



**GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL
STUDENT SENATE**

Senate Meeting Minutes

January 10, 2018 / HUB 334

1. Call to Order 5:33PM

2. Approval of Agenda

5:33 PM

Patrick Rice (Psychology): Moves to approve the Agenda

Jared Rowe (Jackson School): Seconds

3. Approval of Minutes

5:34 PM

Tim O' Neal (Neuroscience): Moves to approve the Minutes

Chase Kania (Fosters School, MBA): Seconds

4. Program Reviews, Graduate School

5:35 PM

Wesley Henry (Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Planning): Shares that program review is the process that every degree granting program goes through once every 10 years. It is often mandated by the State Legislature. Works directly with undergraduate Academic Affairs as well as the Provost Office but it is situated within the graduate school. When said school, college or department, that is based on the historic department orientation of schools and colleges. For example, the college of education internally is divided into many different departments but they are reviewed as an entire college. Runs through the program review process highlighting the importance of graduate and undergraduate students' inputs.

- 1) Notification and initiation of review - His office does all the activities of tracking program reviews and lets people know of all of the upcoming reviews to ensure timely completion.

- 2) Appoint review committee - the members are generally two faculty members and two from outside who have a great deal of expertise. This is deliberated to ensure no conflict of interest.
- 3) Charge meeting – Review teams and the other teams come together to discuss the problems that the school needs to tackle with the program review.
- 4) Self-Study and site visit agenda – Academic units write self-study and establish site visit agenda.
- 5) Site visit – Extends for 1.5 to 2 days in the campus and the meetings are jam packed which is a great opportunity of graduate students to be there and engage. It is also ensured that there are separate graduate and undergraduate student meetings. Also emphasizes that every academic unit shares their self-study materials with every stakeholder under their umbrella before it goes to the Review Committee.
- 6) Review committee report – This is submitted a month later and GPSS also has access to the report. Academic unit prepares written response
- 7) Final letter - Graduate School Council discusses report and response and makes recommendations to Graduate School Dean. Letter on final recommendation from Graduate School Dean is sent to academic unit Chair/Director, Dean / Chancellor and Provost.

Shares that in some ways it's very bureaucratic and it's very important for the students that their voices are heard. There are many ways to do that. It could be either feedback through self-study, engaging in a site visit or through having contact with the GPSS. Typically, the GPSS VP for Internal Affairs or the President or Proxy will come to the graduate program review meetings and be part of the council when the final recommendations are made.

Kelly Edwards (Associate Dean for Student & Postdoc Affairs, Grad School): Asks how are the final recommendations tracked and what are the consequences?

Wesley Henry (Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Planning): Shares that the final recommendations are tracked in many different ways and they are held accountable typically in Kelly's case, the College of Environment would hold the program accountable to making any sort of changes. One typical outcome they have witnessed is the need to hire more tenure tracked faculty. While it's an easy recommendation to make, it's a hard one to see through. Reports that his office is currently working on things like diversity plans. The formal outcome with respect to recommendations from program reviews really ranges from the suspension of offering a degree program all the way to offering that degree program for another 10 years. It's rare to have a degree program suspended.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Asks, why 10 years is chosen between program reviews as it seems too long to proactively deal with issues.

Wesley Henry (Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Planning): Shares that it is indeed a very long time. In any given year, they are doing about 20-25 reviews and so some of these is really related to capacity to develop the academic events that they have in the institution. In the recent times, review committee has been recommending action on each reports. It is getting more and more complex in terms of making sure that there is a more rapid check-in because fields are changing more rapidly. There are mechanisms to do that without a huge site visit. The process can take up to two years.

Elloise Kim (President) reads out the anonymous question posted in Slido: How do you ensure that graduate students in that program can see the final report, the departmental response, and the final recommendations?

Michael Diamond (Atmospheric Sciences): Asks, besides the one grad student meeting, how else can/should participate in the review? In particular, how could grads influence the self-directed goals?

