outside, who do you mean?

Adam: I guess outside is not the best way to describe it. So Robbie, who spoke against divestment. He is a student but he's also a paid intern for a group called Stand With Us, which is a non-profit who actively lobbied for the state of Israel.

Alice: Really?

Chris L: Our ASUW contact or representative, Kevin Shotwell, told me that this was likely to come up in senate and we needed to figure out a GPSS position, I asked him for contact information for both pro and con sides and he gave me the name of Amira and Jamie. I contacted both of them and they said they would send one person to speak as the official representatives.

Adam: Is that typical? I feel it's great to open up a space to talk about a resolution that might draw some questions and criticism but just in discussion with our group, if the senators had questions, why would they ask somebody who is not a sponsor of the bill? A lot of the times when I acted around this issue, it does become sort of a football team: pro/com. That's a narrative we want to steer away from so in a way, that setup reaffirmed this narrative that we are really opposed by this language of pro-Israel and pro-Palestine. That's not how we operate. Our group has equal rights. So I didn't understand how inviting someone who's not the sponsor to speak to the resolution when they necessarily didn't understand or appreciate the resolution on its merits.

Chris L: So given the sensitivity of the issue at hand, it was not my intention to set up a pro/con dialogue but given the sensitivity of the issue and the fact that it was not our resolution, I felt that we, as a senate needed to be informed as possible on the resolution so we could direct our representatives to represent us in the ASUW senate. I made perhaps a naive decision. It was a judgement call on my part to bring in if not pro/con but different perspectives at least. One of the things is that I will say that no one outside of Kevin, who is one of our official representatives, I was not reached out to and anyone else can correct me if I'm wrong but I don't know if anyone was contacted by groups who wanted to come and present this. We knew this was coming up and do something about it so I made an executive decision. Otherwise the alternative would be no conversation.

Yasmeen: Just context wise, I know that last year we were discussing the international student resolution. I don't know whose decision it was but there was also both sides. There was resolution that GPSS put to go against the international student fee. Someone else came also who represented the other side and I'm not sure if the GPSS person who wrote the resolution brought the person in or was just invited. Context-wise, that sort of thing has been done before and it was also a hotly debated issue.

Chris L: I totally appreciate the fact that using the language as pro/con is not productive and not what anyone would want in this context. I did not know and it was never brought to my attention

at all by anyone that Robbie was a paid intern for a non-profit that obviously has a vested interest in the outcome of that. That was my mistake. I took it on good faith that he was just a student and not more than that.

Alice: To be fair, he was asked that at the meeting if he had any affiliation. I guess the question was so specific because it was if he worked for any of the companies requested to be divested from. I think it would've been fair to address the affiliation with anyone including his. Since I'm one of the sponsors of having you here at the meeting, there's a lot of things that we could say that went well about that conversation and a lot things that we could say we could've done differently as far as planning, who was there or even the fact that the vote was geographically distributed based on proximity to the proponents or opponents of the motion. I think the reason that we're having this conversation with you today is to talk about moving forward so I would like to steer the conversation in that direction. This discussion was tabled even though the motion was defeated so it might come up again at the next meeting and my question to all of you and Adam, having you here was to really just about how do we want to handle this moving forward? Are you thinking of drafting a resolution for GPSS? Does Exec think it's a good idea because I was under the impression that that's what you were thinking about? As far as how do we want to handle this discussion moving forward if it does come up at the next meeting?

Chris L: One clarification, is it must come up at the next meeting.

Alice: Oh right, because it was tabled.

Chris L: And specifically the question of directing our representative. That does not preclude adding an item that would be a resolution that would be our's. It simply means that the item we tabled has to come up.

Chris Erickson (Vice President): One of the things I'm thinking about here in the context of this is one, I guess the amount of control we have over who comes and speaks especially since we have open public meetings. Generally we don't see parents of Rachel Corrie in our audience coming to speak. That's the nature of things and I think the clarity of what we were intending to do is important. All this discussion that we're still having is about how one person that we had or two that are representatives to the ASUW would vote on this if it came to a vote. It's an interesting thing that we don't have a resolution and we don't have a narrative. Even if we talk this out, what that means in the context of the whole resolution process. That's interesting to distinguish. There's a different conversation or strategy on how you open this forum or how much deeper we need to get into this. If it's us putting out a resolution on our own or directing our representatives on how to vote on it in ASUW.

Evan: Are you saying that because our options were to vote yes or no, it falls on us to come up with the reasons to say no or yes and compare those two to each other?

Chris E: More so and a little bit more in tune than saying vote what you think.

Evan: I would agree with that too since we were posed with a yes or a no question.

Adam: Just a clarification, yesterday at the ASUW meeting, the resolution was not out of committee. Next Tuesday it will come out of the committee and it will likely come to a vote. Next Tuesdays is the last ASUW meeting because they have elections for the rest of the quarter. This will go to a vote on Tuesday or it will be tabled until next quarter. With that information, the GPSS liaisons will still not know where we stand. I'm going to leave that hanging. And to your point Chris, I completely agree. The Corries don't typically come to campus and sit on GPSS meetings but I would also add that the Corries don't try to improve the brand of the nation state. They're a non-profit where they do a lot of programs so I take your point but it's different.

Alice: In light of the misinformation that was presented at the last meeting, I would feel more comfortable if we do decide to bring this up because if ASUW is voting on it next week, it's a mute point unless we have our own resolution because 15 people, the majority, abstained. So bringing this up like why are we talking about this if the decision is already been made. I'm not saying we should talk it either way but if we do come back to this discussion, I think in all transparency, it should be divulged what the affiliations were. I don't know if some of the speakers on the pro side or if you have a particular affiliation or if you're just a student. That should be divulged and I also think the other side should be divulged. It won't change the decision that we made but I think it's important for people to know who was speaking to them.

Alex Bolton (Law): I don't think there was misinformation but I do think it will be good to have people divulge their information.

Alice: You mean moving forward in the future? Do you think it's a bad idea politically?

Alex: No, I think people should say what their affiliations are but I don't think the omission was necessarily misinformation.

Adam: I know that there were at least two paid interns there from the groups that stands with us that have very problematic material on their website but that's neither here nor there for our discretion. About misinformation, I'm going to look over the minutes and point out at whatever venue that you feel is appropriate where the misinformation is and I would be happy to provide sources because there definitely was misinformation. I don't know how to move forward from that. I don't know how much time to spend on this. I think Chris's point is well taken that things that were said may be untrue but after all, this is a lot of GPSS time on a vote for an ASUW resolution. It's a bit of a weird situation in my mind. I don't know what kind of precedent this sets for any ASUW resolution that is deemed controversial that is going to take up so much of GPSS time. I'm not saying that that's not important but how do we facilitate that process if it's not even a resolution that is being discussed in the senate?

