



**GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL
STUDENT SENATE**

Exec Meeting Minutes

February 14, 2018 /HUB 303

Members Present

GPSS President: Soh Yeun (Elloise) Kim
GPSS Secretary: Giuliana Conti
GPSS Vice President of External Affairs: Tori Hernandez
GPSS Executive Senator: Elizabeth Oestreich
GPSS Executive Senator: Noelle Symanski
GPSS Executive Senator: Grant Williamson
GPSS Executive Senator: Laura Taylor
ASUW Director of Internal Policy and the Liaison: Bo Goodrich
HUB Director: Justin Camputaro

1. Call to Order **5:31 PM**

2. Approval of the Agenda **5:31 PM**

Elloise Kim: Adds one more item to the agenda -Action item for SAGE delegation.

Giuliana Conti: Approves the agenda

Tori Hernandez: Seconds

3. Approval of Minutes **5:32 PM**

Elloise Kim: Needs to approve two minutes in this meeting.

Tori Hernandez: Approves the minutes

Noelle Symanski: Seconds

4. **Guest: Sharon Hwee from MPH Program in Health Services 5:32 PM**

Elloise Kim: Jaron Reed Goddard who was a guest for this meeting could not make it to the Exec due to family emergency. She however will be present at the next Senate meeting.

All Officers and Exec Senators introduces themselves to Sharon.

Sharon Hwee: Shares information on Student Health Insurance and the survey results. Talks about how the campaign started. In 2014, there was a Student Health Insurance plan by UW staff to all students. Hall Health wanted to collect all data on student health insurance across campus. So, there was a survey conducted on Student Health Insurance.

Laura Taylor: Asks if that was largely for undergraduates.

Sharon Hwee: States data was collected from undergrads and grads. It was across campus in the Spring of 2017. Discovered there was a large number of students who did not have health insurance on campus. It disproportionately affected students almost all minority groups on campus. Wanted to do a little bit more with the survey. So therefore, started Huskies for Health Insurance with the mission to advocate for affordable and accessible access to insurance to all of UW students. Going over some of the basic insurance information, there are different types of insurance; Med-care – which is a federal health care program for 65 years or older, Medicaid - for low income student, Graduate Appointee Insurance Plan (GAIP) - only for qualified academic students and ISHIP which is the International Students Health Insurance Plan and an Administrative Health Insurance plan by Lifewise.

For everyone's understanding shares few more information on some of the aspects of insurance. Deductible is a specified amount that one pays for his/her health insurance that kicks in every year. So, the state and federal marketplace averaged last year for individuals \$4328. The way to interpret that is that last year, an average number of US Citizens had to pay \$4328 bill for their health insurance and started paying for any of their medical bills or part of it.

Premium is the monthly cost of health insurance plan regardless of one seeing a doctor or not. The co- insurance is a portion of medical charge one is in-charge of. The health insurance exchange or marketplace is an online market for public and private plans for comparing prices or benefits of the purchase coverage.

Darragh Kerr: Shares the background info on UW Ship. UW start offering insurance back in 1971. In 2010 came the other cares like ECA, The Obama Care etc. It wasn't active and that allowed Washington State to create an insurance exchange plans that Sharon just mentioned as well as extend insurance plan to family members. At this time UW decided to discontinue its student health Insurance plan. In 2017, Congress started to repeal and replace ECA but that didn't happen and at the same time health care costs continued to rise.

Sharon Hwee: In 2014, the ECA allowed to students to stay on their parents' plan until age 26. So, a lot of students left the health insurance plan which meant that the costs rose for people to stay on the plan. So, the premiums were coming really expensive. UW assumed that most students would get Medicaid or something affordable in the market place and they assumed that they soon will be able to get Medicaid or find affordable plan a marketplace

Shares some scenarios of how these policies affect the students today. All scenarios are based on true stories and real student situations right now. Harry is a doctoral student. Harry used to have health insurance as a kid, but he doesn't qualify for it anymore. He's a full time undergraduate student but there's no UW health insurance plan available at UW. He works part time, but his job doesn't offer health insurance. Because he's a doctoral student, he doesn't qualify for Medicaid even though he would as a low-income individual. He also cannot purchase health insurance plan because he is a doctoral student. That means Harry has no options to purchase health care through school, through work, or through any government or private system. Lisa is a Doctoral student in a non - eligible position and she is an RA and that doesn't provide her with the benefit of GAIP. She is over 26 years old and cannot be on her parents' plan. She has too much money to be considered low income and to qualify for insurance.

