GPSS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, September 18th, 2020, 10:00AM 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 Marty Varela
* ~~Executive Senator Monica Jensen~~
* ~~Executive Senator Terrence Pope~~
* ~~ASUW Director of Internal Policy Antonio Gonzalez~~
1. **[Action] Call to Order 10:04AM**

**Aaron Yared** called the Committee meeting to order at 10:04AM.

**2. [Action] Approval of Agenda 10:04AM**

**Aaron Yared** entertained a motion to approve the agenda. **Andrew Shumway** motioned to approve the agenda. **Genevieve Hulley** seconded. No objections.

***Aaron Yared*** *apologized to the Committee for his unanticipated absence at the prior meeting.* ***Hannah Sieben*** *expressed desire in adding a new agenda item;* ***Logan C. Jarrell*** *requested the item instead be discussed under existing item Announcements, noting the agenda had been approved.* ***Hannah Sieben*** *agreed.*

**3. [Information] Training Takeaways 10:05AM**

**Aaron Yared:** Moving on to training takeaways. What did we think of the trainings? Logan, do you want to take this?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** So at the Officer meeting we wanted to pick some key things that we wanted to share with our Executive Senators, who of course weren't required to be there, but we thought were important to know.

**Aaron Yared:** Right. Well Officers, what are some things that stood out that you think the Senators should know?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I'll say that the University very much stresses and cares about its shared governance system, so that's something to be aware of. How the three main pieces on our campus, which is us, the ASUW, administration, and the Faculty Senate work with one another. That was stressed to us very much.

**Hannah Sieben:** I was gonna say the like main takeaway that I took from this two whole days was just be prepared. Know information before you're going into meetings or communication with other people and make sure you have as much information as you can get. I think that's the way that we are taking the most seriously and the way that we have been the most effective, when we go into these meetings with other people in this model of shared governance.

**Julia Overfelt:** I really liked the speaker for SafeCampus, mostly because I was surprised I didn't know more about that resource. It was a really good presentation. It was really engaging, at least I thought so. I think that someone we could definitely bring into some Senate meetings, and she had some really good ideas with how to share resources. I think that would be great if it was something that was prominently displayed on our resources. I was really getting the feeling that part of what they do, too, is connect people to the appropriate one, so it kind of felt like if you don't know who to call: call SafeCampus and they'll tell you who to call, which I feel like is sometimes a really overwhelming thing to try to figure out who should take care of this problem. I feel like that's more something that we should share with the Senate and less so about being a GPSS Officer.

**Hannah Sieben:** They had this great idea that I had never considered this before. Before we start meetings or events, we can have off like a resource slide before we get things going. We don't even have to talk about it or address it, but just that it's up and a reminder that these are resources that students can have access to and that are provided by the university. I just like that as an idea of continuing to just put it out there for people.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** SafeCampus also did a land acknowledgement in their presentation, which I thought was interesting. I don't remember from last year if we did a land acknowledgement. I know we did one at our Legislative Reception. Maybe at the first Senate meeting that’s potentially something that we can bring to Senate.

**Genevieve Hulley:** I would say we should do one every time. I have professors who have started the beginning of every quarter providing resources like SafeCampus, and I have others who haven't. I think to Hannah’s point, it's important to have it be something that's available without somebody having to ask or bring attention to it. They had the anonymous question system yesterday in the Title IX presentation. I think that was also great. I think I'm going to ask for the staff training to have somebody or slides from one of those. I can also open that up, like we're saying, bringing it to a Senate meeting or some kind of broader audience.

**Genevieve Hulley:** I think I also took away from yesterday that Rene has a lot of knowledge and cares a lot, which I knew, but I don't think I knew to what extent she was involved. I think I need to make a meeting with her. I need to make sure that I do that. I also think we need to ask for help when we need it.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** One thing within that was access to slides. Bill went ahead and sent us his slides about the Graduate School, so if you're interested in viewing those let us know. He said surprisingly that graduate enrollment this year was up moderately. He, and he's not the only one, have stressed we still don’t know who will actually come here in the next couple weeks, but it is good to hear that enrollment is up.

**Hannah Sieben:** The University is also a part of a class action lawsuit right now, which was a graduate student who filed for tuition refunds because of classes moving online. There's not a lot of information about that, but that was also something that was drawn to our attention yesterday.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** It was drawn to my attention a couple times, and it was something that I knew but really didn't realize is likely to have a larger impact on students, that our General Election is this year in November. That's likely to draw reactions from students in the week following, and perhaps the days preceding.

**Marty Varela:** The week following is optimistic. It might be weeks following, since so many states are moving to mail-in balloting who have not done it previously and who have not made proactive changes to their local requirements as far as how long you have to wait before you close the election process after the actual Election Day.

**Marty Varela:** I just think that 2020 is just a bad year. We've had COVID, we've had the fires. We've had racial unrest different than anything I've seen in the last 20 years. We've had the Census, which has been a blip and it should be much more significant than that. This election that is creating craziness and chaos for so many for so many reasons. I can't take another thing, and I suspect our students will feel that way around that time so it's good to be proactive you guys.

**Julia Overfelt:** Don't forget about the murder hornets. Those happened this year.

**Marty Varela:** Yeah, nature is against us as well. I mean, the fires: it's just all too much.

***Logan C. Jarrell*** *reported the previous day’s radical listening training was cancelled and that rescheduling has yet to occur, though that it may occur at an Executive Committee or Senate meeting.*

**Aaron Yared:** I definitely thought the trainings were super interesting. The most interesting part for me was the Faculty Senate stuff because that's the one area that I don't know a whole lot about, and it was interesting to hear that they actually don't have a whole lot of control over graduate stuff. That there's an a whole other Graduate Council that controls the graduate curriculum and whatnot. That's something that I want to look into and investigate a little bit more

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I had a follow-up on something that really surprised me. The Graduate School doesn't have, within itself, an entity that really focuses on our international graduate students at all. GO-MAP do it. CIRCLE does, but CIRCLE isn't an entity within the Graduate School. That's something that probably I'm going to set up some meetings about to try and figure out what's going on. What are you all looking into to remedy? I will stress that more than one-fifth of our graduate and professional students are international.

