GPSS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, October 21st 2020, 5:30pm via Zoom

Members present:

GPSS President Aaron Yared

GPSS Vice President of Internal Affairs Genevieve Hulley

GPSS Vice President of External Affairs Hannah Sieben

GPSS Secretary Logan C. Jarrell

GPSS Treasurer Julia Overfelt

Executive Senator Andrew Shumway

~~Executive Senator Terrence Pope~~

Executive Senator Monica Jensen

Executive Senator Marty Varela

ASUW Director of Internal Policy Antonio Gonzalez

Associate Director of Student Activities Rene Singleton

Associate Dean of Student and Postdoctoral Affairs Bill Mahoney

Husky Union Building Executive Director Justin Camputaro

# 1. [Action] Call to Order 5:32pm

**Aaron Yared** called the meeting to order at 5:32pm.

# 2. [Action] Approval of the Agenda 5:33pm

**Monica Jensen** moved to approve the agenda. **Hannah Sieben** seconded. No objections.

# 3. [Action] Approval of Minutes 5:34pm

**Logan Jarrell** moved to approve of the October 7th Executive Meeting minutes. **Andrew Shumway** seconded. No objections.

# 4. [Action] Student Technology Fee Proposal 5:35pm

**Yash Raj Sinna** introduced himself as the chair as the Student Technology Fee (STF) Committee and introduced Yaying Wang as the STF Committee’s Finance and Operations Manager. He said that the purpose of his visit was to get the STF’s annual funding plan approved for this academic year. He explained that every year before starting proposal cycles, the STF Committee first asks ASUW and GPSS to approve of the plans. He said that the STF Committee had student representatives to both governing bodies.

**Yash Raj Sinna** shared the STF Committee’s expenditures from last year. In the spring quarter of 2020, the STF Committee spent $520,000 on tech fee projects which made the total for the fiscal year come out to a total of $2.1 million. Yash Raj Sinna said that this total figure was less than what the STF Committee usually spends in a fiscal year. Their spending was low especially for spring quarter due to the pandemic restrictions. He cited the Open Public Meetings Act as the reason for restricting proposals and funding during the spring quarter and said that the turnout for proposals was a lot lower than usual. He said that the STF Committee received 58 proposals from 33 different departments last year. Out of these proposals, there were 10 computer labs, 3 remote computing projects, 11 machinery and research equipment, 11 collaborative technologies, 3 portable technologies, 0 frontier technologies, 1 software development project for CLUE tutoring, and 5 student softwares, the largest being a $400,000 project for LinkedIn Learning on all three campuses. He said that Spring 2020 was an odd quarter for the STF Committee as they only received 10 proposals, and of those, seven were funded. He compared those metrics with that of Spring 2019’s, where 51 proposals were received and 30 were funded. Yash Raj Sinna said that 2019 was one of the STF Committee’s best years, as they received a record number of proposals and spent a record amount of money. He said that last spring was disruptive and expressed his hope that the STF Committee would get back on track for spending this year.

Yash Raj Sinna said that last year the STF Committee was approved to allocate $8 million of their total budget for the fiscal year to spend, so their goal was to spend $2.8 million in the fall quarter, $2.2 million in the winter quarter, and $3 million in the spring. He explained that the targets were idealistic, but encouraged the STF Committee to reduce their reserve balance. He pointed to the goals listed in the yearly funding plan for reaching spending targets. He said that his plan for this quarter was to increase outreach efforts. He said that the STF Committee wonders why there were not as many proposals as anticipated in the spring and wants to confirm that all student groups are aware of STF and pitch their projects for funding from the STF Committee. Yash Raj Sinna said that in order to make up for the lost proposals from last spring, the STF Committee increased their allocation to $9 million. The breakdown for these funds are $3 million in fall quarter, $2 million in the winter, and $4 million in the spring. He said that while the intent of the STF Committee was to reach their funding targets, this was not a guarantee that the Committee would fund every project: all projects must be within the scope of STF funding.

Yash Raj Sinna shared a breakdown of the STF Committee’s total budget. After estimating the revenue for Fiscal Year ‘21, the STF has about $14.3 million in total and after estimated expenses, which include blocks, special projects, and budget for administration, the STF Committee has $9.9 million set out for the year. He explained that blocks were longer-term funding projects in partnership with departments, highlighting library computers and UDrive as examples. The departments who benefit from block funding report how the STF funding was spent during the year and the STF Committee decides whether to continue block funding every year.