Yasmeen: To the discussion of Alice and Alex about the divulging of information, my reaction was yikes. Divulging information; that can be testy. Would someone have to say I have family in this region and is that a conflict of interest? Or is it more like would guests and invited speakers have to divulge where they work or even guests who are not senators say why they're there. That can get into privacy.

Evan: That's an easy one. Just anything financial whether he's a paid internship and he has a financially vested interest.

Chris L: Was he being paid to be there?

Adam: I don't know what his timesheet looks like.

Genesis Gavino (Treasurer): When you brought this up and asked to be on our agenda, you already knew of this and him being a paid intern and you wanted to it bring to us. Is that what this is all about?

Alice: It was more about him coming to us to see. We didn't know when ASUW would make a decision and because we tabled the item, it will come up at the next meeting. So because Adam is a senator, he's here to talk with us since we're writing the agenda for the next meeting to see what feedback we have if he wants to pursue this or not and get feedback on how we should schedule.

Genesis: Because if we're trying to be an impartial on this whole thing, I think it does us a disservice to not have invited other people and let them know that we're going to be talking about this. It seems like just because Adam is a senator or because he has a direct line to GPSS Exec, he can bring his issues forward as opposed to them bringing whatever issues they have against the other side.

Chris L: I would disagree with that. Our agenda is publicly available and anyone who looks at them has every opportunity to come.

Genesis: But how would they have known to come and present? Did anyone reach out to them?

Chris L: I don't think that's our responsibility.

Chris E: I was just going to say as a senator, it's your prerogative to champion or give information to any body in the senate that is a voting member and more power to anybody else who wants to do the same for anyone else. I think that there is an inherent power that we give to our senators with how our election's run and with how these different things happen. I talked to Alex the other day and he asked me what's going on and I said I talked to Adam. He's a buddy of mine and he asked what was going on in Exec. I told him if he wanted to come, I can see if he can get on there. Then he told me that Alice had already asked the question so there was dual

support. I think what we're looking at is this idea of how do we get our body to make a decision whether that is to abstain, vote no or vote yes on how these people vote. I think we come to this area of everyone saying, "Oh, we don't know." It shouldn't be that hard. You ask your people and you make a judgement call. This idea of divulging information is interesting because as far as our panels go, we don't ask what people's affiliations are as long as both sides are represented equally. As long as there's someone from both sides to do it. Would we usually do a better job than that during an informal discussion point? I think so. I think it's a learning point since it's a new area for us. I think it comes down to are people are going to try and sway votes one way or another, senators or not, inside or outside and it comes back up and people will make a vote or they'll abstain and it goes to whatever.

Alice: I also want to clarify because Genesis, I fully take your concern and if someone approached me about this concern too about why we would have one person if their senator can come. I think a comparable example is someone coming to talk to Exec about fee based programs. This is something that affects graduate students. This is something they care about. We're not going to reach out to someone in the administration who is opposed to the idea of fee based programs to talk to Exec about it. We're going to give priority to a senator who has an issue they care about and who wants to come and talk to us about it. It's not like we, as Exec, are going to endorse one side or the other. It's simply that one senator wants to talk about their issue. With ideas about how they're going to move forward with it, I don't think that's going to affect how the senate votes ultimately. But apparently, the side that the speakers are sitting on does affect people's votes.

Chris L: In terms of moving forward, if ASUW does vote on this next Tuesday, then it will be too late for us, which doesn't mean we still can't. Someone could bring a motion to the floor to render an opinion on a resolution. That's possible. At this point, a GPSS resolution technically would have to be sent out today for it to be under consideration at our next meeting. I agree the stakes are lower if we're talking about a document of another organization that we're rendering an opinion on but it still will be the closest thing we have to an opinion on GPSS's position on this issue. So we should keep that in mind. So this will come up at the next meeting. Knowing that, what would you like to see happen?

Adam: I would like to have the floor at some point to bring up this issue again. Whether that's as a senator or not. I think the whole point is to have a discussion so for us, it's a win. The resolution as it's written now for ASUW, draws on very specific precedent that draws from ASUW. It's not like I can just take that copy and submit it to GPSS. Not only did they already pass a resolution on responsible investing, they also divested from South Africa as an undergraduate student.

Chris L: It would be inappropriate for us to do that anyway.

Adam: So the resolution being submitted to GPSS is something that's come up. Right now, my opinion is that it's not going to be brought up this quarter but it will be brought up so that's one

thing for everyone to keep in mind. I don't know what the best way to announce the result of the ASUW vote. It will either be tabled or voted on. Maybe having some time in the meeting to give an update on that would be great. Just as a body, to Chris's point, this is the complicated process that we jumped into. Leave aside the divestment resolution but I think there needs to be some kind of process to govern this in the future.

Chris L: Agreed. Chris is right. This is new territory for us. I don't know if we had, in recent history, an emotionally and socially divisive issue come up before this body. We had contested issues but nothing on this scale, which is why I took the initiative to invite what I felt were the relevant perspectives. I really regret the fact that there were people in there that they had a rather serious financial conflict of interest. In the future, I think we need to do a better job. We never had to vet people in that way and I think it's an open question. Is it our job to vet people in that degree but I do regret that so I'm sorry. But moving forward, my suggestion would be that we add an item to the agenda that we will give you the chance to take the floor.

Alice: Could I suggest that rather than have Adam give the update on it, since it is impartial, could we have 10 minutes where you present the results of the ASUW resolution whether if it gets voted on and if it doesn't get voted on, just stand up and say ASUW hasn't taken this up but we have the opportunity to discuss this if you want and at that time, feel free to jump in. Rather than present Adam to give the update, it makes more sense for you to come up and say what's going on. We agreed to talk about this again and open the floor and then of course, Adam you'll have every right to give updates or clarifications that you want.

Chris L: I wasn't going to put a line item that said Adam on it.

Alice: Right, if you don't even mention it.

Genesis: Going back to your whole vetting people that come, I think that would only apply to the speakers you invite since anyone in the public can come sit in our meetings and you can't vet everyone that comes.

Adam: By you, who are you speaking to?

Genesis: To Exec.

Adam: I think that's a great idea Alice and I would like to thank GPSS for spending so much time and I would like to applaud you for even bringing this up. Like I said, opening up the space to have this discussion is great. My intent here is not to say I'm outraged and point fingers. I just wanted a little bit more of how it came to be this way.

Chris L: Those are all completely reasonable reasons.

Adam: Another suggestion and I would love to speak to it is do I amend the agenda and put myself in the agenda?

Chris L: You can be recognized and have the floor.

Chris E: There's one way around this. As of right now, what we need to do in our email that goes out to senators is to explain these things. Primarily saying that because of the decision made last week, if the vote comes up on Tuesday, the GPSS representatives will be abstaining since no decision was made. At Wednesday, we will have the opportunity to look at that again. One of the things is this idea of possibly having groups from both sides are called people who want to speak. I rather have it in a 25 minute presentation of hopefully both sides. I think Adam will be able to tell us another group that can represent another side of the issue. There would be time for some questions and see if people want to vote or maybe people don't want to vote. I think there's a need for clarity to be had in the beginning to say this is where things stand right now. By next Wednesday, it could be a non-issue but if we're looking at that, we should have a system in place to address these issues of equal representation.