**Marty Varela:**I know the finance group knows that. Thank you for sharing you guys.

**3. [Action] Equity and Accountability 10:17AM**

**Aaron Yared:** Moving on to Equity and Accountability. I wasn't at the last Executive meeting, but I understand that it became clear that we haven't actually, as a group, since the last iteration of GPSS sat down and talked about this and figured out where we all stand. That's true for some Officers and I've heard that's true for some Senators as well. I thought it was important, we all thought it was important to actually have this discussion from scratch, starting from the beginning, and see where we want to land on the Equity and Accountability Committee and stand on changing the Secretary's role within GPSS. How far do we want to take it? What do we think is actually appropriate? What do we think isn't appropriate?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** As it’s written right now, I am the only one whose job description includes this. This is something that I've been thinking about, reading about, having discussions about. I really appreciate Marty for taking the time in the late evening to discuss this with me. I think the question that we should be asking first is what do we want to do? We have Equity and Accountability: what should the mission, the purpose, of that be? Should it be a version of its current purpose? Should it be something more what like when it was the Diversity Committee? Should it be a combination of those things, and things that we want to move it towards? I think that's the question we need to pursue first, and then we can move into, how do we change the Secretary position to support this? How do we change the Committee itself to support this, how do we potentially change other parts of GPSS to support this?

**Aaron Yared:** I feel like we almost have to take it a step back even further and go, what is the actual problem. That we're trying to solve. This all started with an email from a Senator at the end of last year highlighting that GPSS hasn't prioritized equity, inclusion, diversity, or accountability historically. What does that problem look like within the Equity and Accountability Committee? What does that look like through the Secretary role? How does that problem manifest itself? Does that seem fair?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** We could talk a little bit about prognosis, and I think that we have to in answering that question. I can speak a little bit to that Secretary position. I think it's an easier question to answer.

**Genevieve Hulley:** Aaron, do you want us to go one by one, or start with people on the Committee? I know Marty has been and is on the Committee and has shared some information. We have two members here?

**Aaron Yared:** We could start with the two members.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** The question that you want us to answer right now is?

**Aaron Yared:** The accusation was made that GPSS has not been prioritizing equity, inclusion, diversity, and accountability historically. I personally believe that's true. I think that's a fair statement. What does that look like through the Equity and Accountability Committee? what has the what could the Committee be doing better? I don't want to say what are they doing wrong because that almost sounds like an accusation to the numbers, which I don't think it's fair at all. How could the Committee be more effective?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I like that question more than what are they doing wrong, because I think a lot of the work of this Committee hasn't necessarily been in the wrong. Whether it using its diversity funds to support events, in the past, its compensation survey of Senate. Those are things that are good. I like your question, how can it be more effective, but to really answer that we can look at its current purpose to try and think about that. Its name is Equity and Accountability.

**Marty Varela:** As of the 2019-2020 school year.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** It's a more recent change that that happened. I don't really think, just based on that title, if that's the type of work it should pursue. I don't know what it's done to really support accountability as much. When I think of accountability, it's very similar to responsibility, especially with government. That's a power in our governing documents that Senators have over us: for example, they can recall us. Part of that is sort of internal type of thing, being accountable to one another as members of the Executive Committee, being accountable to the Senate as somebody supposed to oversee those meetings and kind of be the brain or whatnot. Being accountable to our campus partners.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** Marty, I'm willing to turn over to you if you really know what you know the accountability portion of this Committee was ever really supposed to focus on, because it's not in their purpose the way it's written and it's not in their work. We already have a Judicial Committee so if accountability was dealing with grievances that concern the Constitution or duties, we have a Judicial Committee for that. I have a lot of confusion of why we have equity and accountability together in this Committee, the same way that you know the Secretary has this divided role between the traditional duties of a Secretary and overseeing this Committee. The Committee itself has a divided focus and instead of entirely on one. I can't even say it would look like to hold something in the Senate accountable.

**Marty Varela):** I think that there's a structural issue here. Frankly, I don't think either equity or accountability is applicable for the actions, the actual transactions that the Committee was responsible for. I think that that name is au courant. It’s the kind of thing that you want to be able to say that GPSS has taken a stand on and at least they have a Committee that's named Equity and Accountability so they're doing something. I don't know that it goes beyond that. I do think that Meshell's email had validity because she attended those meetings, so she had some in-person experience of what the Committee did and didn't do, but I don't think that the Committee's errors are the Committee's fault. From an organizational perspective, it was not clear what the Diversity Committee originally was created to do besides dispersing funds. Then when the name was changed, what directive was given to that change and how did we then broaden ourselves so that we could be looking at equity and accountability at the Senate level, amongst graduate students, at the university, in the larger academic community: none of that was ever discussed. We just had a name change. We had no more bodies to do any of the work, and frankly very, very sporadic participation, especially towards the end there.

**Marty Varela:** While it's important to answer the question about what they've done before trying to talk about what they ought to be doing, I think we really need to consider GPSS as a whole, and what kind of stance we want to take on the topics of equity and accountability, if any, and whether we're adding inclusion and diversity to that as well. What do we want to do? Is this Committee, the way that it's currently structured, going to be able to affect that outcome? I would propose the answer to that question is no. The way that the Committee is now is not effectively going to do anything for that matter. Since we have the opportunity to come up with a plan and prescribe that plan as a solution, that's what we should be doing. If people have specific questions, I'm certainly willing to answer those to the best of my ability.

**Genevieve Hulley:** Giuliana was the head of the Committee, but that was when she was Secretary and when she switched positions it moved? It didn't go with her when she when she moved to President?

**Marty Varela:** That's right, and I don't know if that was intentional. Because it looks to me, based on the Bylaw, like this was supposed to be a responsibility of the Secretary's role. Frankly, I think that that's more because the Secretary at that point was the only Officer that didn't have an external facing Committee to be in charge of. Everyone else had a Committee that either Senators and or other people associated with their topic could participate, but the Secretary had the Judicial Committee. That is expressly a Committee that has to be seated by people who are already elected Senators. I think it might have been a balancing act.

**Marty Varela:** As someone who's talked to Meshell about her concerns before she sent the email and subsequently, I think that one of her biggest gripes was that we created a construct that said someone would be in charge of a Committee and that someone may not have had any personal familiar familiarity with issues of diversity, inclusion, equity, or accountability. They might not have any interest in that, but the role was demanding that they have it.