Yash Raj Sinna said that the STF Committee’s second goal for the year was to implement a couple website features and that the Committee was currently in the process of hiring its own web developer. He said that another goal of the Committee was to create an inventory of proposals the STF has funded. He said that students visit the STF website without a clear understanding of what the STF provides and explained that the STF website was more of a database for internal use. He said that creating a more user-friendly website that outlines funded proposals would help students understand the purpose of STF as well as find research positions or RSO’s of interest. He said that another objective that the STF Committee worked on over the summer was solidifying their onboarding process and increasing efficiency of personnel transitioning from one position to another.

**Yaying Wang** said that she heard that previous onboardings for the STF Committee positions were unorganized, involved a lot of paperwork, and took an entire summer. This past summer, Sukeeret Dhaliwal, the STF Committee’s Proposal Officer, consolidated all the onboarding paperwork into a single Google Drive which streamlined the onboarding process for Yaying.

**Yash Raj Sinna** expressed his excitement for this year and expressed his aspiration to increase the number of STF proposals. He said that the STF Committee was aiming for over 100 proposals this year.

**Andrew Shumway** said that it seemed the STF Committee had $5 million in reserves. He asked if the money that was not spent last year rolled over into this year’s reserves, and, if so, how much of the reserve money is from last year’s roll-over.

**Yash Raj Sinna** confirmed that money not spent last year rolled over into this year’s reserves. He said that the rollover totaled $5 million and that this year’s budget was $9 million. He said that the total budget of $9 million was the rollover added to the expenditure budget after deducting expenses.

**Andrew Shumway** moved to extend time by 5 minutes. **Logan Jarrell** seconded. No objections.

**Monica Jensen** asked if there was an expedited process for resubmitting proposals that were rejected in the previous spring quarter.

**Yash Raj Sinna** said that none of the groups actually submitted proposals. Before the proposal cycle opened, it was established that the STF Committee would only hear proposals that assisted with COVID-19 relief on campus, so proposals for normal projects were not heard. However, the STF Committee did keep track of emails from interested groups and are currently reaching out to them.

**Logan Jarrell** asked whether the STF Committee would be able to notify GPSS of any proposals submitted by or for graduate or professional students once the inventory of STF proposals is created.

**Yash Raj Sinna** agreed to Logan Jarrell’s idea of tracking graduate and professional student utilization of STF. He said that all proposals had to include the estimated or observed usage between undergraduate and graduate students so that the funding was not skewed in favor of either undergraduate or graduate students.

**Andrew Shumway** asked how realistic this year’s $9 million dollar goal was, with reference to numbers from Fiscal Year ‘19.

**Yash Raj Sinna** said that he did not think it was realistic that the STF Committee would find $9 million worth of projects but having a financial buffer would be safe and would encourage the Committee to maximize the number of proposals accepted and help the Committee allocate money for each quarter. He said that the STF Committee had open positions for GPSS appointees. He asked what the process would be to recruit more members. He said that Julia Overfelft and A.J. Balatico were the current appointees. He said that according to the STF Committee Bylaws, there can be up to 4 GPSS members, and that having more would be great.

**Aaron Yared** said that he and Ashlee Abrantes, the Director of Student Affairs, were working on setting up a liaison program. He said that once they get that running, GPSS will be able to start recruiting students and sending them to different committees.

**Logan Jarrell** moved to approve the Student Technology Fee Proposal. **Andrew Shumway** seconded. No objections.

# 5. [Action] First Senate Meeting Debrief 5:53pm

**Rene Singleton** said she thought that the first Senate meeting went wonderfully. She said people were attentive and the presentations were good.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the breakout session helped Senators engage in the meeting. He said that such strategies should be employed again in future meetings.

**Hannah Sieben** said she liked the first Senate meeting and the Officer’s use of Poll Everywhere. She said that the meeting went smoothly and encouraged participation. She said she also liked the breakout session as it allowed people to talk to new people.

**Logan Jarrell** asked Andrew Shumway to speak to the issue he found with using Poll Everywhere for voting.

**Andrew Shumway** said he was blown away by the enthusiasm at the first Senate meeting. He recommended that GPSS not display live results of any vote so that Senators are not influenced by the majority’s voting behavior, and asked if there was a way to make Poll Everywhere only count the votes of registered Senators. He asked if any of the Executive Committee members knew how to only count the votes of registered Senators and offered to ask Jackie Wong, who ran Poll Everywhere for the past two years.