Wesley Henry (Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Planning): Shares that traditionally the Provost's office has kept the resource of archive program review materials. That has not been happening for the last few years. In the process, right now, for the next month, building a complete archive that goes all the back to when program reviews started and it's also instantaneously updated. All documents go to public website that's accessible ensuring transparency. In terms of having the voice on self-study or self-guiding questions, they are constantly in influx trying to figure out how they can make sure that students voices are part of that. There are a number of ways that student voices are made sure are heard and are considered. In terms of making sure that there are extra questions, which are very specific to the field of extra questions, invites suggestions from Senators. A number of colleges and departments have some groups where they are hard into student guided questions. In the coming years, they will be ascertaining which colleges and departments have student groups.

Claire Pendergrast (Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences): Moves to approve to extend time by 5 minutes

Colton Myers (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance): Seconds

Zhiyun Mary Ma (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): Asks if some student missed the review period, how might they continue to participate/contribute to the program reviews?

Wesley Henry (Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Planning): Shares that it gets back to the fact that 10 years between program reviews is a very long time. Invites ideas from Senators. What his office does is work with student groups to make sure that some of those challenges and issues are elicited and are also looking at ways to incorporate feedback from exit summaries to make sure that review committees have access to that information. Sometimes it doesn't dig into the details of complexities of student challenges which is kind of another data point where review committees can really see student experience from a bird's eye for that number of years.

Elloise Kim (President) reads out the anonymous question posted in Slido: How long do the reviews last and does this determine funding?

Wesley Henry (Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Planning): Shares that the review process can last up to 2 years. The site visit is typically 2 days or larger at times. It does impact some funding. It is rare for review committee to walk out of a final exit discussion and not have said more resources need to be pumped into that academic unit. It is not necessarily impact funding in the way that review committee asks for additional funding for an academic unit and all of a

sudden gets it. Provost understands the needs of the academic funding across the three campuses and GPSS is really specific to the Seattle campus. Two years ago, a survey was done for all of the academic program reviews done in the last 10 years and looked for specific pain points that the academic units were having which was great amount of information and helped make some great decisions.

Elloise Kim (President) reads out the anonymous question posted in Slido: Where can the reports be found and when there is a 5-year mark additional review, where can that information be found?

Wesley Henry (Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Planning): Shares that the reports can be found on archives Grad school website: grad.uw.edu then go to Faculty/Staff tab and find Program Review reports and schedule. For academic units that have 3 or 5 years academic check in, that can be seen on review schedule that now has information all the way up till 2023.

5. Student Roles in Program Reviews

5:50 PM

Tori Hernandez (Vice President for Internal Affairs): Shares that Giuliana will be sharing a very real example of how graduate students make an impact in program review.

Giuliana Conti (Secretary): Shares that she is from the School of Music and the only from that School to participate in her school's program review. Emphasizes that her comments are reflective of her department's process and has nothing to do with the review committee's process. One cannot rely on the department to advertise it well. The meeting was at 8.30am and only one email was sent out. Since it was an early meeting, the likelihood of people showing up for the event is slim. Spoke her mind out about what she knows of her cohort. Due to short time of information, she could not get others' opinions or participation from her department. She wasn't sure what was expected out of her and hence she did not go with any preparation. Didn't know the degree of confidentiality or who were in the committee. After the review process, she heard nothing with the exception of one email that was sent by the Graduate Program Advisor telling her department about the program review meeting that they could go to. In the month's following issues and politics happening in the department, she was curious about what had happened. The Committee was incredibly enthusiastic about her presence and they took extra time for her. Whatever issues a department has, will trickle down to the students because they will be talking about open positions, funding, who is going to let people in or not and issues in the academia with regard to favoritism etc. With the help of another classmate, she created a Graduate School Committee for the School of Music which is now going over the public record documents and are formally requesting the non-public record documents. It is a long and slow process and wishes if they were more ahead of it, they could make a lot of difference. Requests Senators to be on the reviews if it's coming up for their departments. Considering its only once in 10 years, they have an opportunity to make an impact. It has been recommended that the School of Music dissolves considerable number of programs that can have serious repercussions on graduate students who are currently enrolled in it.