**Andrew Shumway:** I just remembered that Michael Diamond, former Executive Senator/Bylaw Expert, sent some recommendations for specific Bylaw changes that can be done to formalize/institutionalize the role and function of the Equity and Accountability Committee. If anyone wants to take a look at those that might be useful to help guide our discussion for specific changes we're looking for. Think the biggest thing is that the Committee is right now just a standing committee. It could, if next year no one wants to take it up, just disappear entirely. These Bylaws changes would, if we were to do something similar to what Michael drafted here, would put in writing: this is a Committee, just like Judicial Committee, just like the Elections Committee, where you have to have people on it. I think that'd be a good change.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I agree with that. Before getting into too much of how we want to poke at it, I think we need to figure out what this Committee should be doing. To Marty’s point, what should GPSS be doing? I can talk about what I would like to see personally.

**Aaron Yared:** I totally understand and I absolutely agree with everything that you both have said so far. I want to say, from speaking with Giuliana, what my understanding of what the Equity and Accountability Committee was supposed to be. My understanding was that the Judicial Committee was supposed to be the legal arm of GPSS, looking at the Bylaws and Constitution saying how has GPSS violated these things. If they have, what is the proper resolution?

**Aaron Yared:** The Equity and Accountability Committee was supposed to be the moral arm. For example, Logan you brought up from the training how SafeCampus did the land acknowledgement before they started. That could be something that the Equity and Accountability Committee would suggest to GPSS: why aren't we doing a land acknowledgement before every Senate meeting, at least something along those lines. With something like deciding whether or not to sign the Demilitarize UW Petition, maybe the Equity and Accountability Committee would advise GPSS by writing a resolution and passing it through that Committee: saying we advise GPSS, we support, or do not support this because of these reasons. That was my understanding of the Committee. That's not the way it was written on from what you've told us. That's how it should be in my mind, but I will defer to y'all.

**Genevieve Hulley:** I have one idea that we have talked about, but I think it could go as an amendment into what Michael Diamond provided. We've been talking about changing the name of the Secretary, so we would change that in this amendment that he proposed. I also think that if the Secretary, when they are elected, it is clear that one of their main priorities, if their name is Equity and Accountability Officer, then it's not somebody taking on a role that doesn't necessarily make sense. It's somebody who's voted in on that platform. My question is, if it's the same as another standing committee, how does that link up in terms of other Officers? Are there other positions that are voted in on that same way? Like nobody thinks VP Internal is on the Science and Policy Committee for example.

**Aaron Yared:** The difference would be I think it would be closer to the VP of External Affairs, where even though LAB isn't so much the focus, the purpose of LAB is for the VP of External to report back to and for them to come up with different stances on policy from Olympia. In that same way, the VP of Equity and Accountability or what have you, would be like that. The other side of this would be elevating the Equity and Accountability Committee from being a standing to being at the same level as Judicial, which was one of the things that Meshell asked for as well. That's my understanding.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** Those are good discussions. One thing I will say is there needs to be a Secretary to do the Secretary things still, so I don't think changing the Secretary into that position is the right way. At the same time, we can’t afford to add another Officer right now. We can potentially you know look at doing some budget magic. There’s the potential, not for this year, but for next year of not having a Senate Clerk.

**Marty Varela:** I think before we talk about adding a budget item for a position, what does that position going to do? What do we envision this individual doing or driving within GPSS? Is there something specific that we want the Committee to be able to show as a byproduct of its existence? Former Executive Senator Jackie Wong stood up at her last meeting as an Executive Senator, when the entire elected group was pretty homogenous, and said basically you guys say that this is important to you, but your actions are not showing it. I remember hearing that and thinking this is an opportunity for us to be better in some way, shape, or form.

**Marty Varela:** We are not reflective of the group of people that were supposed to be representing and are we asking the question why? Are we trying to find out why there isn't more representation from international students and communities of color? Do we have a sense for what barriers participation in GPSS creates that are unique to those communities? If those efforts are ongoing, I am not aware of them, and I try really hard to stay in touch with what it is that GPSS is doing even if I'm not intimately involved in it. I think we need to ask ourselves and answer what is it that we want to do around these topics of equity, inclusion, diversity, and accountability? It may be that we don't want to do something. Maybe we just need to have a body that rubber stamps. The disbursement of diversity payments to RSOs that apply, maybe that's what we want to do. I think that's the question that has to be answered before we can do anything that talks about strategy or execution. We need to know what our goal is, what's our intention?

**Aaron Yared:** Absolutely agree. I think that is really, really well put. From my point of view, over the past three months with everything that's been happening with the protests I've felt like every time I've gotten involved, because the Presidents have been having a lot of meetings with President Cauce and Provost Richards about this, every time I get involved I feel like I'm not so much dealing with racial issues as I feel like I'm dealing with undergraduate issues. I don't know what the presence is of graduate students among you know the Coalition for example. I think that's inherent in the way GPSS operates, to your point, that racial issues, don't even feel like graduate issues anymore. Like I feel like I was going outside of my job to try to do things, and that's just from my experience of watching the previous Officers and the Officers before them as well when I was at Bothell. I think that's something that's seriously missing from GPSS. Like I said from my understanding of the Equity and Accountability Committee, we need a mortal arm. we need a part of our organization that looks at these things and take stances on these things and holds us accountable so that we can be better as well. Historically, the Officers are a fairly homogenous group. At the end of this year, there was discussions of adding a seat for international students. Why did it take this long to figure that out? If a fifth of our students are made up of international students, seems like something we should have figured out a long time ago.

**Marty Varela:** I think even better question than why not did we figure it out earlier is why didn't we noticed that we didn't figure it out earlier? Maybe all of our consciousnesses have been hurt, poked because of what's going on racially in our country, but to me if we're supposed to be putting forward the best that there is to offer from the graduate student population, I don't think any of us would agree that this is our best. I think we have some room to grow.