Giuliana Conti: Asks if that income is from her RA position.

Sharon Hwee: States yes. So, her only option now is to purchase a plan on exchange, but the premiums and deductibles are varying heavily. Her deductibles are between 170 to 600 dollars. Maybe her affordability is a question.

Grant Williamson: Shares that his understanding was that all RAs must qualify as academic student employees under the union contract.

Sharon Hwee: States that RAs only get GAIP if they are considered as student employees. The RA positions that work for only 10-15 hours a week are the ones that are affected.

Grant Williamson: Asks if they can give this presentation to the Union because it sounds like they would benefit from this information.

Sharon Hwee: Agrees.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Asks if the deductible is monthly or yearly.

Sharon Hwee: Says its yearly and that was from looking at the exchange currently. Moving to the final example, Ron is 19 years old and he is an out-of-state student. He is on his parent's private plan who are based out of California. He can't qualify for Medicaid because he is not a WA state resident. If Ron wanted a full coverage the entire year he was a student here, his parents could pay for health insurance plans in two different states. Even though it's costly it maybe his only option.

Giuliana Conti: Points that for Medicaid one doesn't have to be a registered a resident of Washington state because when she first moved here she had Medicaid immediately as a California resident but now living in the state of Washington.

Darragh Kerr: Clarifies that the law states that one have to be a resident of the Washington state to be eligible. It is a bit loose in terms of definition because there is no proof required to prove anything.

Giuliana Conti: Shares that to be considered a resident, it has to be a year after one graduates.

Noelle Symanski: Asks what's the definition of domiciliary used and if it's the same as UW.

Sharon Hwee: Says they're very different. Shares the results for the survey. 4000 students completed the survey. About 60% reported that they had in state health insurance. 20% reported being on Medicaid. 12.6 % had out of state private health insurance plan. 5% of students at UW doesn't have health insurance. Breaking that down, about 6.1% of undergraduates don't have insurance. About 3.5% graduate & professional students don't have insurance. That's over 2000 students without health insurance.

40% of US citizens have health insurance & 89% percent who are legal permanent residents have health insurance and over 31.6% of undocumented students also have health insurance as per the survey. Saw disparities too pertaining to sexual orientation, gender and race ethnicity. This data helps to see how this policy plays and contributes to the story of these other things and then what are the consequences. Looking at what are the consequences of not having health insurance, nearly 25% of uninsured students on campus said that they have medical debt compared to 15% of students with insurance. Medical debt is on top of student loan debt. It can be very stressful. Health insurance is also about productivity and giving every student the ability to achieve succeed academically.

Has a couple of steps that are being worked on going forward. One of them is to clarify if RCW is a barrier or not. Several of the administrators have quoted this RCW as the legal barrier for granting students with health plan. Wants to clarify this legal interpretation more because the intention is to make health insurance more affordable. Need to communicate to the school administration that this is an issue that affects students highly. Hoping to partner with GPSS and ASUW in some way to achieve this.

Giuliana Conti: Asks if they have connections to people in Senate that they know of?

Sharon Hwee: States they have been working with Peder. Last year they met with Matt as well. Would love to partner with GPSS, understand the process of how it works, and also have a petition that's signed by 84 people.

Elloise Kim: Requests them to send the information link to be shared with the Senators.

Tori Hernandez: Points that they themselves can write a resolution and it doesn't have to be Senators. Giuliana's resolution workshops will help learn how to write a resolution.

Bo Goodrich: Asks if they have met with an ASUW Senate to present this?

Sharon Hwee: States they are presenting to ASUW next week for Board of Directors.

5. SAGE Delegate Criteria and Selection

6:00 PM

Elloise Kim: Shares that this is to decide to attend SAGE and if there is a need to extend the delegation membership to other people as well. It is an effort to improve transparency and build a structural process for the future delegation decision. It doesn't require any approvals except President and VP of External Affairs. Last year for the very first time the Policy Director had joined the delegation for Spring SAGE. VP of Internal Affairs joined two years ago. Trying to stabilize it and added Peder as the sixth person who will be a part of the delegation. Matt to share the draft with everyone. If there is a strong desire from any of the students to join the delegation, they have to be given the criteria to decide if they can or cannot join.

Laura Taylor: Seeks clarification on their intention to add Peder to the delegation.