Evan: Under my understanding, since we don't know while we're making the agenda right now and last minute whether or not it's going to be a mute point so might as well have an impartial section of this is where we currently stand and that opens the floor for any discussion as per the bylaws. If anything happens after that can keep on happening just in the event that now it's a mute point we are still allowed to make discussion as we like but we don't force ourselves just in case the senate decides to just move on.

Adam: Those are great points. I haven't been clear though. By next Wednesday, it will definitely be a mute point. Either there will be tabled for next quarter since there are no meetings or it will be voted on. I don't want to get into this pro/con again. I appreciate that we need clarity and information. If I were presenting this issue of the occupation of Palestine, I would presume that you would invite someone to talk about the state of Israel and why it's important for security, etc. but this is about a resolution. There are people who wrote the resolution and we are all critical thinkers in the graduate school. If there are problems and questions about the resolution, you can read it and ask questions. I don't think it needs a pro/con thing but I'm more that willing to take the floor at the meeting and give everyone an update to what happened whether it was tabled and voted on and thank everyone, especially you all for being so open to having discussion in general. So I know I've taken a lot of your time. That's mostly all I came to talk about but I'm happy to stick around.

Chris L: Any further discussion on this?

Alice: Thanks for coming.

Chris L: Next up, GPA of the year.

Elisa: There's still a few applications that I haven't gotten through so I can't give you a good update but we don't have to have anything to give out until their ceremony, which is in mid to late June so I'm going to table this until the next Exec meeting, which I guess the last.

Evan: I'll second.

Chris L: Any opposed? Great, next on the agenda was suggested by me. I was actually going to the Catalyst poll where I put in as per suggested. Alice, what is this called again?

Alice: SIWG. Senate improvement working group.

Evan: I know faculty will be moving from Catalyst to Canvas. Will this be a problem for us?

Alice: This is just a site to get feedback from senators. It's not permanent.

Alex: It's unknown. They don't have anything to replace it with.

Genesis: Are you the only commenter?

Chris L: Yes, so far. The first one is something we've talked about actually, in last Exec meeting. It's the elimination of the committee coordinating board. To briefly elaborate, it's part of the beginning of a culture shift where those activities get taken over by the senate and where the senate feels not only responsible for bringing it before themselves but also to assign them to committees and keeping those committees accountable. Don't need to say much more than that. This is more for people who have not sat around this table and care to look at it. The second one, I think you all would agree, needs some work. It's to either clarify or amend the process of the selection of executive senators. I say selection because currently, the way it's worded in the bylaws is a nomination and confirmation process. Thinking back, I was made an executive senator through nomination and confirmation and not election. Amber Trodder, who because executive senator with me at the time might have run from the floor actually, which is under the bylaws, which is one reason the bylaws for that section is unclear. One the one hand, you have the process where the officers nominate someone, the senate can confirm or say yes or no or someone can run from the floor, which suggests it's an election. It's not clear what the process is.

Evan: I gathered it was a confirmation unless there were multiple people running for one spot, at which point it became an election on the spot.

Chris L: The bylaws doesn't say anything about electing or ballots. It's very unclear. This would be my suggestion in the spirit of not dictating, but either to retain the confirmation and approval process or do away with it altogether and make it a straight up election process. Not on the scale of officer elections but something similar.

Evan: How does the confirmation and approval option handle multiple potential executive senators?

Chris L: It doesn't.

Alice: It's completely ambiguous.

Evan: Should we lean towards the re-write option?

Chris L: That would be my suggestion. I was thinking about it because I got an email from Melanie Mayock and she said the executive committee, which is already out of line with the bylaws since it should just be the officers, have had nominated as an executive senator. Are you interested? I said yes. At the last senate meeting of that year, I was stood up in front of everyone and said why I was qualified to be an executive senator and they voted to confirm me.

Evan: I think thinking back to mine, it was suppose to be me and Larry running against each other for the same spot. Immediately before that, I think there was a third person...

Alice: It was me and I decided not to do it.

Evan: There was 3 people running for two spots, which then because 2 people running for 2 spots. We still had an election and I think the plan was, if there was an election, to be counted by hands because it was a confirmation.

Chris L: The point is figure it out. Those are my two big ones. As we discussed at the last meeting, if anyone thinks this bylaw is wack, please put it on the discussion board. Also, we came to a consensus that we would not propose specific language except how I said here: Article 6, Clause 6 Section b and striking out all of Section C.

Evan: I can put this on there too but I know that we talked about an addition of a committee to handle incoming resolutions much in the same vein as ASUW.

Alice: Drafting committee.

Evan: Something to handle the entire chaotic process.

Chris L: They have a committee to handle the editing.

Alice: It's not content oriented necessarily. It's for typos and formatting to make it consistent so the president doesn't have to do that.

Evan: Our concept was to take it out of Exec's hands and put it into a specific committee.

Yasmeen: I think part of the reason why you guys don't have a committee like that is that ASUW have on the order 10s if not 100s and we have 5 a year.

Alice: We want to have more.

Evan: Because it's a chaotic, un-streamlined process it's unbearable to actually do it. If we can simply it hopefully we'll get more resolutions.

Chris E: Right now, as the bylaws state, it's under the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary.

Chris L: Yes, it would involve other role changes. Yasmeen, your thing that you came up with earlier this year was great because it took away one major, necessary structural barrier to bring resolutions forward that we can't make amendments. This is another one. Hopefully over time, people will see it's not a big of a deal to write resolutions. Also people are put off on how you do the clauses.

Evan: I think you initiated the process to making it simpler and now we're like we can keep on making it simpler so good job.

Yasmeen: Would the resolution committee not fall under the purview of Judicial?

Chris L: It could. That's an idea.

Yasmeen: We don't have a lot to do in Judicial all year.

Chris L: Judicial could take that role on.

Evan: Is Judicial readily and consistently built?

Chris L: It has to be.

Yasmeen: Yes, it has to be for GPSS to keep running and we meet once a quarter. Our last meeting was approximately 5 minutes. There was nothing to discuss.

Chris L: And it's Judicial's primary job to review bylaw changes.

Alice: I would say that Alan-Michael has in the works is, and we met to discuss this, A) is a review of all the officer and staff position descriptions. I don't think they exist for the staff and the president uses male pronouns so there are a lot of problems with our descriptions that need to be updated so Alan-Michael is doing a lot with this stuff like an outreach to all the officers. Have you guys heard from him?

Chris L: Not yet.