**Hannah Sieben:** One thing that stood out to me from our training this week was that Rene was saying you need to have specific examples when talking about these issues. I think one thing that we don't have or get because of who is here and who is not are those like specific stories of how experience and identity has impacted the graduate experience. That impacts all of our roles, like who are we giving money to, who are we representing when we are offering testimony at the state level? What are those stories we bring to the to the President and the Provost? I think that could be one area that Equity and Accountability could be really useful in making sure when we are going into a different conversation, we are representing those stories. I'm hoping to get obviously more participation from diverse voices so we can represent those. Maybe that's an area that Equity and Accountability can help us. If we're saying this is what we're preparing to offer as our testimony, checking off like who are you missing. I think that it needs to be central in all of our conversations like who’s not here to have this conversation. If that's the role of Equity and Accountability, if that is just something that we need to make more prominent in all of our conversation, who is who is not here. Do we have an international student as an Executive Senator? Do we have international students representing any of these departments in general? Do we have first-generation students there being front and center in their experiences too? These are all little things that if we're not looking for or focusing on them, we're going to continue to miss.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** Really appreciate you talking about lived experiences. In the current mission of the Equity and Accountability Committee, it stresses you know the importance of these lived experiences versus what those authors identified as more neutral terms: diversity, tolerance, and multiculturalism. I somewhat disagree with labeling all of those as neutral terms, but I do agree very much so with that emphasis on lived experiences. I like what you said a lot, Hannah. Lived experiences shouldn't be something that just exists within that Committee. It should be something that's pretty present throughout GPSS. It should be at our Senate meetings, it should be at LAB meetings, it should be at other committee meetings.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** View on the Equity and Accountability Community is pretty complex because I think its current focus is too wide and too narrow at the same time. I think that the accountability component is potentially something that we could train all of us more on to do better as a cohesive unit. I also think that limiting its focus to equity isn't enough. I think diversity, equity, and inclusion, the reason those three are listed together is because they work good in that trio. Diversity, making sure representation at Senate is diverse, not just diverse voices in terms of their lived experiences, but I think, and this is part of the reason I think it was given to the Secretary, making sure we have all of the departments there. That could be something more on the Secretary than the Committee. Equity trying to write some of these historic wrongs doing this eradication of some of these barriers that we've talked about in the video that we filmed. We were considering when editing our GPSS mission. Finally, inclusion, making sure that once we bring these people to the table that they use their voices and you'll feel comfortable to. We talked about expanding accessibility, that's within inclusivity.

**Genevieve Hulley:** I think, at least for the purposes of this conversation, there's a lot of rhetoric. We're talking about words, but I'm wondering if we can also come up with—for example, Marty, you were talking about like the name of the Committee and also what's the function. I think you got a lot into the function that was helpful. Is there a way that we can discuss the function and then think about the correct rhetoric? I want to make sure we don't get bogged down by some of these terms. The idea of like international lived experiences or international student voices, I think that's critical. Are we at the point right now where we're thinking of actions or not?

**Aaron Yared:** I feel like up until this point we've been kind of molding what the problem is. That's what I feel like we're right now. If nobody has anything else to add, we can move on to say: now that we've figured out all that can be improved upon, how do we do that? To your point Genevieve, the functionality aspect. Now we can talk about what that is going to actually look like. What can we do?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I think we need to answer very particularly what should this Committee be doing, what should we as GPSS be doing. The two are related, but how you define those is very particular because it affects the function of both.

**Genevieve Hulley:** My point is we have the ability to propose or to think about new ways even consider the Committee. As Marty said, it's not working, but how do we not realize it's not working? We can think radically a little bit here. If we need to have these ideas at the forefront of our discussions, like when we were having the discussion about should we go online. Then we were trying to figure out should we poll everyone, should we just have a discussion in the Executive team, who's on the Executive team, did we reach out to the international student committee or some representative person. We didn't because we don't have anyone in that position that we're in contact with so. Are there any actions that are more radical that people are thinking of?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I've talked about changing the Committee's name, removing the accountability piece, and expanding its purpose to include diversity, equity, and inclusion. I don't think that we should pay people to be on the Committee and I think we have to bring our campus partners back to this Committee. I think that's something that really inhibited its function last year.

**Marty Varela:** I also would add that if the Committee continues to exist, there needs to be accountability for the Committee meeting. They've got to report to GPSS and it needs to be bidirectional. We're not telling GPSS to do this without having the opportunity for GPSS to suggest some of the work that the Committee does because it's got to be that it's tied to mutual goals. GPSS has this intention, the Committee works to execute that intention. The Committee has this intention, GPSS works to execute the Committee's intention. I feel like the Committee has been operating in secrecy; so many people don't know what's going on but the Committee has been operating. There have been meetings and people have attended and stuff has happened. There's no dissemination of what's happened. The reason that so many of you don't know what's going on in the Committee is because there's no requirement for that to be shared. If you don't go to the meetings, you might not know what happens in those Committee meetings.

**Genevieve Hulley:** I have one radical idea. If we are making this the same as the Judicial Committee, there isn't an Officer on the Judicial Committee. Is that something we would consider but then have something like at every Senate meeting that group presents?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I think we can go even further than that. I don't understand why it's not a requirement for all of our Committees that meet regularly, I guess Judicial being exempted and Elections having kind of a larger presentation to Senate, to not report it all of our Senate meetings. In my former student government experience, we had a committee report. I was on a committee called Building and Grounds. We reported every week on what we talked about in our Building and Grounds Committee Meetings. That would really help provide a little bit more transparency about what goes on in these communities because we have Senators who show up to Senate—that’s all they do. They don't know what else is available to them, and part of that is that we can do a better job onboarding and educating them here in the next couple weeks.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** To your other point, I very much would agree that the Secretary position is not the right position to sit on Equity and Accountability. I think for this year it probably will sit on for at least most of it, but I think it probably should not.

**Aaron Yared:** I totally. I guess the reason why I've been personally pushing for just changing the Secretary position altogether was because one it was already saddled with the duty of diversity, equity, and inclusion. You mentioned it earlier, but there's just no way financially that we'd be able to create a different position to be in charge of this. That might be something we can do in the future, but here's the problem with saying that is that if we kick this down the road there is no guarantee that it'll actually get done. We say hopefully we can do this next year when the budget’s better, but I guarantee you next year they're still going to be recovering. The Graduate School is doing 15% cuts across the board that are permanent cuts. The school is going to be hurting you, the University of Washington is going to be hurting for a while. If we don't do it now, then when is it going to happen. That's why the best case solution I could come up with is: okay then, we're just going to have to edit one of our positions to do this. That's part of the reason why, in our Officer meetings I've been saying that some of those secretarial duties can put on the staff and maybe asking to raise the payload for the staff is an easier asked than creating a brand new position. A brand new Officer position at, with the tuition waiver, salary, and benefits, all of that stuff. That is a huge ask, but asking to increase two of our staff positions by $2/hr to SAF might be an easier ask. That's kind of where why that's where I'm at.