**Logan Jarrell** said he knew how to do it. He said it involved making Senators registered participants and that the Senate meetings were already like that because Poll Everywhere requires people to sign in with their UW credentials. Poll Everywhere currently only counts votes from Senators and Officers. He said it was a relatively streamlined process, but that GPSS needed to finalize the Senate roster. He said that he and Gina Rome, the Administrative Specialist, have made good progress on finalizing the Senate roster. He asked everyone how they felt about seeing live results for Senator voting. He said that this issue was brought up in the past and GPSS had already talked about integrating Poll Everywhere.

**Julia Overfelt** asked if GPSS could display the number of people responding, but hide how they responded. She said it would strike the balance between showing people that it was time to vote but not swaying anyone’s judgement by seeing results.

**Marty Varela** agreed with Andrew Shumway that watching people entering their ideas could have influenced the voting process. She said that votes should not be influenced in that way but that people should instead be encouraged to support ideas that they value without being concerned with whether others think the same. She expressed her support of showing a count of votes cast or showing the results immediately after the votes are cast.

**Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience)** also recommended that the live results of the vote not be shown. She said that before COVID-19, votes cast in person were done at once so there was no social pressure to vote a certain way. She expressed concern that GPSS would not be able to keep up with a fast turnover rate of Senators and fail to count votes of newly designated Senators.

**Aaron Yared** agreed with Britahny Baskin and said that it would ultimately depend on the robustness of the attendance system, tracking whether individual Senators were attending meetings and voting.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the task was not hard, but being diligent with collecting and updating information could be difficult. He said that this year’s attendance survey asked whether the person attending was a Senator or guest and that at the last meeting all but one person marked themself in the correct category. He said the number of attendees at the Senate meeting peaked at around 70, and 60 people filled out the attendance poll. He said he was able to verify the votes cast by Senators who did not fill out the attendance poll. He pointed out that in a contentious vote, he would have to be able to figure out where the majority was at that moment. He therefore recommended that a system be in place where only Senators would be allowed to vote.

**Aaron Yared** suggested that each Senator be given a unique key, which would solve the proxy issue, since the senator would be able to give their proxy the key.

**Logan Jarrell** agreed with Aaron Yared that the proxy issue was important to resolve, as it would be important to accurately count proxy votes, especially during contentious votes.

**Aaron Yared** agreed with Julia Overfelt’s idea of displaying the number of cast votes in real time, locking the results, and then displaying the results of the vote.

**Andrew Shumway** said that to bypass the proxy issue, last year’s Executive Committee decided to ask proxies to mark themselves as proxies on the attendance sheet so that the Executive Committee could cross-reference how the votes were cast. He asked Logan Jarrell what system was in place this year.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the same system was in place this year. He said that the attendance poll this year had 2 questions: 1) identify the word of the day, 2) identify which department you are representing and whether you are a proxy.

**Aaron Yared** said that the Washington Student Association would deal with contentious votes by telling voters that they would count and verify each vote and email the result of the vote to everyone in two days. He said it would not be an issue for GPSS to also utilize this method when it came to voting on issues such as last meeting’s resolution, but motions that mattered in the moment such as tabling a topic, could not be resolved in such a way.

**Logan Jarrell** referred to the poll for working group topics from the last Senate meeting. He said that GPSS has historically had 9 working groups that were headed by the graduate student members of the Executive Committee. He noted that there would be an election for another Executive Senator, bringing the number of graduate members on the Executive Committee to 10. He asked the Committee whether they wanted to increase the number of working groups to 10.

**Andrew Shumway** suggested that some working group topics be combined, citing “Tele/Mental Health” and “Mental Health and Well-being” as examples.

**Logan Jarrell** said he paired down the topics to the following: diversity, equity, inclusion and anti-racism; climate change; mental health and well-being; student parents and caregivers; university COVID response; international students; student health-insurance/health-care; undocumented students; virtual connection. He said that some of the topics could potentially be split.