Inaudible: Asks if Tori from GPSS can advocate for mechanisms for this review process that directly go around the institution and straight to the students because if a department has issues with its own students, then they won't be the best ones to reach through.

Giuliana Conti (Secretary): Shares that according to the review, the topic of graduate students was rarely brought up in the self-study as well as the review process with the faculty and the rest of the school. So, the role that the graduate students play in a department is significant while it's possible that unless students do something actively about it, it may not be of huge consideration.

Lawrence Koster (Political Science): Makes a motion to extend time by 4 minutes

Christian Love (Education, Higher Education PhD): Seconds

Tori Hernandez (Vice President for Internal Affairs): Shares that GPSS has been involved in program reviews in the past and are still trying to figure out the best way to be involved and get the knowledge to students. After having meetings with the review committee, GPSS came up with a one pager to help students understand better about program reviews as it's not easy to understand program reviews otherwise. The most important part is attending the site visit with information from their respective constituents and also students to connect with GPSS Senators or a student organization. Having coffee hours to discuss issues that are going through the departments and being able to formulate that in a way that can be shared with the review committee at the site visit is vital for the review committees to understand what is going on with the student perspective. The one pager will be shared over an email. In her role as VP of Internal Affairs, she has been reaching out to different programs and departments who have program reviews coming up this year.

Wesley Henry (Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Planning): Requests everyone to give feedback about them as well either through GPSS or directly. Based on Giuliana's unfortunate experience, they now have much more insight of the agenda.

Elloise Kim (President): Highlights that one of the biggest problems is that since program reviews happen once a decade, requests Senators to spread the word so that younger students know about the program and share the importance of the program.

6. Executive Senator Nomination

6:00 PM

Elloise Kim (President): Invites Grant to share some highlights about the roles of Executive Senator. Also reminds that people could be nominated by other Senators or can nominate themselves.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Shares that the current Executive Committee developed a two-page Executive Committee guidelines on what they would look for in an Executive Senator. Overall, the basics are attending Executive Committee meetings, expected to know the Bylaws and constitution better than the other Senators, spend some time in the GPSS Office, work

towards building a shared culture across GPSS. In addition, Executive Senators are to act as Liaisons so there are a lot of committees that they can serve on and also learn about what's going on in the Executive Committee and bring it back to GPSS and share opinion as a Senate Body as a whole. Executive Committee should help to serve a longer time perspective for GPSS. Help guide the other Senators and Senate, do parli pro and function really smoothly. Overall, the position is about increasing GPSS's ability to advocate for graduate students. The Officers have very specific duties, the staff have a lot of duties and so as an Executive Senator, once can help with bandwidth to the organization pursue new projects and make sure all the current things are going well. Not expecting everyone to do all of those things, but a subset of few things that are of interest to them and as a whole Committee, follow all of those guidelines.

Lawrence Koster (Political Science): Asks what is the minimum term for the office?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Shares that the term is 2 years minimum unless they resign.

Elloise Kim (President): Highlights that in the past, it was indefinite. But last year, it was decided in the memorandum that the Officer after 2 years will be asked to re-run and then get the Senator's approval for another term.

Lawrence Koster (Political Science): Asks if the term begins next Wednesday and if they are required to be there during Summer quarter?

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Says yes for both. There are Executive Committee meetings during summer quarter although they are less frequent. According to Bylaws there will be meetings once a month during the summer quarter but it's difficult to get quorum in the summer. Strongly recommends attending at least one meeting a quarter.

Elloise Kim (President): Highlights that during the regular quarters, their consistent presence is highly expected. Thanks Grant and invites nominations.

Evan Fischer (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance): Nominates Colton Myers

Colton Myers (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance): Accepts the nomination

Seungeun Park (Nursing): Nominates Nate Dreesmann

Nate Dreesmann (Nursing): Accepts the nomination

Christian Love (Education, Higher Education PhD): Nominates Zhiyun Mary Ma

Zhiyun Mary Ma (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): Accepts the nomination

Beatrice Magistro (Political Science): Nominates Lawrence Koster

Lawrence Koster (Political Science): Declines as he won't be there next quarter

Elliott Okantey (Law): Nominates Noelle Symanski

Noelle Symanski (Law): Accepts the nomination

Elloise Kim (President): Closes nominations. Gives 2 minutes each per candidate followed by the Q&A session and voting.