**Aaron Yared:** I totally agree though that could see it being like the Judicial Committee, where there's no Officers sitting on it. At this point, we need somebody to lead that charge, we need somebody to make those changes. Maybe that's something that gets phased out over time, and we can leave that in our legacy documents. I'm worried that if we don't do something, like Genevieve said, if we don't make some radical changes now, we kick this can down the road—I've seen this happen in student government before. That idea of like waiting us out: if we wait ourselves out that's the least effective thing we can do. I would like to find some kind of solution that's kind of in the middle where we can kind of do some of the things you're saying Logan, but also do it in such a way that we can actually achieve it this year or get the get the ball rolling.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I agree with you. That's not what I was proposing, the changes that we need to make need to happen this year as much as they're able. What we can't do we need to lay foundations for. I would love to hear what Andrew and Julie are thinking about this or maybe some prior discussions.

**Andrew Shumway:** I wanted to say that I second Logan's idea of having weekly reports from the Committees. As a Senator, I remember hearing about all these Committees and being like that's interesting, but I never got updates like “here's what we're working on.” I think that's really good for holding those Committees accountable as well to the body. I know I personally work better when I have to present in my group meetings, I have to have some kind of results. That’d be good for keeping our Committees on track and also keeping our Senators informed.

**Andrew Shumway:** One note about Judicial Committee. The Secretary does serve on the Committee, but as an ex officio member, so maybe we could do something similar for E&A. Not necessarily the Secretary, I don't want to put another thing on Secretary’s plate, but some Officer serve as an ex officio member meaning they're supposed to be there to keep track of what's going on and report back to Executive Committee. They can't really exert influence on that Committee.

**Julia Overfelt:** I also like the reporting out. The first thing I think about is how long the meetings already are, but I think if we have like a pretty strict 45 to 60 seconds and then we're cutting you off, saying thank you for your update.

**Julia Overfelt:** I feel like this conversation is a little disjointed, like we keep going back to we need to figure out this, we’ll need to figure out this. Like Genevieve was saying, this seems to be a lot of rhetoric. I don't know if it would be easier if we had some sort of like a worksheet like that one Bill showed us that looks like a weird logic model, if we went through something with steps that would help us figure this out. I feel like we all have a lot of really good things to say, but I feel like they're not flowing from one to one. That might be a more efficient way to have this conversation, and it might be a more efficient way to keep track of what's being said. I feel like that's what's happening right now, we're all saying good things, but I don't know where we're looking to end up. I don't know what our goal is for this conversation.

**Julia Overfelt:** Also, I think it would be great if E&A Had a way to get involved with other committees. I would love to be able to be like: hey, can someone from E&A (or whatever, it's going to be called) come and help on travel grants? Can someone come sit on F&B for a few weeks, once a quarter, or something like that. I don't know if that's the kind of responsibility that people in that Committee would want to do, but I think that would be a great thing that that Committee could is to have it as part of their core thing is that they help the other committees be more efficient and be more inclusive.

**Hannah Sieben:** I think the first today was the first time I got to see those Bylaws that Michael Diamond had proposed. I think one thing that I really appreciated about that was that if we make Bylaw changes, they can be reviewed by E&A to ensure that this was happening. For our elections, we can run all of that material by E&A to ensure—those are the tangible things that I am looking to figure out. What does it mean to have E&A participating on these other committees? Like you said, it would be really helpful to have somebody from in a review some budget specific things or to have them somebody from E&A participate in LAB to give perspective on the Legislative Agenda and what we're missing. I want to have a pretty directed conversation about what we can do, and it's hard. We've got seven people here who have a lot of different and great ideas. I'm just wondering if there's any way that we can like tailor that to make this an effective conversation, that when school starts we can present and be like here's some options, here's what we're thinking. To bring that to the Senate, to bring that to the Committee so that they can make some decisions.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I think it's important we diagnose some of these things the Committee can and should be doing, but we've yet to diagnose what the Committee's purpose is and from that flows the things it should be doing.

**Marty Varela:** It sounds like, based on the comments that people are making, that they're comfortable with the sort of moral arm of GPSS. It seems like the kinds of actions that are being proposed create an opportunity for E&A to insert that perspective in various parts of GPSS. If people are in agreement that that's what we want the Committee to do, then we can move on to the actions part of it. Is that all that we want the Committee to do? I'd say further, is that a GPSS morality that then drives the creation of the Committee, or is it the Committee that has that directive and their assisting or benefiting GPSS?

**Julia Overfelt:** I would say the latter. Frankly, I think that having the Committee set their goals and what they're trying to accomplish would be more effective. If we're trying to change things, if we're trying to modify how things are done, I think that having GPSS set there, I mean it can be collaborative, but I think it would be more efficient if the Committee was more involved with that.

**Genevieve Hulley:** So you're saying that the Committee would set the health check parameters and the Senate would go through the check versus the senate setting, like you were saying Marty, the morals: what we would define as having a healthy community. Are you asking whether we go back to our vision statement and say these are the things that we want and then the Committee is the check, or does the Committee come up with the things that make us healthy. If the Senate as a whole doesn't believe in those values, it's not fair to ask five to seven people. It has to be something that we all have ingrained in the mission, then these five to seven are the people who check in and say you're not really where you doing on this because this isn't right here.

**Marty Varela:** I think that what Genevieve is proposing and what Julia is proposing are both possible if GPSS says that in our effort to be the best representatives of our student population that we can be, we recommend that E&A be our moral arm and keep us accountable and in check on things that involve diversity, equity, inclusion, and accountability. Then, E&A gets to decide what they focus on, when they focus on it, how they focus on it, and has a responsibility to report back. It may be that one year they're focusing on the dispersion of members, how many international students, how many students do we have that are first-generation students, how many students are parents. All of those kinds of things that will help us to illustrate our diversity, but it could be another year that they're focusing on making sure that they fund RSOs that have diversity activities that wouldn't occur without the funding that the Committee has the ability to distribute. I don't think that we're asking for something that's mutually exclusive, but as the GPSS is it would be very unusual for us to have a Committee that dictates to us solely what happens without us having the ability as an entity to drive some of what that Committee is doing. The Committee exists because of GPSS, not the other way around. Can we get behind some single directive, like Aaron suggested in the beginning, the moral arm that Giuliana alluded to? Can we get behind that and offer some suggestions for how that gets enacted at the Committee level, but then the Committee decides this is what we're going to focus on 2020-2021. In future years, committees will do that so that the Committee has the capacity to be dynamic with the time, but is also operating within the structure that says that their overarching goals are being directed by the parent entity GPSS.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I think that's what should happen. I've been on committees in GPSS and elsewhere that function similarly.