Elloise Kim: Shares that when Peder expressed interest, she asked if other people also know about the opportunity. So, this document clarifies that concern. So, Matt wants to propose Peder join the delegation which will be a pilot.

Laura Taylor: Seeks clarification on why Peder gets precedence over others?

Elloise Kim: Shares that's the reason it is being discussed with Exec currently.

Grant Williamson: Shares that since UW wants to be maximally effective in its lobbying, adding additional students is part of being more effective in getting more stories. That being said it's difficult to discuss this without having either Matt or Kelsey in the meeting particularly because there are questions about the effectiveness of lobbying in this way versus lobbying that way, is adding a sixth person deluding the group or sending or should more than six people be sent etc.

Elloise Kim: Clarifies that Matt, Kelsey and she discussed this. UW is the second biggest group to send delegation to DC. Personally, thinks the group should not be extended too much as it will be ineffective and big group becomes very hard to control. It should not include more than six people.

Tori Hernandez: Makes a motion to table this discussion until Matt, Peder and Kelsey can be there to discuss.

Elloise Kim: Shares that she has added an action item after this. However, today's action is that two members needs to be decided; and those are Kelsey's position and Tori's positions. If there is a discomfort in making a decision, it can be postponed.

Giuliana Conti: Seconds

Elizabeth Oestreich: Objects

Elloise Kim: Disagrees with the motion and the statement because she believes that Matt needed the two names atleast to be finalized and this was made clear in her discussion the previous day. She is infect representing Matt when she says that.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Asks when the SAGE event is.

Elloise Kim: States it's in April. Changes every year depending on all school's schedules.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Clarifies that there is another Exec meeting before deciding it. Highlights that going from 2 to 6 is ridiculous based on the budget cuts that GPSS had. Also disagrees with going for Travel grants because it is for all Senators and they all should be getting equal opportunity to avail those funds.

Laura Taylor: Adds that if someone else wants to take Peder's spot and go for SAGE regardless of whether they can pay or not, they should have the opportunity and they should have been advertised in a way that was more inclusive. Since Peder is not here, it's a tough and weird decision to make.

Elloise Kim: Suggests leaving Peder out from this discussion as this was supposed to be only information sharing session. Agrees with Laura that every Senator should be granted the opportunity to consider. However, different departments have different ways of selecting Senators. Evan's School has better understanding of SAGE and such aspects.

Grant Williamson: States that the motion needs to be voted as there was an objection and they are still discussing things that still need the respective/particular people.

Noelle Symanski: Asks if whole of UW has one vote for SAGE delegation.

Elloise Kim: Clarifies that UW has one vote for SAGE delegation as a whole.

Laura Taylor: Agrees with Tori and Grant that this needs to be tabled because Matt and Kelsey aren't there.

Bo Goodrich: Moves the previous question back so that they can vote on that and move on. So, Tori tabled this to next week until people are here and since there was an objection, it was debated and then he moved the previous question back so that he could vote on tabling.

Majority vote in favor. Motion passed.

Tori Hernandez: Makes a motion to table it to next week

Grant Williamson: Seconds

6. Resolution Revision Tool

6.20 PM

Giuliana Conti: Shares that last year, Catalyst was used for resolutions. There is a setting in Google Docs where you can share it so that people regardless of whether they have a Google account which is the biggest issue are still able to go to the link and make comments. That that seems like the most logical route because Google Docs offers a lot of options for editing and commenting.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Shares that everybody who has UW email should have access.

Giuliana Conti: States not necessarily since UW email on Gmail is a choice. Shares that one of the safeguards that she has in place for this is that you can house the Google doc with folders and so her plan is that after people weigh in, she would make a direct copy to include all the comments and how is it within the Officers team drives because GPSS has folders for each part of everything that they do and so that it would still be a living document that would be assigned to the gpssec@uw.edu id and that would allow for the original copy which is associated with the GPSS Secretary e-mail but then also a copy of it within the team drive that is accessible to officers for archives.

Justin Computaro: Suggests looking into the safety of using Google docs as there have been issues about docs being shared etc.

Elloise Kim: Suggests communicating the tools at the earliest.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Asks if someone can view and edit the resolutions on Google docs?

Giuliana Conti: States no because there's an option for multiple layers of accessibility; there's the view only, comment only and edit and that she has selected "comment only".