Colton Myers (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance): Introduces himself. Says it's easy for him to be in front of people. He studied music in undergrad and he is studying policy now. He never intended to go to graduate school. When the policy massacre and election happened, he was compelled to be a voice and challenged himself to be an advocate for those who were elected in the upcoming years. Joined Evan's school to be that voice because that was the opportunity he was awarded with when growing up as family and that's one of the reasons he is in GPSS as he intends to be one of the voices and believes he could be a good advocate for them. He has gone through his own share of diversity of being able to speak to many different demographics of people on many different levels of discrimination. That being said, he is running for the Executive position because he believes he can bring back that role where he goes and wants someone to be able to lift all people up. Assures to continue to empower people and speak for the people he represents.

Nate Dreesmann (Nursing): Introduces himself. Shares he completed his undergrad from UW and he is a registered nurse. He was involved in lot of projects where a lot of representation didn't exist within Nursing school. Lot of undergrads didn't have voice and therefore he worked with others to basically help give them a voice. They could talk to the Dean through a student Council. Being back in Ph. D, he recognizes that there is a gap in upper and lower level. There is a lot of disconnect in the health sciences schools. With GPSS, there is an opportunity to help create much more cohesion between joining the campuses and especially at health sciences school. Wants to work with leadership amongst the health sciences school as well as the upper campus which allows to understand the big issues that are going on such as financials, equity and diversity. That drew him to being a Senator and that's what he looks forward to doing as an Executive Senator.

Zhiyun Mary Ma (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): Introduces herself. Shares that her undergrad was in English and writing. She was also a co-founder of a club called Translation. The club was about English translation, cultural translation or any translation one can think of. That is part of the reason why she is running for the position of Executive Senator. Believes that each and every individual is unique in terms of personality and culture. As a storyteller, she has travelled many ideas, perspectives and cultures that were once separate, are now together. Being an international student in an American University is very special and wants to bring as many as possible closer to one another. Hopes the Senators give her the chance to have this experience and help get to know each other better and tell the stories together.

Noelle Symanski (Law): Introduces herself. Shares that during her undergrad at UW, she was an ASUW Senator and also part of the Washington Student Association where she lobbied on behalf of undergrad and grad student issues in Olympia. After school, she was involved in two different campaigns – 1) State House race in the 43rd 2) Seattle City Hall. This has enabled her to talk to a lot of different people and connect better. Believes her communication skills are great. She also

worked in a Law firm for a little while. Regardless of the outcomes of this election, one thing she intends to work on is mental health on campus. In general, she looks forward to work on student advocacy.

Elloise Kim (President): Opens the floor for Q&A. Limits each candidates' responses to 30 seconds.

Rene (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance): Interested in the systems and the way that they work. A lot of them mentioned about reaching out to people and knowing their stories and experiences. Asks if they can share an example of how they have done that in a system before, how they reached out to people that they don't know and how they would like to that at GPSS.

Nate Dreesmann (Nursing): Shares that in the past when he was the President of the organization for students, he represented all the students in the cohort and there was no other way for them to have a voice. So, he basically knew who was coming up and who was being elected. He reached out to them directly to discuss things they can change, how they can do that together etc. Similarly, Health Sciences has Senators that reach out to other Senators creating more network with other Senators and reaching out to RSOs that are more departmental specific that can help create a positive change.

Colton Myers (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance): Shares that in his previous job, he did a lot of internal connecting with a lot of insurance companies. Having to be a voice for a client and advocating, he had to ensure he gained everybody's trust. Doing that built interconnectedness between insurance companies ensuring client's best interest were considered at large. It was hard in the beginning, but got easier protecting and advocating both party's interests.

Zhiyun Mary Ma (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): Shares an instance of how she and her friend introduced a program and reached out to Professor for introducing their work and asking for their help. Also reached out to students to contribute.