Alice: Well, he said he was going to, to you guys and your staff to get description of what everyone does and really finalize those and get someone who has knowledge of bias language and diversity to evaluate them so they're all gender neutral and equal opportunity language. The idea is to do regular reviews of the all of the staff and officers. The officers would do it for the staff but ideally, Judicial would do it for the officers to do a quarterly review of are you doing your responsibilities and how is it going with your position? Are you fulfilling your position as laid out in the bylaws? I think that would give us more accountability as a body and maybe help some of the year-to-year fluctuations of people's fulfillment of responsibilities.

Chris L: Don't we have descriptions for staff position?

Genesis: Yes, Natalie has them.

Chris E: I have a job description that I used for a job search thing. I'm going to jump in and say it's a continuation of our executive session the other day. I think in some spots, that's the prerogative of the officer to hire who they want and furnish their staff as they want and I think that the board is overstepping their bound to get into those things.

Evan: On which issues?

Chris E: Personnel management. On what staff roles are doing.

Evan: I think this is just a rewriting of what the staff roles are.

Chris E: But not on this idea of quarterly check-ins.

Chris L: I think the officers would do that.

Alice: The staff people who work for the officers would be reviewed by the officers. To have a standard set of guidelines that's agreed upon by the officer and the person who will be working for you at the beginning of the year so that when you're doing these reviews, you can give them raise if you think it's necessary to have actual metrics to go by like, "Oh this is in your job description. All of these things on this list are what you've been responsible for that we've agreed upon and you fulfilled these and exceeded them. Therefore I'm going to give them a raise," versus "Oh, you've only been doing half of the things on this list of your job description which we've agreed upon. Therefore I'm not giving you a raise," to give it a little more transparency. It's not taking away from the officers whose managing those individuals but it's giving everyone else, including the staff member and you more clarification on what metrics you are using to evaluate them and make it more fluid and a consistent process over the years.

Chris E: Again, those are noble and lofty goals but I think it's outside the bounds of what we do as an organization. I'd love to be able to get there.

Chris L: We do have a comprehensive staff responsibilities list.

Genesis: Yes.

Chris L: That is in place. A lot of these things that are being talked about, go put them on the board and also, this is my suggestion. Summer is a really good time to hash these things out in Exec because Exec is the only body that is working over the summer, Exec can prepare the relevant bylaw changes and have them ready to be voted on at the beginning of the year.

Alex: I want to understand what was with Alan-Michael and the staff and officers. What was the thing with officers? Who would they report to?

Alice: The Judicial committee since it's their job that everything is going right and is in accordance with the bylaws. Maybe that could be something we could talk about giving them additional responsibilities is evaluations and reviews of the officers. Next year, I check out in winter quarter and I'm not fulfilling my duties as President, I know that I have a quarterly review coming up with Judicial to go through everything I'm responsible for and give an update on what I'm doing to hold officers accountable.

Rene Singleton (SAO Advisor): Judicial is appointed by the senate but you guys are elected by the bodies as a whole. You have all these procedures in the bylaws already. One of the things I feel like we're doing is we're making it all insurable. I'm sitting here and I've been to more of your meetings than anyone else and you haven't had a single officer being asked to removed in GPSS since your inception nor have you had a big disciplinary problem. You have differences in opinion over styles between members but you haven't tried to get rid of anyone that way. Some of the things that are outlines in your bylaws are made fluidly but you also have these operational personnel policies. What we have to go back and check about whether an underlying committee can purview those that are elected. Washington state has some funny rules. I would back off. I'm not criticizing the idea but in this state, we don't have underling body doing oversight and doing reviews like that. I would check that out before you guys go forward.

Alice: The idea of that wasn't to change the bylaws to implement that. This came out of our previous discussion on personnel issues and how we didn't have clearly delineated reviews on what criteria you could give someone a raise. It was at the discretion of the officer. So Alan-Michael was given that charge out of the meeting to review the language for bias language and so as a result of that discussion, he's been thinking about these issues and we talked about it. We thought that not to give Judicial the opportunity to fire someone if they're not doing all their responsibilities on their list but just to give a sense of accountability. It feels really good for me personally to meet with Judicial once or half way through the year that this is my job description. Let me tell you how I've been fulfilling those roles and they say good job. If you meet half way through the year and you're like embarrassed about the things on your list, then it's a wake up call and an opportunity to do better. Maybe we can switch it to a personal evaluation rather than

Judicial but I think it's a good idea in practice if we're worried about fluctuations in productivity and things like that to have a clear set of delineated responsibilities that go beyond what they say in the bylaws. It could be a procedural handbook and you have an opportunity to talk to some external people about it. It might be good for the positions in general. It's not going to be prescriptive.

Chris L: Again, a lot of what we do is standard practice. That's not a bad idea. Since this discussion is about bylaws and we're getting a little bit away from bylaws, unless there is any other suggested bylaw changes, I suggest we move on.

Alice: I'll just say this is one of the topics that we addressed in the senate improvement working group. When we talked about in our meeting, we discussed the bylaws specifically and we were going to wait for your changes and we have a working report that we're going to include your suggestions. I think we can take them and incorporate them and give some sort of presentation on our recommendations and we may not have something to send out tonight but can we present that at the meeting and have the senate vote to approve our recommendations informally?

Chris L: Sure. Keep in mind, this is not the body that will be living with the bylaws. I think it's worth taking the time over the summer to draft good language.

Rene: Are you guys talking about bylaw updates or bylaw changes?

Chris L: Both. So clearly there will be continuity so I think these are completely appropriate to present. These are the suggestions we have and these are the kinds of things we have and get some kind of straw poll. I could entertain a motion to endorse or whatever. Also, that will generate some discussion hopefully. The idea being that up until the end of the year, it's more the idea gathering time and the implementation begins next year. So seeing no further discussion, we'll move along. I forgot to add in agenda item.

Alice: No, it's here. Planning fall exec and summer sessions. That was my interpretation.

Chris L: So last week we spoke to the importance of scheduling our meetings at least through the fall quarter. This would be my suggestions for the moment. We have 3 out of the 4 and one executive senator. I think we can go ahead and do senate meetings because that's not going to change. We're not going to poll people. It depends on the start of the school year and what Wednesday we start counting from.

Alex: And we need to get the rooms reserved.

Chris L: For Exec, since we don't have the whole Executive committee in the room, should we schedule those meetings and have it be like whoever can make it can make it? In the past we did Wednesdays every week. We haven't gone around and do Tuesday this week and Thursday

next week or whatever. We just did Wednesday and whoever can make it, made it and whoever can't, can't. Would you rather do the Exec meetings not right now?

Genesis: I would recommend that they do the Exec on their own because then they can be flexible. There is only one Exec senator here and three of the incoming officers. Senate, you can dictate when they're going to meet and have that set up so we have the room and dates ahead of time. For Exec, you guys have the board room and can figure it out.

Alice: Don't we have to have the public meeting schedule?

Genesis: For the summer you can figure it out.