Bo Goodrich: Thinks that as long as there is a way of saving it later and recording it, Google doc solution is pretty effective. It allows people to see what other people are thinking and like to add to what they said and one can see what's really going on. It's also pretty accessible if it's a link.

Grant Williamson: Moves that they use Google docs for this and in future until IT asks not to use.

Giuliana Conti: Shares that they have two resolutions that they'll be using this month.

7. OSFA update

6:27 PM

Elloise Kim: Had a meeting with the Office of Student Financial Aid. After hearing GPSS's feedback, they have shared a document with updates. Disagreed with them earlier along with ASUW University Affairs Director. They have reworked, and this is the rough draft. Shares the draft with everyone.

Grant Williamson: Points that the actual cost it should be listed as the actual cost. Does it hurt the university to state the actual cost?

Elloise Kim: States that their reasoning behind being conservative with this number is when the cost is shown as high number, they are afraid that students would borrow more money than necessary and get into debts.

Grant Williamson: States that's completely unacceptable as students should be able to make these financial decisions for themselves and should be trusted to do it as adults. Yes, some are going to make mistakes but limiting this financial aid, so they can do what they do is way worse.

Elloise Kim: Shares a point of information that it's not for aid but for general students.

Giuliana Conti: Suggests mandatory online training for people to familiarize them on interest rates, compound rates, relevant costs and managing budgets that maybe some people are really good at would find boring but other people are not good at and find useful.

Elloise Kim: Shares that she suggested OSFA to change the language in the document such as living on campus, living off-campus, living with parents/relatives etc. This language has been used for over 25 years and its high-time they changed. But the OSFA is very conservative.

Grant Williamson: Going back to the point of them not showing the real increases, points that this makes it hard for the university to combat the stuff that's going up way too much. For example, book fees is increased by 20% in few years like that's an area the university should be focusing on to keep costs down for students because that's way too large of an increase. So, if this is distorted it causes problems not just for the financial aid or learning what students should be doing and helping students. Don't think it helps students actually make good decisions or not

knowing what it is but it also makes it hard for the university itself to combat areas because this is a kind of a guiding document of the university on these issues.

Elloise Kim: Agrees. Hopeful of changes of the languages. Unless there are strong objections to line items, it will stay as they are. Another suggestion that she has made is more and more electronic devices. They are interested in revamping the website as it needs work. They will be seeking inputs on website structure etc.

8. Review of Feb. 7 Senate Meeting

6:40 PM

Elloise Kim: Shares that she particularly added this item to the agenda to discuss the topic on Good of the Order. Invites comments on structure.

Tori Hernandez: Suggests one structural change during the meetings which is to have the action items at the beginning after guests that way Senators won't miss out anything.

Laura Taylor: Points that back in the day people used to stand up and give announcements that were helpful. Suggests bringing it back as people are upset about not getting to do that anymore.

Grant Williamson: Points that it still exists and he himself has made announcements.

Elloise Kim: Highlights the need for better time to make announcements. Asks if they want to change the time for announcements.

Grant Williamson: Points that's not what he heard from the feedback. The feedback was about any announcements that has an action items to be moved to the front.

Elloise Kim: Seeks suggestions on how to announce the Fall Social event that's coming up.

Tori Hernandez: Suggests action items as upcoming events to be under new business.

Grant Williamson: Agrees.

Giuliana Conti: Asks why it can't be part of agenda?

Grant Williamson: Clarifies that Senators wanted it after guests. They specifically asked for it after guests.

Laura Taylor: Points that when they were having the Elections Committee elections, one of the things that people felt was that they did not have enough time to think about being a part of the committee. Asks if that was part of the email announcement or not?

Giuliana Conti: Clarifies that it was part of the email announcement.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Suggests live streaming and saving meetings for people to view it later. Suggests ponopto.

Giuliana Conti: Shares her concern regarding the attendance which is at 38%. Live streaming would be a stronger reason for people to not to come for the meetings.

Tori Hernandez: Points that one of the concerns is affordability of doing it and the other concern is if they are doing live streaming and saving the recordings, it has to be published as public records.

Elloise Kim: Asks how many thinks live streaming or equivalent is going to be effective?

Tori Hernandez: States it would be effective, but it would be expensive and additional layer of work.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Likes the idea of live streaming as it grants accessibility but people not showing up for meeting would be a concern.

Laura Taylor: Agrees.

Grant Williamson: Agrees too.