**Genevieve Hulley** asked whether the number of working groups would stay at 9.

**Aaron Yared** said that the number of working groups should be increased to 10 because there were eventually going to be 10 members in the Executive Committee. He suggested that the formation of groups wait until the next Executive meeting so that the newly elected Executive Senator is fully on board with their responsibilities. He also said that there were only two more Senate meetings before the end of the quarter.

**Julia Overfelt** suggested that there be 9 working groups for now and then introduce one more working group at the start of winter quarter. She said this time frame would give Officers time to gather feedback from Senators about the working groups.

**Aaron Yared** asked what the newly elected Executive Senator would do if there were only 9 working groups. He said it was possible for them to join one of the 9 working groups. He also presented the possibility of creating 10 working groups and having the newly elected Executive Senator be forced into a working group that they were not passionate about. He suggested that the working groups be initiated at the next Executive meeting, but acknowledged the downsides of waiting until then.

**Andrew Shumway** said he agreed with only creating 9 working groups for now and then creating an additional working group once the Executive Senator election was over. He said there was no harm in having two Executive members on one working group.

**Monica Jensen** agreed with Andrew Shumway and Julia Overfelt. She said that having more Executive members than working groups allowed for flexibility should an Executive member not be able to make it to a Senate meeting.

**Logan Jarrell** said that it was good for the Executive Senator to have as much flexibility as they needed because they were coming into an already established group dynamic within the Executive Committee.

**Genevieve Hulley** said that the first Senate meeting built good momentum, so starting working groups as soon as possible would be a good way to keep people engaged.

**Logan Jarrell** asked which 9 working group topics to choose.

**Genevieve Hulley** recommended that the Executive Committee use the most popular topics from the poll. She said that the Committee could combine some of the topics.

**Logan Jarrell** said that both anti-racism and climate change appeared on the poll twice. He also said there were very similar topics such as “International Students” and “International Student Matters” as well as “Health Insurance” and “Healthcare.”

**Marty Varela** expressed her concern that the topic of International Students would not become a working group as it was tenth in popularity on the list of working group topics.

**Andrew Shumway** said that in the cleaned version of the list, the topic “International Students” ranked 7th.

**Aaron Yared** suggested that the Executive Committee members choose to be part of a working group that they were interested in.

**Monica Jensen** asked if there would be any overlap between the Equity and Accountability Committee (E&A) and the anti-racism working group.

**Logan Jarrell** said he was surprised to see so much support for an anti-racism group given that there was little participation in E&A. He also noted that the E&A had more institutional power than a working group.

**Marty Varela** said that it could be due to the resolution passed at the last Senate meeting and the ensuing discussion.

**Aaron Yared** agreed and said that working groups happen during the Senate meeting, so they might be more convenient for Senators to participate in. He also suggested that Logan Jarrell use the anti-racism working group to recruit people for E&A.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the working groups were created to provide a soft introduction to Senators about working in committees.

**Genevieve Hulley** motion to extend time by 5 minutes. **Logan Jarrell** seconded. No objections.

*The Executive Committee assigned themselves to the working groups as follows:*

* ***Marty Varela*** *for Virtual Connection*
* ***Monica Jensen*** *for University COVID Response.*
* ***Andrew Shumway*** *for Climate Change*
* ***Julia Overfelt*** *for Mental Health and Well-being*
* ***Genevieve Hulley*** *for Student parents and Caregivers.*
* ***Terrence Pope*** *for International Students*
* ***Hannah Sieben*** *for Student Health Insurance*
* ***Logan Jarrell*** *Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Anti-racism*
* ***Aaron Yared*** *for Undocumented Students*

**Aaron Yared** said that the Executive Committee would reevaluate the working group assignments come winter quarter and that the Executive members could swap committees if necessary in a week or two.

**Genevieve Hulley** suggested that if there was a working group that had too much overlap with other GPSS work, the Executive Committee would switch out the working group topic or figure out how to collaborate different parts of GPSS.

**Logan Jarrell** said that no interest was expressed by the Executive Committee regarding Zoom add-ons, so they would not vote on it.

**Aaron Yared** said that the current Zoom situation was going well, so there was currently no need for extra add-ons.

# 6. [Information] Theme 6:29pm

**Aaron Yared** said that the GPSS last year and the year before established a theme for their respective years. He said the first theme was “Spring Cleaning” and the second theme was “Connect.” He said that when he ran for office, he proposed the theme “Build” to succeed the previous “Connect” theme. He acknowledged that a lot of things had fallen apart due to COVID-19, and that “Build” may not be the most appropriate theme for this year.