Rene: What I recommend you guys do is set your times for both early or you're under Exec special meeting status where you can do very limited things. You can do that but you can't get mad because you can't have open agendas.

Alice: I think we should schedule everything right now since we do have 3 out of the 4 officers and potentially two since Yasmeen is here to be an executive senator.

Yasmeen: I'm not voting.

Alice: No, but I think we have enough of us here to schedule the meetings in compliance and if we have to make a change, is that problem?

Rene: You can do both. Honestly, you seem to work well with Wednesdays. I would continue what you're doing.

Alice: I think keep doing it and if they can't make it, they can't make it.

Alex: For fall?

Alice: For summer and fall.

Alex: How often?

Chris E: For the summer, it's once a month.

Chris L: The minimum is once a month.

Chris E: We met twice this summer?

Chris L: Yes. My recommendation is that you need more than once a month. My sense is that we did not have enough Exec meetings last summer but the minimum is once a month during summer qtr.

Alice: How do you guys feel about every three weeks?

Chris L: The first day of school is Sept. 24th, which just happens to be a Wednesday.

Alice: Can we talk about summer?

Chris L: Let's go back to that after. My recommendation is you have an Exec meeting that day and start counting forward from that.

Alice: September what?

Chris L: 24th is the first day and it happens to be on a Wednesday. It depends when you want to start counting from.

Chris E: You also lose the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

Alice: I think we should start at that first day for Exec.

Chris L: I'm going to put this as a placeholder.

Alice: How do you feel about 5? For exec?

Alex: I think I can do that this fall but not for the summer.

Chris L: So, I'll entertain a motion that fall 2014 senate meetings be held on the following days: October 1st, October 15th, October 29th, November 12th, skip November 26th because that's the day before Thanksgiving so no meeting, and December 3rd.

Genesis: So moved.

Evan: Second.

Alice: At what time?

Chris L: I say 5:30pm. Any objections?

Yasmeen: I have a hypothetical question. I just noticed or this just might be me making stuff up but it seems like the beginning of the quarter, the meeting are pretty slow. There's not a lot going on. At the end of the quarter, it gets real hectic and a lot of stuff to cram in there. Does it make

sense to do something every three weeks at the beginning and every one near the ends or is that silly?

Chris L: It's not silly but it requires a larger discussion in the senate. That's one reason why summer is such a crucial time because using summer effectively is doing things so you don't have a slow period in the beginning or at least you don't have the slow, slow, slow, Oh My God! You can be more consistent.

Yasmeen: Is there a downside for booking a room for every week and canceling if you don't need it?

Chris L: Yes.

Evan: It also might be kind of rude.

Rene: Depends on where you're having it.

Chris L: Moving on to fall Exec meetings, I'll entertain a motion that fall 2014 Executive committee meetings be held on the following days: September 24th, October 8th, October 22nd, November 5th, November 19th, do you want an Exec meeting during exam week?

Evan: We can schedule it.

Genesis: So there's a senate December 3rd right? And then there's no Exec before that because there's Thanksgiving.

Chris L: We ran into a similar situation this year. You could do Exec on the third. Holding a senate on the 10th is pretty dicey.

Evan: We just planned two senate agendas right?

Chris L: Yes. Tina, did you get all those dates?

Tina White (GPSS Communications Specialist): Yes.

Alice: Are we doing Exec on the 10th?

Chris L: No. So I'll entertain a motion to make those the fall 2014 Executive committee meetings at 5:30pm.

Evan: So moved.

Genesis: Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? Okay, now let's go back to the summer. I don't know if we have Exec meetings scheduled officially for the 11th. Either Elisa or Genesis might have it.

Genesis: Really? No we don't.

Chris L: That will be the final Exec meeting of this year.

Rene: That's a nice break in between because the others aren't official until the 23rd. The next Exec meeting could start the week of June 23rd.

Alice: June 25th.

Chris L: Let's not do a motion. Is someone recording these?

Alice: June 25th, July 16th, August 6th, August 27th and September 17th.

Chris L: That's once every three weeks?

Alice: Yes.

Chris L: You'll have two Exec meetings before the fall.

Rene: Sometimes the building closes at 5:30pm.

Alice: Will we have lunch funds at that point?

Rene: No.

Chris L: We've been in this room at 5:30pm.

Rene: There's some weeks that they close early.

Alice: Alex, you can't do it in the middle of the day right because you're working?

Alex: I'll be in Olympia.

Alice: Every three weeks on a Wednesday could you can leave a little early?

Alex: I'm going to try to set that.

Yasmeen: I was wondering if other rooms aren't available? For example, like library rooms or room in someone's department.

Chris L: If worse comes to worse, use the GPSS office. Sorry, nevermind. The whole HUB is closed.

Rene: A lot of buildings on campus close early.

Yasmeen: I understand that so the library stays open all summer and there are public rooms. In Odegaard, any student can check it out and you can reserve it weeks in advance. Just to let you know, there are other rooms on campus.

Chris L: What time do we want to make these?

Alice: We have big binders with all the minutes and everything that live in the GPSS office. If the officers are here working, it doesn't make sense to have it somewhere else.

Yasmeen: I was just thinking if the whole problem was 5:30.

Evan: Do you want to meet earlier?

Alice: We can't because Alex.

Chris L: This would be my suggestions. You would assume that this building will open and if it's not, then you make a contingency plan. If that means sticking a binder in a backpack and bringing it to a library, then that's what it will be.

Alice: You said they will be?

Rene: There's 3 days that they're closed early. The week of the 18th is one of them. Our custodians actually need a break. As for the rest of them, I'll tell you when that will be. Usually we close at 9pm so you're fine.

Evan: Let's meet at 5pm and if we hear that they're going to close early, we can figure it out.

Alice: Whose job is it to reserve the room for the summer?

Genesis: Secretary.

Alice: Elisa or Natalie?

Elisa: It's whoever is the next Secretary.

Evan: If her term doesn't start until the 23rd, it's probably you.

Genesis: It's part of your transition things.

Alice: To book the rooms.

Chris E: I'll also say that make the assumption that not everyone will show up so make sure your technology is still viable. With that, there's a lot of great energy and ideas happening right now but that's not necessarily the purview of the board.

Chris L: I'll entertain a motion that summer Exec meets...

Alice: I move to schedule Exec meetings starting on June 25th, July 16th, August 6th, August 27th and September 17th for the summer quarter at 5:30pm in the HUB.

Evan: Second.

Chris L: Any opposed? Cool, so this brings us to planning the next senate meeting.

Genesis: What are we doing?

Evan: We're planning the agenda for the next meeting.

Genesis: I would like to get F&B on the agenda again, like one of the first ones. It's our presentation of our recommended guidelines.

Elisa: We need a call to order too.

Chris L: Genesis, is this an action item?

Genesis: No.

Chris L: How much time?

Genesis: 10 minutes.

Rene: Is the divestment issue coming back on your agenda?