**Marty Varela:** Do we have agreement about the morality aspect of it? Is there anything else that we think that E&A could be doing, or Equity, Inclusion, Diversity, and Accountability?

**Logan C. Jarrell:** We need to figure out what we want to call this.

**Marty Varela:** I don't think that Equity and Accountability is enough. I think either we're going to do all of it or we go back to just Diversity and have Diversity be sufficiently generic that it can encompass anything that we want it to.

**Aaron Yared:** Including all four of those letters spell IDEA.

***Logan C. Jarrell,******Marty Varela, and Julia Overfelt*** *voice support for the name “IDEA Committee”.*

**Julia Overfelt:** I will say that this would work well to bring the committees together. If I had known that it was an option to sit on both IDEA and F&B, and to be an IDEA representative on F&B, I absolutely would have been on both. That is absolutely something I would have done, but that’s not how it was presented. I think that this will also really help with people who want to sit on multiple committees. I think that there may be more involvement, because I wasn't sure what the Equity and Accountability Committee did, but I knew I wanted to be involved with F&B.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I think that's something that should be a discussion, even outside of this context that we're talking about this Committee, increasing cross-committee collaboration. That helps us build a tighter community, and that's one of our goals for this year. Probably increases the ability of deliverables to send it into cross committees. I think it's an excellent idea.

**Logan C. Jarrell** moved to propose naming the E&A Committee the IDEA Committee at the first Senate meeting. **Marty Varela** seconded. No objections.

*At the direction of* ***Julia Overfelt****, discussion begins on potential pitfalls concerning the Committee’s nature.*

**Hannah Sieben:** I think this remains that we’re asking people to do a lot of work, and be very present in a time that’s hard to continue to do this work and be present. It's just exhausting. That might be an area that like people are like let's do it, then have a really hard time getting that participation. I think one way that we might be able to work around this, while not going to be the same as having a person there, could be a benefit to us is building a racial equity toolkit or equity tool kit. The city of Seattle does this. I don't think that it fixes everything, but I think it points out blind spots and so that could be like a worksheet that all Committees view when they are working on specific projects. If we can't have an E&A person at LAB, we have a developed toolkit to point out who's not here, what impacts might this have on populations that we aren't typically considering or aren't here. I think that might be a tool to have that conversation in all of our Committees if we're not able to get the participation that we're hoping for. So that's a pitfall and a potential solution to accomplish the goal of like having those voices and ideas in different committees.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I think it's an excellent idea. If we build that racial equity toolkit, that's something that we can share with our Senators to make sure that they're not missing out on some of these voices they might not be hearing within their own constituency.

**Hannah Sieben:** I think equity is more important, rather than racial equity, because we are talking about not just race but parents, first-generation students, the whole block of things. While race should be centered in that, I think it's also broader than that as well in who we have been missing and who we want to ensure are represented in our conversation.

**Aaron Yared:** That's a great idea. Were you thinking that the Committee would create that worksheet or we were created before the Committee came into being?

**Hannah Sieben:** I think that we can offer what the city of Seattle does and have them tweak it. We will make it fit within like what GPSS does. I think that also brings down how much for asking of this Committee but produces a tangible thing that we can use across all of our committees and with all of our Senators within the context of GPSS. I think that also is important because then when we bring ideas or conversation to external facing things like we will have the answers or know already what we don't have the answers to. That goes back into being really prepared to have those conversations with administrators, with legislators, with RSOs, and will help us to remove some of those blind spots that we have continued to miss that are much easier to miss when we are not in person and not getting to see our Senators to have those like smaller conversations in this whole year.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I want to continue to maybe talk about some potential pitfalls. What we've done, we didn’t modify purpose or anything, but from the name, it would follow the Committee has a sort of taller order. While I do think that some of us on this Committee, don't quite kind of understand, and I think it's kind of impossible to understand fully, the work ethic and level of commitment that Senators will have on this Committee. I think it's important to for this Committee to have some pretty specific focuses when we come up with its purpose. For example, we have committees that have one major deliverable. We have committees that have multiple. Based on the name, this is a committee that's going to have multiple: some of them will be regular, some of them will be as needed. I think it's a question of direction and that this Committee is tasked with a tall order. It's definitely one that's going to need a lot of support. I would encourage other committee members, so people external to this Committee to attend this Committee, so that way that members of the IDEA Committee aren't tasked with attending the other committees and educating people there. The purpose of our racial equity toolkit is trying to fix some of those issues.

**Julia Overfelt:** I think one thing that could come up is how we are recruiting and maintaining members for this Committee? Is this a Committee that's only for Senators or for people outside of Senate as well, and if so how are we making sure that there's a spread of different departments? I know that there are going to be certain departments that are more interested in this, but the Committee may be more rounded if there are people are coming from multiple departments. A question that will come up with this is: this is great, but how you going to do it? A big part of that is going to be the members of the Committee. The answer might be like this year we're going to try our best and once this Committee does something we're hoping it'll pick up. It could be as simple as we don't know, but we recognize that as a problem.

**Julia Overflet:** That's the thing with some of these pitfalls. I don't think we need to have solutions for them. I just think there's something that we need to be thinking about, where are weaknesses.

***Genevieve Hulley*** *shares links to peer Graduate Senates at other universities.*

**Genevieve Hulley:** On the Yale Graduate Senate’s Executive Committee, every person on the team had like a title. In addition to President, Vice President, there's the Community Engagement Chair, a Diversity and Inclusion Chair, an Advocacy Chair, a Funding Chair. Would that help spread the tasks if we named the Executive Senator positions. When we asked for more Executive Senators, because we are about to search for more, if we could decide what kind of tasks or titles that we are interested in? Maybe break up IDEA into two different people, kind of like they did in this example.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I'd really encourage the Executive Senators to speak on this. Based on my discussions with current and former Executive Senators, part of the appeal of wanting to be an Executive Senator is this ability to specialize in what you're interested in. For Michael Diamond, that was very much Bylaws and the Elections Committee. That would be my big concern on doing that. If you're giving them something that's more restrictive, you may have to consider paying them more as well.

**Marty Varela:** I didn't even know that this was a paid position, so that's not a driver for me at all. I can tell you that what was really appealing to me was being able to dig in on a topic and potentially using my skills in a non-traditional way to help the Senate. I think that I've already identified at least one, which is the HR and operational support that I can provide because I do think that I am uniquely positioned to do that. I'm not unwilling to take on something else. Clearly, diversity is something that I'm interested in. The reason I went to the Committee initially was because they made a plea to the Senate in January of 2019 saying we need members, we need people. I was like, okay, I will do it. I've been doing it since then. I think that it's a great idea for people to have positions. I do think that you should consider: does it limit or does it expand your possibilities?