**Marty Varela** suggested “Resilience” or something similar that expresses the incredibly dynamic state of people’s current lives.

**Aaron Yared** suggested “Thrive.”

**Hannah Sieben** said that “Resilience” expressed more flexibility, creative solutions, and moving forward. She wondered if “Thrive” was a bit too much when people were literally dying from COVID-19.

**Julia Overfelt** expressed support for “Resilience” since it had a community-based undertone.

**Marty Varela** suggested “Resilience: Let’s Bounce Back Together.” She said that any theme would bring people together, especially if it resonated with the group. She asked Antonio Gonzalez, Britahny Baskin, Christine Shoemaker, and Ashlee Abrantes for their input.

**Ashlee Abrantes** said she thought “Resilience” was a good idea.

**Christine Shoemaker (Dentistry)** introduced herself as a Senator and said she had self-nominated for the Executive Senator position and was at the meeting to learn and observe. She said she liked “Resilience” and the community-based motivation behind it. She said it did not undermine the suffering that people have endured thus far.

**Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience)** said she also liked “Resilience” because it acknowledges how much is going on and how stressful it is for everyone despite everyone’s efforts to act normal. She said “Resilience” captured the immense strength under the pressure of everything going on.

**Janis Shin** suggested “Overcome” since “Resilience” was focused on fighting, instead of surmounting a challenge.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the Executive Committee should consider how well this year’s theme would flow from last year’s theme. He said that he thought the Committee should acknowledge that there’s been a disruption, it should consider how last year’s work in the GPSS translated to where GPSS was now.

**Genevieve Hulley** suggested that the Executive Committee consider which part of speech to use when coming up with a theme word. She expressed support for “Resilience” as it meant GPSS was working hard and would keep working hard to her.

**Julia Overfelt** said that it seemed that the majority of the Executive Committee was in favor of “Resilience.” She asked for reasons why “Resilience” should not be the theme.

**Aaron Yared** said that “Thrive” was too tone deaf and “Survive” was too depressing. He said “Resilience” was in the middle of the two extremes.

**Monica Jensen** said that “Resilience” has the connotation that there are outside forces out of a person’s control but that the person was still able to keep going. She said that some of the things GPSS needed to work on were things that GPSS did themselves.

**Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience)** said that “Resilience” has the tone that something negative happened to a person, but that the person had a buffer against it and was able to deal with it well. She said it had a connotation that someone had bounced back quickly instead of enduring an ongoing challenge.

**Christina Shoemaker (Dentistry**) said that the denotation of “Resilience” included “bouncing back” or “springing forward.” She said a lot of people were struggling and would continue to struggle for the next year or beyond. She suggested “Perseverance” as the definition encompassed the idea of continuing to work in the face of hardship, even if there is little success. She said it was more of pushing through difficulties, not necessarily overcoming them, but still continuing those efforts.

**Marty Varela** moved to extend by time by 5 minutes. **Logan Jarrell** seconded. No objections.

**Aaron Yared** said that “Perseverance” sounded too much like “Survive.” He said “Adapt” did not give off as strong of a tone as the other words. He said that “Relentless” also felt a bit like “Thrive.”

**Marty Varela** suggested “Boundless.”

**Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience)** suggested “Persist.” She said it did not acknowledge that people wereliving in a difficult time, and may be too political since the feminist phrase “Nevertheless, she persisted” was recently made popular by US Senator Elizabeth Warren.

**Genevieve Hulley** expressed support for “Persist” but added that she did not believe that “Resilience” was a negative term. She said that choosing a word that acknowledges some negativity in a negative scenario was respectful for what people were going through. She said that resilience is about hardship, bouncing back from hardship, and persisting. She also said that the theme did not have to be confined to a single word.

**Aaron Yared** suggested the phrases “We shall overcome” due to its allusion to race, and “This, too, shall pass.” He suspected that the latter was a Bible quote.

**Marty Varela**, in reference to Aaron Yared’s suggested phrase “This, too, shall pass,” said that she did not want to convey that this current moment was not valuable nor beneficial. She said that people could hope for a difference in the future but could not discount the potential for good in the present moment. She said that the phrase suggested that people only look to the future and ignore the present struggles.