Giuliana Conti: Points that minutes offers the summary.

Noelle Symanski: Shares that even podcasts are great way of listening to the summary.

Giuliana Conti: Points that minutes highlights the names against the comments. The recordings must be of great quality as well for it to be broadcasted as podcasts.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Likes the idea of live streaming as it grants accessibility but people not showing up for meeting would be a concern. In terms of trying to increase access, minutes are there but there are times when people have not read the minutes or just skim through the minutes later. Minutes are rough to read through. Likes the idea of a podcast that one could listen to. The video would potentially also be more engaging in terms of trying to create more access to the information you're putting out, purpose like identifying people on the record could have another form. It could potentially be a great access.

Elloise Kim: Suggests Tori & Giuliana look at options of replacing minutes with Podcasts and videos. There could be a test period. A new addition would be an addition more than a replacement.

Giuliana Conti: States that she would talk to Britney because she's also been looking at this for people who want to record when they have students with disabilities in their class and what she's finding is that accessibility and cost efficiency or feasibility of technology for this exact purpose is just not here on campus. There is no infrastructure and hence might need to purchase GPSS' own equipment.

Elloise Kim: Asks if there are any further comments.

Laura Taylor: Suggests having the document up displayed when the document is being discussed. This is in reference to last meeting's resolution discussion/reading.

Giuliana Conti: Highlights that their point was more about supporting those who are overseeing the changing document because it could easily have been just pasted in that document as it stood at that time into the resolution but that document is changing as they go through the negotiation process and the resolution is in support of the bargaining demands that are being advocated for by the people in that process as they fluctuate through the demand.

Noelle Symanski: Agrees with Laura in having the document up, to know the context.

Giuliana Conti: Shares that it was sent out a week earlier.

Laura Taylor: Points that it was getting a little bit patronizing in front of everybody when she was told "you should've figured this out by now" because she believes she was not the only person in the room who was confused. So, it helps if they could be a little bit more aware of the fact by dropping a line saying these are the "three things we're talking about" instead of spending 2 minutes asking people to read the resolution beforehand etc.

Giuliana Conti: Clarifies that was not her intention at all to communicate. Her thought process was more geared towards time efficiency and hoping that because the document was emailed and was hoping that that would instill more of an urgency for people to read rather than say "OK so I emailed it but let's go over to anyways" even though that was not the central purpose of the resolution. In that moment she admits having also come into conflict with what to do and may not have handled it the best way, but it was difficult to make that decision once she was up in front of the entire body. That's valuable feedback. Looking forward to seeing people engage with that online because she is sending it out tonight and if that's something that people want, she is happy to include that and then it also means that maybe it wasn't communicated as efficiently as it could have been.

Grant Williamson: Points that they did talk about it in Exec a week before so was hoping to receive feedback from there about how to make it more accessible and it was here for people to use and if that had been the case would have changed it and again it's being put on the spot on the floor and probably didn't handle it as well as we could have been. Feels like the thrust of the resolution was also to some like the trust on union that they're going to advocate for graduate students and GPSS wants to support them regardless and this is also coming from past years where GPSS has spent an hour debating whether everyone agrees with individual points when someone is trying to write a resolution to just support a general group and he really did not want to get into that trench because they know how the Senate body starts to move when they get into this. They probably don't agree with the wording of all the little points and when that's happened in the past it means the resolution gets stuck and therefore, didn't want the first resolution of the year to see getting stuck on.

Laura Taylor: Points that he is making an assumption. Not everybody agrees everything that the Union does. Most people might assume that they do good every time but not every single person.

Giuliana Conti: Highlights that's the whole point of the voting process. There are numerous resolutions that come through that not everyone is going to agree upon, but a resolution is testing the waters to see if as a graduate body, this is something that Senators agree upon. So, as it stands, people disagree with that generally because they fundamentally disagree with the Union or don't trust them, then that's going to come through in a vote.

Tori Hernandez: Highlights that the topics are digressing. Suggests continuing reviewing the meeting.

Laura Taylor: Objects and wants to add 2 minutes into the conversation.

Giuliana Conti: Seconds

Laura Taylor: States that the reason for bringing that up is not to pick on the resolution but it was more of trying to bring like general feedback to Exec.

Giuliana Conti: Thanks Laura for her feedback. Regardless of whether or not this is where these things should be said or not, it's great that its actually being practiced because if that's a concern of Laura's and if that was an uncomfortable experience that she has contributed to in any way, she appreciates being told. But these are also important considerations for anyone who brings resolutions across especially if those resolutions are not being sponsored by anyone from GPSS.