**Andrew Shumway:** I definitely agree with what Logan and Marty are saying that part of the appeal is being able to focus on whatever issues you're passionate about. I think if we tried to put boxes or put labels on the Executive Senator positions, we might open ourselves up to blind spots. To Genevieve’s point, it might be good in this recruitment for this to build the Executive Senator seat to specifically say we're looking for someone who might want to focus more on getting involved with this IDEA Committee and serving us like a liaison between the two, but not necessarily like mandate that.

**Julia Overfelt:** I think a good thing here is setting a goal for the end of this conversation. At what point has this been a successful conversation, at what point do we want to start saying what are our next steps before we come back? Can anybody do anything and bring it back for our next meeting?

**Marty Varela:** I think right now the success that we have is that it does not appear that anyone is in disagreement that GPSS should be providing the directive for the Committee and that that has something to do with morality. It seems like we're all in agreement, because I haven't heard anything to the contrary. And we've also it seems agreed that the Committee itself should be able to decide what it prioritizes, when it prioritizes within that morality context. That's where our successes stop, but I think that's significant progress for the short amount of time that we've given this today.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I really agree with what Marty said. In terms of priority setting, because we're going to make this Committee report out to the Senate, they can get even more feedback on that, and particularly alter those priorities. This discussion of making our committees report, even though it wasn't something I didn't expect to happen today, is something that’s very good. Something that we should pursue.

**Marty Varela:** I don't want us to lose sight of is the need to address the connection of the Secretary to the Committee. It's great if the Secretary operates in an ex officio capacity, but the way that it sits now the Secretary is driving the Committee even when there's a chair. Because I know it's going to require a Bylaw change to make that change, we should have a conversation about what that relationship looks like in 20-2021 as well as what we would propose for the future. If we can get an amendment change before the end of the school year great, but that may not actually happen. I think we at least need to address what happens for the school year. Well,

**Genevieve Hulley:** Marty, in your opinion, do you think that the Secretary should be, if not the chair a driving factor? You think we should remove that? I'm curious about going forward.

**Marty Varela:** I don't think that the Secretary should be mandated to lead this Committee, but I do like the idea of an ex officio Officer and if the Secretary has the interest, inclination, and time they could be that Officer. I do think there should be an Officer connection because it validates the Committee. It means that something's going to happen because you know that a participant is going to be reporting back to the Executive Committee on what's going on. I think that that's important, but I don't know that that specifically has to be the Secretary

**Aaron Yared:** I'm going to propose an idea. We can have it set up the way LAB is for the VPX. As of right now, from my experience being on as the Policy Director last year, the way it operated last year was the VP of External Affairs would come back and report to the Committee. The Committee would then, based off of that report, decide what to do next and hold the VP of External Affairs accountable in a lot of ways. Maggie did a fantastic job last year, there was never a point where we had to be like “do your job,” but that idea of having the Secretary or a different Officer be held accountable by the Committee on. Not necessarily the chair: it's almost like the President reporting to the Board of Regents. The Committee says what the Secretary—or the President, the VP Internal, or whoever—on what they need to be doing better, what they're doing well. What do you think about that?

**Marty Varela:** I think that that's fine. I just don't want the Secretary to be overwhelmed with the weight of this responsibility because my suspicion is, given our current circumstances in the country, people are going to be much more alert and vigilant on this particular topic and there may be more activity as a result. We can present it as a new opportunity and way for people to sort of get involved in GPSS. I don't want someone to be overwhelmed by that responsibility. What you're describing gives limited connection so that there's a very specific set of expectations, not that they're responsible for creating an agenda, getting contributors, getting people to request funds, and dealing with the return of applications and such. I think that if you remove all of that sort of administrative stuff and just have the responsibility, where they're acting as a conduit, I’m not uncomfortable with that suggestion.

**Logan C. Jarrell** moved to extend time on this item for 4 minutes. **Andrew Shumway** seconds. No objections.

**Aaron Yared:** Do you think it would be a better idea, if we were to make it into that role of having the Officer report to the Committee, to make the President that Officer instead of the Secretary?

**Marty Varela:** I think any officer would be great, but if you're going to pick an Officer, the President is always the best Officer. I don't want to diminish the importance of the other Officers, but because of their title is there at the top. If you're looking for a way to give merit and substance to this Committee, that it's just language it seems for a bit, here attaching the President to might do that.

**Aaron Yared:** Yeah. I was thinking if we're making it so that the responsibility of the Committee doesn't fall on the Officer, it might make more sense to have the person who's supposed to be the public facing Officer, the one who reports. That would also mean that when I go and meet with President Cauce, Provost Richards, or any other person in the administration or in the faculty, I can say here's how the Senate stands on these things, especially when it involves diversity, equity, inclusion, and accountability. I would hope that it will also ensure that future Presidents will keep all of those concepts in mind when they decide to run for office. That way I'm not just doing this just so that you know I can be the President and be in charge, but also so that I can ensure that we're not only holding ourselves accountable, but holding the university accountable.

**Marty Varela:** If you think you have the bandwidth for that Aaron, I think it'd be great. If you can model it properly, future Presidents would be able to do it too. They don't want to not be able to do something that their predecessors was able to do.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** As the person who's in the secretary position, which is the hot seat position today and has been for a little while. I definitely strongly agree that the job of a Secretary is largely disconnected from what you would expect somebody on this Committee to do. I think it makes sense to move Secretary away from that position. Even to as the Secretary works to better balance things with their staff, none of the staff have a diversity and equity focus really. I would agree that there should be a formal Officer who kind of sits on the Committee, even in a non-voting role, but that each of us have Offices are likely going to end up having interactions with this Committee. If they're creating programming to celebrate or foster diversity might have interactions with Genevieve. If they're talking about potential blind spots or things that need to be in the Legislative Agenda, it might be referencing Hannah. If they're talking about failures in transparency, GPSS they’re probably be talking to me.

**Marty Varela:** If they are looking at money issues: Julia.

**Julia Overfelt:** I just want to see if we have any action items for our next meeting or if this is a topic that will pick up once Senate it kicks in? What do we want our deliverable for next time?