**Logan Jarrell** strongly cautioned against using the phrase “We shall overcome,” given that GPSS received a scorching critique for using the phrase “in solidarity.”

**Julia Overfelt** said that the top option for the theme seemed to be “Resilience.” She said she liked “Tenacity,” but no one expressed support for it.

**Logan Jarrell** suggested “Grit.” He said that it was appropriate to have some acknowledgement of negative things happening right now. He said it was important that the theme word should seek to have a resolution from the negativity. He said that it would be appropriate for the theme to be neutral and said that “Build” and “Adapt” were fairly neutral, although “Adapt” hinted at something to be done. “Rebuild” also suggested that something needs to be done. He reiterated that the theme for this year should follow with last year’s theme “Connect.”

**Marty Varela** suggested “Surviving and Thriving.”

**Aaron Yared** and **Logan Jarrell** expressed their support for “Surviving and Thriving.”

**Genevieve Hulley** said that “surviving” could be offensive because some people are literally dying.

**Christine Shoemaker (Dentistry)** said that she supports “Resilience” since it seemed the safest and least contentious. She said she liked “Surviving and Thriving” but that it could be problematic as many people were not surviving and thriving.

**Aaron Yared** said that the theme should be a little idealistic and that “Resilience” straddled the balance of being optimistic and recognizing that people were going through tough times.

**Monica Jensen** moved to extend time by 3 minutes. **Marty Varela** seconded. No objections.

**Aaron Yared** asked all the members of the Executive Committee to give consent on “Resilience” as the theme for this year’s GPSS. He said he would introduce the theme at the next Senate meeting.

**Logan Jarrell** recommended getting the feedback from the Senate as they might suggest ideas that the Executive Committee did not consider.

**Aaron Yared** said if the Senate did approve of it, then “Resilience” would become GPSS’s theme for the year.

**Genevieve Hulley** asked if “Resilience” could be the theme of the Executive Board so that the Senate did not have to vote on it.

**Aaron Yared** said picking a theme did not require a vote. He said as long as no one had any problems with it, it was fine.

# 7. [Information] Graduate and Professional Student Resource Fair 6:50pm

**Genevieve Hulley** said that the Graduate and Professional Resource Fair which was previously held in the HUB Ballroom, usually involved graduate students meeting 20-30 groups on campus. She said that this year, the Internal Affairs Committee was putting a new tab on their website and emailing all the groups that wanted to be involved. She said she asked at the last Senate meeting which groups the Senate wanted to see at the Q&A session on Zoom this year. She said that tonight was the last day people could respond to the form and that Jennifer Emmett, the Events Director, was compiling the results. She said that the Resource Fair’s date would be set based on the availability of all the invited groups. She said that the panel would be recorded and posted on the website for those who cannot attend the Resource Fair.

# 8. [Information] Announcements 6:52pm

**Logan Jarrell** said that E&A would have their first meeting tomorrow at 4:30pm. He also said he would attend the ASUW Board of Directors meeting at 5:30pm. He asked if GPSS had anything they wanted Logan to communicate at the Board meeting.

**Antonio Gonzalez** said that the ASUW Senate was trying to push for a joint resolution process, a formal way for both ASUW and GPSS to work on legislation together. He said that ASUW Officers reviewed their Bylaws and said there was currently no process to initiate a joint resolution process. He said ASUW’s Senate wanted to write a joint resolution with GPSS regarding UW’s divestment from fossil fuels. He said that the Resolution on divestment from fossil fuels was going to go through first reading in a week. He said that he needed to get in touch with the chair of E&A.

**Aaron Yared** asked Antonio Gonzalez how similar ASUW’s resolution on police divestment and Black lives was to GPSS’s resolution.

**Antonio Gonzalez** said he believed it was similar and encouraged the GPSS to write a joint resolution about police divestment and Black Lives with ASUW’s Senate. He said he would have to look back and check on the actual wording of the Resolution in order to be sure.

**Aaron Yared** volunteered to assist in drafting the joint resolution. He also suggested having a reconciliation process so that if there are two resolutions that are similar, then both parties would come together to change the wording to match their desires.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the resolution in question did not consider UW’s Police Department. He said it actually concerns the endowment and divestment from fossil fuel companies. He said it was consistent with Institutional Climate Actions, a RSO on campus formerly called Extinction Rebellion.