Noelle Symanski (Law): Shares that during her undergrad at UW, she was also the president of young democrats and she created a steamed debate with young Republicans. She came up with the most controversial questions. Talking to people and facilitating, enabled her to reach out to many. Believes facilitating is extremely important.

Jacob Ziegler (Chemistry): Asks each one to share how long their programs are for to know if they are actually going to fulfill the two-year tenure.

Nate Dreesmann (Nursing): States, in the School of Nursing, he has 3 to 7 years depending on funding.

Colton Myers (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance): States, his program is for 2 years and he is currently in the first year.

Zhiyun Mary Ma (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): States, her graduate program ends in March 2019, slightly before 2 years.

Noelle Symanski (Law): States, her program is for 3 years.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): States this is a volunteer position and so there is some limited amount of capacity not going to be able to do everything. Asks, what would be the biggest area of focus if they are elected.

Nate Dreesmann (Nursing): States, his focus would be in trying to get those departments that usually don't talk to each other to be able to work better together.

Colton Myers (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance): States his focus would be on being the advocate for the voices of people that haven't been heard so that they don't feel left out.

Zhiyun Mary Ma (Education - Leadership in Higher Education): States, her focus would be on having more students participate in GPSS and be able to take the opportunities.

Noelle Symanski (Law): States, her focus would be on inter-department mixing and mental health.

Senators cast their votes for the position of the Executive Senator. Candidates also vote for self or others.

7. GPSS Resolution

6:15 PM

Giuliana Conti (Secretary): Shares that resolution is something she wants to more for everyone to get acquainted with what they are capable of. When she started as a Senator in the first quarter of being at UW, she was a bit lost and unsure of her own potential. Talks about her resolution that she drafted and encourages Senators to check the other resolutions on the website. In her first quarter, she drafted a resolution with the help of two other Senators after the college shooting in Oregon that psychologically and emotionally affected her. Believes that was a complete violation of every sacred about school and learning. When she looked up on UW's website, she found out that the Active Shooter Training protocol was dismal and that the resources available for students, faculty on campus was inadequate. In her opinion and after talking to few other people, she was convinced that everyone felt the same way. So, the resolution was drafted asking the school administration to update not just the materials but the availability of materials. The impact of that resolution was that it went to the desk of Denzel Suite who had been working on it with other security people on campus – the UWPD, the safe campus; but it lit a bigger fire. By the end of the year a video specific to UW campus was created for Active Shooter Training and UWPD is offering on-campus training opportunities for all faculty, staff and students during different parts of the year. It is mandated during Freshmen orientation and undergrads. For grad students, it depends on the specific departments if they have mandated it. The materials online were made more accessible and easy to find. That's an example of what Senators can do. Over the next few months, hopes that there are people who come in with resolution they know of that has had tremendous impact on campus. A joint resolution between ASUW & GPSS is responsible for making The HUB happen several

years before it was planned. Bo from ASUW and Giuliana are working on other joint resolutions and wants ideas. Resolution is a venue for any change someone wants to make.

The resolutions can be found on GPSS website in the Records section. Shares that last year, there were many resolutions that were “in support of”. While resolutions are formal requests, one is not mandated to follow it. Resolutions does make a difference and helps administration know that something is a problem unless they are told and resolutions are the way to do that. The challenge will resolution is that they can be confusing while writing due to the structure and lingos. So, suggests, sharing their ideas if they have any for a resolution, and she would start putting them on her Secretary updates, in the email announcements etc. so that Senators will know who is interested on what and can reach out directly. Shares that she is also working on a resolution writing workshop. The resolution templates can be found online as well.

Elloise Kim (President): Asks who can be a writer and what is the requirement for sponsorship?

Giuliana Conti (Secretary): Shares that anyone (graduate and professional students) can write it. But the people who present it and bring it here have to be Senators. Even better if they can get faculty on board.