Chris L: Yes. Adam came in and we had a conversation about that earlier. By that time, ASUW will have acted somehow on it so it will affect the way. I'm naming it this because technically, that issue was tabled so it has to come back up but it won't be exactly what we were dealing with. ASUW will have already act on it so we won't have anything to instruct our people to do.

Genesis: Did you know that we had a June meeting? It was brought to my attention that we have a June meeting.

Chris L: Yes.

Genesis: I was the under the impression that it's our last meeting.

Yasmeen: On the website, it says it's our last meeting. It says Wednesday, May 21st.

Chris E: Isn't the last one just a party?

Chris L: Yes.

Yasmeen: Whether or not it's a party, it's not listed.

Chris L: Then I will call a special meeting as is my prerogative.

Genesis: You have a lot of prerogatives.

Chris L: It's on the calendar. Shouldn't it be on the list?

Yasmeen: It could be on the calendar but not on the list, which is how the person told you.

Chris L: Anyway, getting back to the issue at hand.

Alice: Point of clarification, are you giving the update on the ASUW resolution during the PeaceHealth resolution agenda item?

Chris L: No.

Alice: Can we take BDS off of it? It's not about that at all.

Evan: You can call it a divestment resolution. Why is it an action item?

Chris L: PeaceHealth?

Evan: No, the divestment. Does it have to be an action item?

Genesis: Secretary, can you check in our minutes to see if we have a June meeting?

Elisa: Yes.

Rene: I was going to say that if ASUW takes no action this coming Tuesday, and they don't finish theirs by that time, your meeting will come and you can decide then.

Chris L: Then, they'll either have tabled it until the fall or have voted on it.

Rene: They're just having a hard time.

Evan: We were told today.

Rene: If it went to their committee and it went to committee the week before last. They didn't finish reviewing it and it stayed in committee and so the committee is going to review it there and it may or may not go to the full senate next Tuesday.

Alex: Is that the last meeting they'll have?

Chris L: Adam said that's their the last meeting.

Evan: Adam said that something would make it a mute point either way.

Rene: They have meetings scheduled on May 20th, 27th and supposedly going until June 3rd.

Alice: He said that the rest of the meetings will be dealing with elections.

Rene: That can change.

Evan: Okay, let's keep it an action item.

Chris L: I anticipate that we will make an action.

Alice: Moving to never discuss it again, for example.

Chris L: Anything else? I feel like there's something totally missing.

Alice: Executive senator elections.

Chris L: Right.

Evan: Is there bylaw discussion on there?

Alice: And recommendations from the senate improvement working group.

Chris L: Do you want to do it next week or at the last meeting?

Alice: Are we having another meeting? This has been advertised as the last meeting. Everyone thinks it's the last meeting.

Elisa: It says that we planned when the meetings are going to be on the agenda for the August 7th but I can't find the minutes for August 7th.

Chris L: Here's my thought. We have a lot of substantive stuff to get through at this meeting and it would be nice to have a final meeting with year end reports and prepare the office for a year end celebration. It's the last week of class so I don't feel bad. It's not held during exam week. Yes, it has been advertised as the last meeting. We can take a mulligan on that and I can simply call a meeting of the senate on June 4th as is my prerogative. That's my thought. I do understand that people are expecting it to be the last meeting. However, we have so much stuff to get through, there's no way. It's short-sighted on our part but it's also hard to predict how much we have to get through.

Yasmeen: I'm looking at the Exec committee meeting minutes for August 7th. You only planned fall so it's on the website. If you click under Executive Senator and the link that says Executive committee.

Alice: That's because we planned the meetings for each quarter at the beginning of the quarter.

Yasmeen: So it would be in the minutes for spring.

Alex: I don't remember that.

Chris L: I don't think you were a senator yet.

Alex: I'm just saying that I don't remember doing anything for the spring in the late fall.

Chris L: We did it.

Alice: At the end of the quarter, we plan the following meetings for the next quarter.

Evan: All that being said, you want to keep the substantive stuff here and keep the senate improvement working group?

Chris L: Sure.

Alice: So you can move the recommendations or keep the update there and we'll do the action on the last meeting.

Chris E: Does it matter at this point? I think what we're saying is there will be a meeting in June whether it's in the minutes or not. It's irrelevant.

Chris L: I think we probably screwed up. I'm reconstructing our thought process. We said, "Oh June is the end of the school year. Why would we have a meeting in June?" Then we didn't realize that we have a lot of stuff to do in June. So I'm saying that we made a mistake by not scheduling a June meeting, and you are correct. It is a mute point. I will call a June meeting.

Yasmeen: The smoking site survey is both me and Ragan Hart so in case you want to change that.

Chris L: I'm happy to do that.

Genesis: Okay, our minutes officially say that we only scheduled a meeting until May 21st, so now we know.

Evan: How long is it?

Chris L: 94 minutes.

Genesis: And we'll be done at 9.

Chris L: I feel like this will not take the full 10 minutes.

Evan: What are the 20 minutes?

Chris L: Divestment and executive senator elections. I anticipate that several of these won't take 10 minutes.

Evan: Exec senator elections might not take 20 minutes either. I move to approve that agenda.

Yasmeen: I was going to add more comment. The smoking site thing in the email, we requested about 10 minutes so it's an actual presentation and discussion but I don't know if that's appropriate given that the meeting is 94 minutes.

Chris L: Done.

Alice: When we initially talked about divestment resolution update, it was only 10 minutes and people can extend time if they want to.

Evan: The other thing though is that we overestimate so that it's over time and people start leaving. We can do it for now but for future reference. There was that one time there was a mass exodus during the meeting and we couldn't adjourn and the feedback was because we underestimated the time. I move to approve this agenda.

Alice: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? One thing I'll say to that is that it was a combination of that and that was the apex of our meetings being nothing but information. That's why when we came back from the final meeting, there was discussion and there were people that I was like "You're a

senator?" It was full to bursting. I think that initiative that is being continued on in the senate improvement working group will hopefully continue on next year. I really think that that has started to turned the tide.

Evan: We have good meetings now.

Chris L: It's been a slow process. It's been more than this year. It's a process over a couple of years. When I started, meetings were info dumps. They continued to be info dumps. We brainstormed a lot of ways to not let it be info dumps so now were getting closer.

Yasmeen: In Exec when you approve stuff on the agenda, how often you turn stuff down?

Evan: The only time we get close to turning stuff down is asking people if they are okay to be put on the next agenda.

Alex: We don't filter much.

Yasmeen: I was just curious.

Evan: Usually you can just ask and we say if they can put it shorter or like that. Most of the filtering comes within our own suggestions on how to keep it short.

Chris L: Moving on to executive reports.

Alex: I went with the Chrises for the mayor's press conference on proposed funding for Metro and we looked pretty behind the mayor.