**Aaron Yared**: We can start working on what is missing right now.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I would suggest at our next meeting we prepare what we want to tell Senate about this because I imagine next meeting we're gonna be talking a lot about the first Senate meeting.

**Marty Varela:** What I can commit to in between now and then is to review Michael's proposal regarding the Bylaws, because I think that we need to be prepared to say this is the remedy if we want it to get done before our terms are over. I will also look at the links that Genevieve shared and any others that I can find that talk about sort of the connection between committees and Officers on representational bodies, just so that I can have that background information should we need it the next time we discuss this.

**5. [Information] Announcements 11:33AM**

**Aaron Yared:** Moving on to announcements. Hannah, I know you had an announcement.

**Hannah Sieben**: I think one thing that I'm having a hard time with lately is that we are getting requests from various people asking for somebody to speak on this or this. I don't know our Senate yet, it’s just been kinda hard. So the requests that we got was have a student speaker to talk about to student debt forgiveness campaigns for virtual teach in that is happening. I am not experienced in that, and I'm looking for someone who is so didn't know anybody in this group feels like they could talk about that or has somebody. Logan says he might be a good fit.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I confirmed they were interested. They just need information.

**Hannah Sieben:** Cool. I think if anybody else can think of anybody too, just in case that that doesn't work out with Logan’s person. I think this is where I will need the most support this year is just being connected with the right students who can talk about these things because I'm not an expert on a lot of this. I'm not going to be able to become the expert. I just really want to utilize our Senate and hopefully we'll get to know people more. As some of you have been more involved in the past year, I think that's where I could use a lot of stuff. That is my PSA.

**Marty Varela:** Good for you, protecting your boundaries Hannah. Kudos.

**Aaron Yared:** I also have an announcement. Earlier this week, I met with Meshell along with two other graduate students were a part of the Coalition to Decriminalize UW. They asked for us to pass a resolution passed earlier this summer by the Faculty Senate’s Executive Board. It's modified so that it also involves GPSS prioritizing equity and accountability, among other things. The conclusion we came to after speaking was that it would be more powerful if the Senate actually passed the resolution instead of just the Executive Committee. After this meeting, I'm going to send it out to all of you so that’s going to be something I want us to discuss on our next Executive Meeting and kind of give like a preliminary approval or disapproval. I want everybody to take a look at that and let me know what you think.

***Logan C. Jarrell*** *reminded the Committee that resolutions need to be submitted to the Secretary two weeks prior to when they’re brought to Senate.* ***Aaron Yared*** *clarified this was that formal notice.*

**Marty Varela:** So if our first Senate meeting is on October 7th, that gives us enough time to review it and have it submitted for the Senate, if our goal is to have the Senate act on it.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** Yeah. What could come out of our meeting on the 30th is, instead of just Aaron cosponsoring it, it could be cosponsored by the Executive Committee.

**Julia Overfelt:** How far in advance do resolutions do to be sent to the Senate before they can vote on them because I know Bylaws have like a two week period or something, but I'm not sure about resolutions.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** Believe it's one week. I can check and get back to you.

**Julia Overfelt:** Just so that we know if we need to finalize anything at our meeting and send it out Wednesday so that we can vote on it on. That's just the only thing is that if we don't get it done, we don't get it done.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I believe it's one week. One of the things that we will have to do at our next meeting will be making the agenda for Senate. That's something that needs sent to them a week in advance.

**Aaron Yared:** Genevieve go ahead.

**Genevieve Hulley:** I just wanted to give a thank you to everyone for helping with the staff interviews. We have a couple more this afternoon, so if you guys want to check the spreadsheet. If you're curious about hiring, I made a new tab for offers that have been made and we have three accepted offers so far: Abbie Shew for Organizing Director, Ashlee Abrantes for Director of University Affairs, and Stephen Lee for Budget Specialist. We are moving along in the hiring process. So make

**Julia Overfelt:** Have you given offers to anybody that you haven't heard back on?

**Genevieve Hulley:** No, but those are the only three that have been given.

**Julia Overfelt:** I was just wondering if we had any bad days to go along with the good news.

**Genevieve Hulley:** Bad news is there's still two more interviews today and Logan might be scheduling another.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I might rethink that.

**Hannah Sieben**: That staff training and orientation for new people, is that something we all will need to be on for the whole time and do we have like an idea of when we should put that in our calendars?

**Genevieve Hulley:** So I think in the past it was just me and them, but I also we're in Zoom land so I think that it might be better to have like people come on for half an hour. They would be on the whole time. I also was thinking of having, like people coming in like we had in our own orientation, some other people coming in, but it would be end of next week or the beginning of the following week based on the schedule of the staff that we hire. I want to go through the personnel policy also with Marty before that day because I need to be able to present it to them.

**Marty Varela:** Is that on the Google site because I can help you by reading what's there, if it's accessible.

**Genevieve Hulley**: I think I either sent it to you but it hasn't been updated. I'll put it in the same folder as everything else, like the staffing folder.

**Marty Varela:** I'm adding it now to my list.

**Genevieve Hulley:** The other complication: we can't have them come work hours for us until they're like allowed to be working hours for us. I'm going to go ahead and guess it's not going to be next week, based on how long Rene says she needs to onboard them.

**Marty Varela:** So we're looking at the 28th or later?

**Genevieve Hulley:** That's what I'm thinking, the 28th or 29th, because on the 30th they will have classes.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I also want to extend a thank you to everyone who's picked up one of these orientation so far. I've a good bit left. I heard from a department for the first time yesterday so that sheet is going to continually be updating. I know that sometimes giving these you don't hear any feedback and it is very quiet. Sometimes people ask you questions, you may have even have someone asked you a question you don't know the answer to. I appreciate people maybe taking that a little bit of vulnerability in that.

**Logan C. Jarrell:** I also kind of want to provide an update on minutes because it did not appear on this agenda, because I forgot to put it there and it's an action item. I plan to on the 30th have all of our meetings for the summer because those are the ones that I think Senators will be the most interested in. The backlog is something that I and the Clerk will work on. It's something I didn't want to happen. If you are really, really, really interested in that. Just send me an email.

**Julia Overfelt:** At time for announcements.

**Aaron Yared:** Executive Senators, have you got any announcements?

*Executive Senators do not have announcements.*

**6. [Action] Adjournment 11:43AM**

**Aaron Yared** entertained a motion to adjourn. **Marty Varela** motioned to adjourn. **Andrew Shumway** seconded. No objections.