**Justin Camputaro** said that the application for the HUB’s scholarship for excellence in student leadership was due on October 30th. He encouraged everyone on the Executive Committee to apply. He said that he would pull the HUB Board of Representatives Committee together soon.

**Aaron Yared** said he was interested in serving on the Board. He invited Genevieve to also sit on the Board.

**Justin Camputaro** said that the representatives do not have to be members from the Executive Committee. He said that the liaison was oftentimes a Senator or a graduate student.

**Logan Jarrell** encouraged the guests interested in running for the Executive Senator position to reintroduce themselves.

***Christine Shoemaker (Dentistry)*** *introduced herself.*

***Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience)*** *introduced herself.*

# 9. [Action] Senate Agenda 7:01pm

**Aaron Yared** said that the Student Regent, Kristina Pogosian, was coming to the upcoming Senate meeting to introduce herself. She is the second student from UW Tacoma to be the Student Regent.

**Logan Jarrell** asked who would want to do the land acknowledgement at the next meeting.

**Hannah Sieben** volunteered to do the land acknowledgement.

**Andrew Shumway** asked whether the Senate meeting would include committee reports and Officer reports.

**Logan Jarrell** said that items on the new agenda were new but that the formatting was copied from the old agenda. He asked if the Executive Committee was in favor of hosting breakout rooms again at the next Senate meeting.

**Aaron Yared** said he was in favor of having breakout rooms because they increased senator involvement during the meeting. He asked what the question would be this time.

**Monica Jensen** suggested “Why did you come back?”

**Genevieve Hulley** suggested “What are you stressed out about right now?” as well as “What are some positives from your week?”

**Andrew Shumway** proposed that the breakout groups be lumped into working groups because the working groups will give people something to talk about. He also suggested that the working groups be initiated with an ice breaker.

**Julia Overfelt** suggested putting working groups after adjournment so that groups did not have to wait on each other to come back and adjourn the meeting. She asked if there was a way for people to choose to enter a specific breakout room so that Logan Jarrell did not have to individually sort people into breakout rooms.

**Aaron Yared** said he created rooms that meeting attendees could choose to go into and asked if other people could see them.

*Only co-hosts and meeting attendees that had recently updated Zoom could see the breakout rooms.*

**Britahny Baskin** suggested using the Gather Town platform. She said she had used it for her neuroscience retreat. To use it, people set up avatars and moved the avatars in a virtual room. The closer the avatar was to another avatar, then better they could see and hear each other.

**Julia Overfelt** asked how steep the learning curve was for Gather Town and whether people needed an account to use it.

**Britahny Baskin** said Gather Town had a steep learning curve. She said she did not recall having to log in. She offered to ask the organizer of her retreat whether the organizer had to set up anything. She said the avatar was customizable.

**Genevieve Hulley** asked whether Gather Town was a service that UW provided.

**Logan Jarrell** said if Gather Town was not provided by UW, it would be another expenditure.

**Aaron Yared** said he was able to create a space on Gather Town for free.

**Logan Jarrell** said if the gathering involved less than 25 people, the service was free. He said that working groups were typically larger than 25 people.

**Aaron Yared** said that GPSS would either have to create a town for each group or create a large town and have each group gather in their own corner.

**Julia Overfelt** asked whether figuring out Gather Town logistics was essential to building the meeting agenda.

**Logan Jarrell** suggested moving people into breakout rooms to have them discuss which working groups they were interested in. He also expressed support for providing the groups with a generic question like the last Senate meeting.

**Rene Singleton** asked the Executive Committee to explore Gather Town and let her know if there were fees involved so that she could assist the Committee in obtaining funding.

**Aaron Yared** asked whether the breakout groups would be combined with working groups or whether the working groups would be done after adjournment.

**Andrew Shumway** said he supported having working groups post adjournment. He said that having a crash course in parliamentary procedure may be helpful for everyone. He suggested that it either be a part of the breakout sessions or make it separate.

**Aaron Yared** said he had a cheat sheet from WSA regarding parliamentary procedure that he could share with the Senate members.

**Julia Overfelt** said that discussing parliamentary procedure in the breakout rooms would give people a chance to ask questions. She said it could help consolidate her own understanding of parliamentary procedure.

**Logan Jarrell** asked whether the land acknowledgement should be followed by a 5 minute course on parliamentary procedure and then send people into breakout rooms.