Alice: I guess just the senate improvement working group. Bylaw changes will move to summer. I went to the Board of Regents meeting which was really cool and I'm learning all sorts of things for next year and I get to have lunch with Chris every Monday.

Chris L: That's the ultimate perk.

Evan: I started poling my constituents about that ASUW divestment issue and got good feedback. I was expecting no feedback or limited feedback but I got 20 something long email exchange. That doesn't mean responses but I've gotten a fair amount of reasoning and I pushed for it.

Alex: How did you go about getting that?

Evan: I emailed. I forwarded Elisa's email and then I put in my own short tldr summary on the top since we didn't have minutes to attach. I said I would really like your feedback and since I never ask you for feedback, I would like some on this and I went about asking them and there

were some interested people. I'm more comfortable bugging my cohort so I bugged them and kept on getting feedback one or two a day.

Yasmeen: They really must've helped.

Evan: I said it very desperately and I got some good feedback, which was nice. Overwhelmingly no on the resolution. A lot of people found it unnecessarily biased even to the UW community. Then I applied to be a peer mentor for Chris's thing. Hopefully that goes well. There were a lot of boxes to check on there. The only qualm I had is with the gender I noticed there was male, female and trans*. I thought that would've been better served by trans man and trans woman.

Chris L: Trans* is the new thing.

Evan: I know it's all encompassing. I was mainly thinking that a trans man may not identify particularly as a trans woman and putting that together.

Chris L: It's a fraud issue but I understand that it's a complicated issue.

Evan: I can also understand the need to be concise and the matching of forms. How many applications have you received?

Chris L: I'll speak to that during my report. If you guys have nothing else, officer reports. Chris?

Chris E: I have a couple things. The first one is that WSA was at our meeting last week and talked about graduate education being a campaign item. While we did not ask for that to be a campaign item, I also need everyone to know that that issue did not come up very organically. It was fought very hard for by ourselves and UW specifically on behalf of graduate students. We met with Ana Marie and Margaret Shepherd who gave us some very good feedback on where we need to go and actually offered to partner with us and this idea of a working group but that needs to be the decision of Alex and his team of next year's officers on what the choices are for that because it does carry some different ramifications. On what it can and can't be, personally I see a lot of value in joining together. Again, more power to the people who carry the torch on. The other thing I'll talk about is transit. While the mayor's press conference was great and he had a pretty good plan, it was a distraction ultimately and mostly propagated by UW Transportation that they don't want us talking about the real issue that in September, the cuts are going to be made. Very soon, the U-Pass will be renegotiated. With what's being look at on the table, we're going to be paying the same or more for less service. So while it's nice that we went and talked about something that will go and be voted on in November...

Alex: Before then.

Chris E: I'm pretty sure it's in November.

Chris L: The sales tax and car tab is.

Alex: There was talk after the press conference.

Chris E: Okay. The reality is UW needs to go to King County and say, "Listen, what we're paying for is service. You better save our routes or else." I think it's a wrong inclination that people get all weirded out to say that. Everyone else gets to stand up and say something about the decision, especially when we're paying for this. We had some students there who were about to see the stuff and personally I didn't stand up there because I feel used in those situations. They don't give us any information but want us to stand up behind them with our UW apparel on and making sure everyone knows that UW supports it. Then it got pretty partisan in that but we didn't lose anything. That's just personally why I didn't stand up there.

Rene: Just an advisory for you, people for the future. The downtime for the U-Pass advisory board for your MLUs has all the documents for the U-Pass program. It's something that ASUW and GPSS may want to look at in review. While you're in transition, lot's of different conversations will be happening over the summer. I hope both student governments will designate people to help monitor and transcend over the summer and I highly encourage everyone to make yourself educated about what's in there and how the fees of the MLU will be going up or not. It's very important that all these conversations will happening before elections and UW students are in an important spot to just take a look at that and read it. For those that haven't looked at it, you may want to. It should be on the website on the U-Pass thing. You want to make sure you have good people around for the summer and connecting. Chris was talking about where you guys are going. Maybe that's something that you want to be involved with. Make sure you empower yourself.

Chris E: Next steps is meeting with Larry Seaquist on our thing. Other than that, all is well.

Chris L: Cool, Genesis?

Genesis: Travel grants closed last week and we're going to be meeting next week before next senate to award the rest of our funding. We got a hundred applications it was brutal. A lot of them is happening early in the fall quarter or late summer. We only have \$2300 in departmental allocation funds. F&B isn't going to meet until May 28th and we haven't gotten any applications so we don't know if we'll have a June meeting either.

Evan: The departmental allocation?

Genesis: It's the only thing we're funding. The guidelines we'll present to senate next week. I haven't heard about our budget next year. Sorry, you guys don't have money. That's all I have. Wait, the S&P Summit is tomorrow. If you can, please come and support us. We have the three panels and food.

Alice: Elisa are you sending out an email tonight with the agenda?

Elisa: Yes.

Alice: Can you make the poster really big and say that it is tomorrow?

Elisa: Yes, I will. I'll also say the Diversity forum is tomorrow at the same time, 12:30-1:30pm.

Alice: How did we miss that?

Genesis: We had our schedule first.

Elisa: We just scheduled them last month with all of them in May. It'll be a different crowd. We don't get very many people at the forums so we I don't think we're taking very many people from you to be honest. How to Start a Diversity Committee forum is tomorrow at the HUB. Our funding is dwindling. Genesis and I haven't talked about that item that was on the budget last year that was misallocated. We'll need to talk about. We're pretty much down to the end of our funding and that's it.

Chris L: ASUW is absent so my report. Evan, thank you for signing up to be a peer mentor. It was created as a Google form and people have been having trouble accessing it because they have yet to be brought kicking and screaming on the Google apps era.

Evan: It also didn't work on mobile.

Alex: You have to have an app.

Evan: I think the thing is you need to be signed in in the window and since you're going through myuw, it's messing up.

Chris L: My long term plan is supported by two short term ones. Hopefully in the next couple of days it will be moved to Catalyst, which will be more accessible and as a stopgap measure, I embedded the form in the page itself.

Evan: It didn't help.

Chris L: Okay, those are two and I also said if you're having trouble, email me.

Evan: The link that you sent to UW Net IT was a really good thing.

Chris L: Cool. I think we'll do another push on that because we were not expecting a huge cohort of first mentors but I would like to get 10. I think we're at four right now. We'll be talking about extending the deadline but we have a date for the kick-off event and we have a training.

Evan: Do you have mentee applications?

Chris L: No, we're going to work on that now and open it soon after.

Evan: Are you going to be working the link for the driving mentality habit?

Chris L: All those things are in the works. So I've been trying to do that in between other things. WSA, last week, just to echo Chris's sentiments. Chris and his team drafted several legislative items around graduate education and it was decided that we package them together as graduate student issues. We added it and proposed to add it to the legislative agenda as an ancillary item and a motion was made from WWU to move it to a primary campaign item which was unexpected but very welcome. So now it's a primary campaign item. We had to vote to withdraw WSA from the US student association which was a very emotional but in the end, the vote was fairly decisive.