8. Executive Senator Election

6:25 PM

Laura Taylor (Molecular and Cellular Biology): Announces the election results - New Executive Senator is Noelle Symanski. Also announces that she will be graduating soon and hence her position will become available in Spring quarter. Encourages people to attend Executive Senator meetings even if they are not Executive Senators that will help them to know the process a bit better. The meetings happen alternate Wednesdays at 5.30pm in HUB 303.

9. Officer Reports

6:27 PM

Tori Hernandez (Vice President for Internal Affairs): Reports that UPASS Advisory Board Work Plan. Looking to update student support information. Provide resources for ORCA Lift. Looking to provide Nightride Evaluation has been extended for finals week. Also looking at how the planning for 2021 Northgate Link Light Rail Expansion will affect UPASS and ridership. 2018 Program Reviews (Winter Quarter) is coming up for Center for Digital Arts & Experimental Media (Feb. 1 & 2). Site Visit is scheduled for Feb. 2nd at 10:00 AM. Ten graduate students are listed for the site visit. Program review for Department of Urban Planning & Design (Feb. 5 & 6) is also coming up. Site visit is not scheduled yet.

Reports that she attended the Student Safety Advisory Board. If any questions facing student safety, invites Senators to talk to her come to the meetings on Wednesday at 4:00 PM. Winter Social is on Thursday, Feb. 22nd, 7:00 - 10:00 PM at HUB Games Area. There will be food and drinks.

Kelsey Hood (Policy Director) for Matt Munoz (Vice President of External Affairs): Reports that State advocacy is going well. Big focuses so far are the Student Loan Bill of Rights, child care resource bills, and decoupling which passed out of committee. The AG's office is looking for someone to talk to about their experience with student loan debt and servicers. They are looking for a group of very diverse group of people who have loan debts or other debts. Invites interested to contact her. In the Federal advocacy, there is a lot of DACA conversation happening. Lot of bipartisan support for finding a solution and a couple of bills are floating around. The biggest advocacy point is in making sure the Congress and Congressmen know it and help the most affected individuals. Expect updates and documents in the near future. SLAB meetings are on Fridays at 10 am in HUB 314. FLAB will incorporate – invites to contact her if interested in joining. Huskies on the Hill is happening on Monday, Jan. 29. Specific information will be shared later. Requests everyone to put up the posters.

Elloise Kim (President): Asks Kelsey to explain what SLAB and FLAB are.

Kelsey Hood (Policy Director): Shares that SLAB is State Legislative Advisory Board and FLAB is Federal Legislative Advisory Board. It's a great way to get involved.

Ridley Jones (Human-Centered Design and Engineering): Asks what decoupling means.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): States that currently the Student Activity fee is tied to the tuition. That was basically why there was budget crisis last year where Student Activity fee had previously had waivers to increase that fee every year even though tuition remained flat, there was no waiver last year. That caused a lot of problems for budgeting. So, decoupling is you can charge the fee to offer the services without having to increase tuitions.

Kelsey Hood (Policy Director): Adds that despite the tension last year, it has been going through well this year.

Sierra Adibi (Aeronautics & Astronautics): Asks what is Huskies on the Hill?

Kelsey Hood (Policy Director): Shares that Huskies on the Hill is the lobby day where GPSS and ASUW representatives along with students will be there to lobby. Every participant will get a packet which will have the Legislative Agenda. There's also a training on how to talk to Senators and how to conduct oneself during a meeting. The participants are expected to tell them why they are there and why the items are there in the Legislative Agenda.

Katie Reichard (Pharmacology): Asks if there is a bus or if they are expected to reach on their own.

Kelsey Hood (Policy Director): Shares that there will be a bus. There's also the option of waiver for grad students if they want to drive down on their own. Lunch will be provided there.

Francis Abugbilla (Jackson School PhD): Asks if it's happening in Seattle or in Olympia?

Kelsey Hood (Policy Director): Clarifies it's in Olympia, on the capital campus. Some of the meetings will have ASUW representatives and some of them will have just grad students based. It's a great opportunity to get together in smaller groups and discuss issues that can lead to significant changes.

Elloise Kim (President): Adds that one also doesn't need previous lobbying experience to participate in this.