9. Next Senate Meeting Agenda -Feb 21st '18

7:10 PM

Elloise Kim: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda, Approval of Minutes. Student Regent is going to be the guest and wants to know for how long she should talk?

Laura Taylor: 15 - 20 minutes.

Elizabeth Oestreich: 20 minutes.

Grant Williamson: Shares that from what he has been hearing about Jaron versus Austin last year, she is very much excited to be listening to people and bringing her feedback back to the region. So, giving her more time to actually hear the students asked the questions could potentially be useful. Just based on what Jaron has presented as her personal goals for the year, suggests 30 minutes for her.

Laura Taylor: Asks if Jaron has access to Slido.

Giuliana Conti: States she gets the emails.

Laura Taylor: Highlights if there are multiple questions slightly differently worded questions, she would know those.

Elloise Kim: Shares that the problem is that most questions come in 5 minutes after a guest starts to talk.

Giuliana Conti: Suggests figuring out the rest of our schedule and then come back to this last.

Elloise Kim: Agrees. Continues calling out rest of the items on the agenda. Old Business, resolution on bargaining for Union for 5 minutes.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Suggests discussing about the parli pro beforehand to ensure everyone knows it well.

Giuliana Conti: Agrees. Shares that there's friendly amendments which don't take movements that can be just chosen to take them or not.

Laura Taylor: Suggests having a slide on parli pro to clarify things.

Tori Hernandez: Suggests a 5 minutes overview on resolution Parli Procedure.

Giuliana Conti: States that would still constitute as old business as they have gone over it.

Tori Hernandez: Also suggests tabling the minor changes.

Elloise Kim: Asks for a title.

Tori Hernandez: States it can be called "Resolution overview"

Grant Williamson: Suggests splitting the screen with resolution on one side and parli pro on another.

Giuliana Conti: Agrees.

Elloise Kim: Continues with 10 minutes for Union resolution. Going to GPSS upcoming actions items, it will be 5 minutes. Michael, Suraksha and others have drafted the resolution on international CPT fees. That would need just 5 minutes. Gone through the resolution. Will be sharing more on Officer reports. Good of the Order might be about last Saturday.

Tori Hernandez: Asks if she wants Exec to put this across as the topic.

Giuliana Conti: Recommends that they say that it's going with good of the order and invite people to come with discussion topics and if that comes up it comes up, GPSS should discourage

themselves from promoting it as a discussion as GPSS are a non-partisan party and that might seem like taking sides. Was part of a very lengthy discussion with ASUW one similar discussion last week and her recommendation personally would be for those at this table to stay neutral in bringing it up but of course everyone is welcome to have their own opinions. Just want people to know that GPSS is a non-partisan body.

Grant Williamson: Points that there's a difference between being non-partisan and talking about major issues that are occurring on campus. This is a major issue that's occurring on campus and this comes to some of the stuff that was talked about that there definitely is based on the destruction the band caused on campus there are some pretty clear violations of some of the student codes of conduct. That said, the student code of conduct, free speech definitely supersedes any of those code of conduct violations. It's based on what's written into the way that the Constitution or supersedes all of it. So, based on that, what they're doing is completely within their rights as a student organization, the student code of conduct and if GPSS were advocating to shut down future events that's very different than discussing what happened.

Tori Hernandez: Asks if these are somethings they want to say on email this week or open the topic right then. Feels that there is a need for someone to facilitate the conversation.

Elloise Kim: Shares a point of information that GPSS should be non-partisan when it comes to advocacy. But when it comes to positioning of certain issues, GPSS can be bi-partisan in terms of respecting everyone.

Giuliana Conti: Highlights her concern that if they are going to talk about campus republicans vs. other campus groups, or through the language communicate a distinction that is reflective of political parties, at the same time thinks that there should be room for people to talk about grievances toward the cancellation of important events and the presence of this tension on the campus. Has no issue with anyone becoming involved but don't necessarily believe that GPSS should be the one to prompt the discussion as that would reflect on GPSS more than an involvement in the discussion and if anyone would need a facilitator she is happy to volunteer.

Grant Williamson: Agrees that they definitely need a facilitator if it's happening. Is aware that a lot of Senators do feel very strongly about this and there are constituents who feel very strongly about it, discussing it is concerning to me because of the partisanship issues but not discussing it is also concerning to me because of the level of interest of the senators.