**Monica Jensen** said she supported learning activities in the breakout rooms in addition to having a “fun” question.

**Genevieve Hulley** said that there should be one “fun” question and then the breakout room attendees would learn parliamentary procedure together.

**Aaron Yared** expressed support for asking breakout room attendees what was their high and low of the week.

**Hannah Sieben** said she was not comfortable hosting a parliamentary procedure crash course.

**Logan Jarrell** asked whether a short introduction or primer should be given about parliamentary procedure before people are released into their breakout rooms.

**Aaron Yared** said that it would be a good idea to send Senators an email on Sunday detailing the possible groups. He said that after the meeting adjournment, the Senators could go to any group.

**Monica Jensen** said that regarding the parliamentary procedure, the Executive Committee should send the Senate a link about parliamentary procedure with important information highlighted.

***Aaron Yared*** *shared a link to a Robert’s Rules cheat sheet in the chat.*

**Logan Jarrell** said that Sturgis was more flexible than Robert’s Rules.

**Rene Singleton** said that she had provided a cheat sheet to the onboarding packets of the newly elected Officers last year.

**Logan Jarrell** said that Sturgis was a little rarer as people used Robert’s Rules more often. He said that the Executive Committee should make clear that anyone at any time can raise a Point of Inquiry to speak their intent and ask how to perform it in accordance with parliamentary procedure.

**Aaron Yared** asked whether the Executive Committee wanted to do the parliamentary procedure crash course before, after, or during the breakout rooms. He said that the breakout rooms would better serve as a warmup room with an icebreaker. He said that the parliamentary procedure cheat sheet could just be sent out.

**Andrew Shumway** said he thought it was important for the Senate to go over the basics of parliamentary procedure for 3-5 minutes. He cautioned against having Senators reading materials beforehand.

**Aaron Yared** suggested asking two questions in the breakout room: 1) What are the highs and the lows of your week? 2) What is something you don’t understand about parliamentary procedure? He said that the Senate could quickly review parliamentary procedure once out of the breakout rooms.

**Aaron Yared** asked how many committees would have something to report.

**Hannah Sieben** said that LAB was in session but that there was nothing to report out.

**Julia Overfelt** said F&B had not yet met, so there was nothing to report.

**Aaron Yared** suggested that the committee report time be used to recruit more committee members.

**Andrew Shumway** asked to have the Executive Senator election moved up to before the committee reports because it was an action item. He asked how much time should be given to each candidate for speeches. He asked if this year’s election would utilize ranked choice voting, which was also done last year.

**Aaron Yared** said that Executive Senator candidates would be given 1 minute to speak with a 30 second grace period.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the voting would not occur on Poll Everywhere because it was a ranked choice ballot.

**Aaron Yared** asked when the results of the vote would be posted.

**Logan Jarrell** said it would depend on the margin.

**Andrew Shumway** said that tallying the votes happened quickly and could be done during the Senate meeting.

**Rene Singleton** said that she agreed with Andrew Shumway. She suggested that two or three Officers enter a different Zoom meeting to tally votes and then come back with the results.

***Julia Overfelt, Hannah Sieben,*** *and* ***Andrew Shumway*** *volunteered to help tally votes.*

**Andrew Shumway** moved to extend time by 5 minutes. **Logan Jarrell** seconded. No objections.

**Genevieve Hulley** suggested giving the Student Regent and all future speakers a specific amount of allotted time to speak.

**Julia Overfelt** said that a biography of the speaker should be provided so that if a Senator asked a question about the speaker’s background, the question could quickly be answered by referring the asker to the biography.

**Aaron Yared** suggested sending the Student Regent’s biography on Sunday with the list of working groups and parliamentary procedure primer.

**Hannah Sieben** asked what precedent should be set for speakers and their time. She said that if the GPSS hosted multiple speakers at a time, then 15 minutes per speaker would be a safe precedent to set. She said that the precedent could be increased.

**Julia Overfelt** suggested giving the speaker 15 minutes and then later amending the agenda if the speaker had a prepared presentation.

**Logan Jarrell** moved to approve the agenda. **Monica Jensen** seconded. No objections.

# 10. [Action] Adjournment 7:45pm

**Hannah Sieben** motioned to adjourn the meeting. **Logan Jarrell** seconded. No objections.

Meeting minutes prepared by **Janis Shin**, GPSS Senate Clerk.