Elloise Kim (President) for Brad Copenhaver (Treasurer): Reports that Special and Departmental Allocations applications are both LIVE. Encourages to spread the word to the respective departments. Travel Grant Applications for first was closed on Jan 3rd. There were few applications and hopes for many more in the next round. Students travelling for conferences can get funded through GPSS. F&B meeting is every Thursday at 5.30pm on GPSS office.

Giuliana Conti (Secretary): Reports that the next Diversity Committee meeting is tomorrow and needs quorum to decide on funding for applications. If interested in being a part of Diversity Committee, requests them to email her. A planning meeting is coming on 1/22 at 5.30pm in HUB 314. Discussion will be on event and resolution planning specific to diversity issues on campus. Some ideas proposed are monthly brown bag lunches in the intellectual house starting next month. Reports that they are in the process of doing a departmental representation historically over the past 7 years. Found the departments that are underrepresented. Those will be targeted to build representation in GPSS. Might seek Senators help to reach out to departments. Finally, a celebration in ECC for the anniversary of OMA&D Black Student Union. Invites, people to check it out and check out the website of OMA&D.

Sierra Adibi (Aeronautics & Astronautics): Asks if the meeting is on Monday the 22nd?

Giuliana Conti (Secretary): States yes.

Elloise Kim (President): Encourages everyone to complete the Senate Survey which is still open. Invites Louie Vital, University Affairs Director to talk about the survey.

Louie Vital (University Affairs Director): Shares that this is her first Senate meeting. Encourages people to take the survey that was sent last year by Giuliana. The reason for doing this is to learn more information about Senators to help better serve them. Currently, the response rate is 18% which is low and hence hopes to have more responses in the coming days.

Elloise Kim (President): Reports that quarterly newsletter was sent in December and received a lot of positive responses and feedback. Invites Senators to share their feedback on the content and format if any. Announced new Provost and Exec Vice President Mark Richard effective July 1. Since Mark is still with UC Berkeley, he will make a few visits to the university in the coming months to give consultation to the current Provost. Board of Regents meeting on Jan. 11. This year each month Academic and Student Affairs Com's report begins with a featured student experience.

Elizabeth Oestreich presents tomorrow on student veterans and other student experiences that she had at UW. Attended Higher Ed Reception in Olympia yesterday. The Regents and UWAA Trustees also went and discussed about Higher Ed and witnessed a mixed response. Invites everyone to participate in MLK Week events. MLK Birthday Party will be held tomorrow, Jan. 11 (Thu) 11 am - 3 pm in two locations. MGH 171, ECC 4-7pm. MLK Day of Service will be an all-day event in several locations. President Cauce will be there at the next Senate meeting on 1/24.

10. Announcements

6:50 PM

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): Shares that she is here as a GPSS family member to remind them that this year is a bargaining year. The contract that covers the employment of RAs, TAs, Reader/Grader, will expire in April. The union will be renegotiating the contract that will affect for the next 3 years. Meeting tomorrow in Savery at 5.30 pm. More details will be shared. Also, every department receives a sum of \$50 to do any event meeting in their department. So, Giuliana from Music, herself from Drama and a couple of other departments are coming together to hold a bigger meeting to talk about what issues people want them to bring to the bargaining committee. Invites interested people to join. The week of Jan 16th, the agenda needs to be approved and there should be people for that. The faster and more people approving will pose a stronger case to the administration. Encourages everyone to join.

Tori Hernandez (Vice President for Internal Affairs): Asks what about the people who haven't heard about this and are not a part of the Bargaining Committee; how can they get the information and sign off over the email.

Monica Cortes Viharo (Drama): States anyone and everybody who is a grad student can be a member. But, only Union members can vote on the contract. So, the option is to sign up as a Union member.

Grant Williamson (Molecular Engineering): Announces that Husky 100 is about how one is making a difference on campus and not necessarily academic based. The applications are open. Encourages people to nominate someone who seems like a good fit.

11. Adjournment

7:00 PM

No quorum to make the motion.