Laura Taylor: Points that they shouldn't just assume that the Senate wants to talk about it. Suggests opening it out and let them talk about it.

Grant Williamson: Adds that if there is Good of the Order, they need to anticipate it coming up and wants to have someone planned as a facilitator and a step in that moment to say that the Exec and Officers have talked about this in an executive committee meeting and if this is of interest of the Senate body since GPSS is a nonpartisan organization and the College Republicans were within their right to do this on campus. Even if anyone disagree with it on a personal level, GPSS thinks facilitation of this is important and are going to have this discussion unless the Senate body objects.

Giuliana Conti: Adds that campus Republicans are GPSS constituents as much as others and just because the population ratio might be different and much smaller, that it would behoove to if they are drawn into this conversation to acknowledge that fact.

Tori Hernandez: Clarifies if they are going to have a topic or not.

Giuliana Conti: Yes. There will be a topic.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Curious if anyone has spoken with any of the College Republicans and if that would be something not in the Senate but doing outside I and also have heard concerns that GPSS is a very liberal body and that comes across and that GPSS don't seem very welcoming to other opinions. Suggests going a step further and really be welcoming.

Elloise Kim: Suggests being prepared as it seems like it would come up. Asks who would like to facilitate.

Laura Taylor: Shares that last year during elections time she had spoken to a few people who identify as part of the group of College of Republicans who since then have left the group. Wants to see if they have a safe space or not. Therefore, needs to be careful about the language that are to be used.

Noelle Symanski: Volunteers to be the facilitator.

Elloise Kim: Continues that she has asked her University Affairs Director to display and share the Senate Survey results. She will postpone it next one as it seems a bit incomplete.

Laura Taylor: Suggests adding a time for Guest, Jaron.

Tori Hernandez: Says 20 minutes.

Giuliana Conti: Suggests 25 minutes.

Elloise Kim: Highlights that the meeting is 85 minutes overall. Makes a motion to approve.

Giuliana Conti: Approves the agenda.

Grant Williamson: Seconds.

10. Executive Senator Reports

7:25 PM

Laura Taylor: Reports that there was the Research Advisory Board meeting after many cancellations. In response to what happened on Saturday, she believes that UW doesn't have any language about Guest Speakers.

Grant Williamson: Points that there is a language in the code of conduct but that's superseded by others.

Elloise Kim: Shares that the University is implementing policies about which event to organize in what way and look at events that could attract threats and security and impact the campus financially and emotionally. Looking at legal ways and one of the ideas that is being talked most at the most is about restricting students from inviting guests unless there's sponsorship. Suggests being watchful about what might come from the university.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Talks about resolutions on cancelling events, bringing speakers etc.

Laura Taylor: Agrees and points that the language should be straight and simple. Continues that she is currently working on the Dignity for incarcerated women Act. This is something that came out last year regarding not treating women like animals and give them the rights of human beings. It was installed in Senate in July and hasn't gone anywhere. Going to write an Op-ed with different groups and push that forward. Invites referrals. Might bring it to the Senate.

Grant Williamson: Requests Laura to share a bit more on the specifics of the act.

Laura Taylor: Shares that this would be an Act which could be looked at as a federal issue. There are quite a few different aspects to it. For instance, women who are pregnant can still legally be shackled. Women who are permitted to give birth in prison aren't allowed to hold the baby. That would be considered as inhumane.

The other piece of information that although she is in charge of the Elections Committee she doesn't have any of the others names and email ids. Asks if there was a preference for elections date.

Elloise Kim: States yes, May 2nd is the preferred date.

Laura Taylor: Has a graduation date. Will be gone on June 6th. Needs an exec senator to be on Elections Committee. If someone wants to be on the committee, she would step down sooner, so they can assume the role.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Asks if they start effective immediately or if there is a transition period.

Grant Williamson: States its effective immediately.

Noelle Symanski: Reports that the mental Health Ad-hoc committee met again. Started with the resolution. Good data. Contacted Advancement for additional counsellors in Law School. It was politely declined.

Elloise Kim: Shares that more than 90% of donation made to the university is designated for specific purposes. So, the university is sometimes confined and restricted to use those funds for few things.

Noelle Symanski: Shares that therefore the resolution is also looking at Advancement specifically. Shared analysis with Grant.