Chris E: It wasn't emotional for us.

Chris L: I've been trying to wrap things up. One new thing is I recently had a conversation with a representative Gillian from Safe Campus and she's a victim advocate from UWPD and I suggested and talked about ways to move forward and part of the larger sexual assault strategy is reaching everyone on campus in their different channels and I suggested GPSS's role. I suggested one doable way in the short term is to do what we did with UWPD this year and integrate them in our orientation activities. They will be holding their own training this summer and they expect to have 30 new facilitators so we'll have a big pool of people to draw from and they were really excited about that. I talked about the possibility about the long term and how GPSS can reach out to departments and make sure that departments have people in them to facilitate, train and educate around these issues. The unpaid internship working group has stalled but I'm going to try and bring it back up. Dawn is taking off for awhile but I'm going to try to get her in touch with you guys to get something started. Finally fee based programs, there's been a set of recommendations released by administration that outlines under what circumstances a fee based program should be created. They're still open to input. There is an open question to who has oversight over that. FCAS, Faculty Council on Academic Standards, has to approve all the programs that want to be fee based programs or not. Ana Marie is talking about having the senate committee on Finance & Budgeting being a subcommittee of that and also having an oversight role and an important thing going forward is to make sure it have robust graduate student representation because the SCB student appointment is a joint GPSS and ASUW position and the GPSS and ASUW president is ex officio. My suggestion to her is that there be a permanent and dedicated seat for a graduate student on the subcommittee and that's it.

Chris E: That's only for new programs?

Chris L: Yes, so there's no moratorium on transferring and of course there's the law that has protections around that. They have not released guidelines on transferring. It's still a good faith agreement.

Chris E: Do you think this is a big of an issue then?

Chris L: Yes, because new fee based programs are created all the time. At the Regents' meeting, I think two new ones were approved. It's something that needs to be monitored. Particularly when they are programs that there should be a real judgement to is it appropriate if this program should be a fee based program. Take Museology as an example. It doesn't fit in any of the criteria. For example, the criteria are things like it serves a population other than traditional, day students, which I'm assuming is not the case for Museology. It's largely a day program with traditional students and it's not in line with the criteria they have. That would be the kind of thing that there should be some robust oversight. Where it's really going to be an issue is on the Tacoma and Bothell sites where Masters programs are sprouting like weeds. The Tacoma campus is by definition is non-traditional students, which is what the fee based program is most appropriate for. So that's where it's most problematic and not necessarily our problem except that more and more is likely that we'll have to pay attention to grad students on the Tacoma campus.

Rene: I had a question about TA/RA pay. A lot of things are tied into what traditional departments can pay you guys in terms of fees and payments. Is there any talk about the other side about how people can be compensated for scholarships?

Chris L: That's another issue. Currently there is nothing.

Alice: The PACS recommendation to the Board of Regents came out and said that they had concerns about tuition dollars being used for Life Sciences building given that there aren't enough TA positions. Is there any movement on that or any advocacy on that front?

Chris L: No, the thing with fee based programs is that they're graduate programs so you wouldn't have TAs in fee based programs because there are no undergraduates.

Chris E: There's TAs for graduate programs.

Chris L: There are some but not on the scale of...

Alice: No, but we need them. There are TAs for every graduate program. That's what funds a lot of grad students.

Chris L: Who teach undergraduates.

Alice: No, and graduates. I had TAs in all my classes and the ones that didn't said they needed them.

Chris L: I think the issue right now is the place where TAs are missing is in departments like Biology where the demand is absolutely skyrocketing. If the discussion comes up, my sense is that those are the places where it's going to be looked at first before fee based programs come up and also none of the issue impacts around this issue. None of it was focused on fee based programs or TA positions in fee based programs.

Alice: I guess I was talking about the broader issue of TA positions being an opportunity for grad student to get tuition paid for. I was asking if you had conversations with other people of that disconnect and are you on board with the PACS recommendations?

Chris L: To answer the first question, no. The second, with regards to the Life Sciences building, I disagree fairly strongly with that particular aspect of the PACS recommendation but by majority vote it was adopted.

Alice: Do you think it's because it's bad for graduate students or a personal disagreement?

Chris L: I don't want to draw this out too much but it's based on the recommendation of our representation of the Arts and Sciences advisory committee. It's based partially on my own personal convictions. I do think that ultimately graduate students will be benefited by a state of the arts facility being built for basic research on this campus but it's not an issue we have taken up in GPSS yet but there will be opportunity in the fall. At this point, only the project architect has been approved. The notification on this issue came late in the process. That's why we scrambled around to decide what was going on. I could talk a lot more about it but I'm not going to. Yasmeen, did you want to say something?

Yasmeen: No, it was made clear.

Chris L: I will say the issue of TA/RAships is a big one. Ultimately, it's a complicated issue. There needs to be fewer fee based programs and we need to be very judicious about who is fee based and the ones that are more than one year really need TA and RAships.

Alex: Going back to the U-Pass subject and I don't know if you directly deal with it but who appoints the three GPSS reps to the U-Pass?

Chris L: The president. On the U-Pass, Chris is right. Up until the funding fell out of the bottom, things were stable. I believe this is still the case, there is no increase in the U-Pass fee for next year. After that, all shit breaks loose because we just don't know what happens.

Alex: The timing of that is January.

Chris L: One thing to note that the U-Pass stabilization fund for students is very robust on the order of several million dollars. Unless there is a severe fee hike or something else happens at Metro, increases in the next five years is in the single digit dollar range. It's not to say that it's outrageous to pay the same or more for less service. However we did renegotiate two key things. In return for reallocating or rebalancing the way in which the transportation demand management fee, which is what's tacked on at parking, is allocated to the student and faculty and staff U-Pass programs. Transportation Services is establishing several parking spots on campus where you can park for 30 minutes and drop something off and take off and several students only carpool spots. Those were two concessions that we got in exchange for a slightly less favorable mix of that funding.

Alex: When are the short term parking suppose to go?

Chris L: I don't know, soon. It's been decided where they will go. They just haven't put them up yet.

Alex: Who are the three current GPSS reps on the advisory board?

Chris L: I don't know all their names. Scott, Ethan and one more. They're all from Urban planning.

Chris E: Ethan might be a dual. He's in Evans too. That's different than UTC which always cancels their meetings

Chris L: I've been talking for a long time so I'll stop there. Please ask me afterwards if anyone else has any questions on these. So does anyone have any announcements?

Evan: So we decided we're electing executive senators at this meeting. We still have four executive senators so they won't start until June 16th?

Chris L: Yes, but they can start coming to meetings.

Evan: We just might want to make that clear.

Chris L: Yes. Any other announcements? Then I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Evan: So moved.

Alice: Second.

Chris L: Any objections? Thank you everyone.