Grant Williamson: Suggests sharing the analysis with Senate if it's okay or talk about it in Good of the Order.

Elizabeth Oestreich: Reports that she spoke with Sam from the Union and trying to connect with someone who does the family friendly stuff. Childcare is allocated by the Financial Aid. If they get denied they are supposed to be automatically eligible for Union's childcare funding. It was interesting. Its concerning as well to know if people have been denied these funding as well. So in communication with federal. In communication and trying to figure out who made the decision.

Grant Williamson: Reports that there are a 122 people at the climate policy of state and twenty of them signed up to get on the emailing list.

Elloise Kim: Asks how much was spent?

Grant Williamson: States, about 150 dollars.

11. Officer Reports

7:43 PM

Bo Goodrich: Reports that he and Giuliana are looking in to home safe standards for all international students both undergrad and graduate and are meeting with FIUTS on 21st. Has resolutions come through with the post completion fees as well. Collaborating with GPSS on that hope to collaborate on Husky House health insurance too. Also, never had GPSS come to ASUW Board. Before the elections, it would be great to have everyone there.

Tori Hernandez: Reports that GPSS Senator Bystander training will be next quarter. Fall Social is next week. Need volunteers.

Giuliana Conti for Matt Munoz: Reports on Federal/SAGE. DACA/immigration is obviously still a major concern - a new draft deal was announced today that included granting legal status to young immigrants and authorizing \$25 billion for southern border-security - it's still developing, Don't have all the details, but tracking it. Call with Sarah Castro tomorrow to get more details and to see what the other relevant issues are. PROSPER is also top priority, working closely with SAGE to address that - they're putting together an advocacy packet to distribute, will update once that is available. SAGE Day on the Hill is April 8th-11th, prepping for that.

Reports on State/Olympia/WSA updates. Student Loan Bill of Rights is expected to pass off the floor tonight. Extremely excited, as the top legislative priority is within the bill. Meeting with legislators to schedule a hearing on the child care task force bill, and to get their support. Decoupling is moving along nicely, vets mental health was voted out of the Senate. WSA Board of Directors is this Sunday, he will be in attendance representing GPSS. The WSA is currently restructuring its bylaws - any suggestions on how WSA can improve its processes, to be sent to him. In beginning conversations with the WSA Executive Director to plan a graduate student issues summit after session - not sure when, the idea has just been floated, will be looking more into in the coming weeks

SLAB is currently working on collecting information relating to the campus climate around sexual assault and mental health, what processes are lacking, and how the situation can be improved, possibly at the state level. Working with SARVA to plan a town hall on Title IX and campus sexual assault issues for next quarter. Federal issues are also being folded into SLAB, especially the SAGE working group content. Mayor Jenny Durkan will be hosting a roundtable discussion this Friday from 10 am - 11:30 am downtown, focusing on free community college in Seattle; the WSA Director has given us one delegate spot, if GPSS would like to send one. While this issue does not affect graduate education directly, it does benefit the education pipeline leading to graduate education.

Giuliana Conti: Reports that Senate attendance was borderline not quorum. Had 38% in attendance last week and the quorum is 25%. Diversity Committee is going through a really fascinating transition. We're planning an event and now are actually scaling back and reassessing the missions and goal and creating more of a cohesive committee identity which is really encouraging something that will be really helpful especially for someone who ends up taking over her role and overseeing the committee. There's some deep things happening in diversity committee.

Elloise Kim: Shares that for Brad's position, she is in conversation with Rene. Duong has filled in for Brad very well as a Budget specialist.

Reports that the Faculty Senate Exec has approved the Resolution C. Will be introduced to the Faculty Senate and will be voted. Saturday was the big issue. Talked about it already. There is a high chance is that the President's picnic that provides tent, equipment, and decoration would not happen next year due to the cost involved. Because just the tent costs about 65K. So provost is leading the conversation and did a survey about the way to reduce the cost. The popular opinion was to remove President's picnic. It could affect the way Husky Sunrise could happen. With new Provost coming, it could be hard to get enough budget. Post completion OPT/CPT fee discussion is with ISS next Wednesday. Its concerning that the information was not known to other admins. They didn't feel the need to include student's voice. It should be included. ASUW University Affairs Director is helping her to push the agenda.

12.Adjournment

8:03 PM

Laura Taylor: Approves to adjourn

Tori Hernandez: Seconds
