GPSS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, January 20th 2021, 5:30 pm 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 Jules Overfelt

Executive Senator Andrew Shumway

Executive Senator Terrence Pope

Executive Senator Monica Jensen

Executive Senator Marty Varela

Executive Senator Britahny Baskin

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 5:31pm

**Aaron Yared** called the meeting to order at 5:31pm.

# 2. [Action] Approval of the Agenda 5:31pm

**Jules Overfelt** moved to approve the agenda. **Monica Jensen** seconded. No objections.

# 3. [Action] Approval of the Minutes 5:33pm

**Monica Jensen** moved to approve the agenda. **Abbie Shew** seconded. No objections.

# 4. [Action] Non-academic Seat Resolution: D Center 5:33pm

**Logan Jarrell** presented a point of order and said it was required the non-academic seats be provisional and that the proposals be presented to the Executive Committee before them being heard in the Senate. He said it was required that a representative from the community in question have a representative present. He introduced Lesley Ellis as a representative of the D Center.

**Jules Overfelt** asked if there was any interest in someone actually sitting on this seat and whether the D Center was anticipating filling the seat quickly.

**Lesley Ellis** asked whether the Executive Committee was asking specifically for her perspective.

**Jules Overfelt** said yes.

**Lesley Ellis** introduced herself and said that there were a lot of graduate students involved in the community who attended and participated in the D Center’s events. She said she could reach out to a significant number of involved graduate students. She said it was possible to find interested students, but that she could not guarantee that the D Center would have someone ready to go since people were busy. She said she would do her best to make sure the word got out there. She said that she worked closely with the Disability Studies program which had a network of graduate students because of the program’s interdisciplinary nature. She said she was optimistic that the GPSS would find someone interested.

**Jules Overfelt** said that she was just curious and that it would probably not have any impact on whether or not the Resolution was passed.

**Andrew Shumway** asked how the seats would be filled. He said that the filling of academic seats was generally delegated to departments or graduate program coordinators. He asked if there was any procedure for selecting people for non-academic seats or whether the GPSS would pass it off to the leadership of the respective organizations to decide.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the process was determined by the petition itself or the Secretary. He said he was not aware of doing this without some level of involvement from the community. He acknowledged that all of the seats that the GPSS currently had or were being proposed were tied to specific organizations. He said that the current non-academic seats that the GPSS had belonged to the Q Center, the Student Veteran Association (SVA), and Residential Community Student Association (RCSA). He said that the RCSA’s petition process may have been slightly different from the Q Center’s, but that all organizations generally followed the same procedure which was outlined in the petition. He noted that academic programs varied in how they selected Senators, so there was flexibility for other communities that were not represented by one organization, like international students. He said that seats for international students were not necessarily for that entity, but rather the constituency, in the same way that the SVA, Q Center, and the proposed D Center seat were.

**Andrew Shumway** directly asked Lesley Ellis what her plan was for choosing a Senator for this specific seat.

**Lesley Ellis** said she had not yet finalized her plan. She said she planned on looking into what other organizations had previously done to gain insight into the process and ensure that it was fair. She said she would model a method that had worked previously for another organization. She said it depended on the level of interest from students. She said the seat could be filled either through an application process or by a sole interested person. She said she was unsure whether students were interested in the position, but would strive to follow any guidelines that the GPSS sets for filling the seat.

**Logan Jarrell** said that part of this role as the Secretary was to support units in making selections. He said that once the seat was established, these students would have a seat by default.

**Jules Overfelt** asked whether it would be more accurate for the document to say that representatives would be appointed by the D Center rather than elected if the GPSS was not sure it would hold elections. She asked if the GPSS could create an election process out of appointing someone.

**Aaron Yared** said it may be better to change the wording from “elected” to “chosen by the D Center” so that it maximizes their ability to choose however they want.

**Terrence Pope** asked whether the beginning of the Resolution should be changed to specifically name a group of students and whether it was sufficient to say that the representative was appointed by the D Center.

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

**Logan Jarrell** said it was not outlined in the action clause because it was described in the whereas clause which established the kind of community that the GPSS hoped to serve. He said that the GPSS could edit the process by which it created non-academic seats. He said that the GPSS had the power to create seats and that he had followed the memorandum very closely.

**Andrew Shumway** said that the document reflected the language in the Bylaws which specifically laid out a process for “underrepresented graduate and professional community groups.” He said that he thought this process was exactly what needed to be done to increase representation for groups like the D Center. He said it was a great Resolution.

**Jules Overfelt** asked who would elect the representatives if the word “elected” would be changed.

**Logan Jarrell** asked if he could change it to “selected” and consider the change as grammatical with the approval of the chair.

**Aaron Yared** said that was fine.

**Logan Jarrell** moved to approve the Resolution and bring it before the GPSS Senate. **Jules Overfelt** seconded. No objections.

**Aaron Yared** said that the Resolution would be presented to the Senate and the Senate would vote whether or not to pass it. He thanked Logan Jarrell for his work and Lesley Ellis for her cooperation.

**Logan Jarrell** recognized the prior work of A.J. Balatico (College of Education), Giuliana Conti, the former GPSS President, and Leslie Michaud, the former GPSS Secretary.

**Lesley Ellis** thanked the GPSS Executive Committee members for their help.

# 5. [Action] Non-academic Seat Resolution: UAW 4121 5:46pm

**Logan Jarrell** said that the Non-academic Seat Resolution for UAW 4121 was different. He said that the only way the GPSS Executive Committee could add a non-academic seat was through the process as outlined in the memorandum. He invited everyone to ask him or Kyle Kubler questions about the Resolution.

**Jules Overfelt** said she had the same issue with the “elected, selected” wording at the bottom. She wondered if the language for underrepresented graduate and professional minority groups was accurate in describing UAW 4121, especially considering that the fourth “whereas” clause stated that UAW 4121 was composed of one-third of graduate students and 70% of the employees. She said she would like to have a conversation around whether the language was appropriate.

**Logan Jarrell** said that he and Kyle Kubler were aware that some of the language needed to be revised.

**Terrence Pope** said he agreed with Jules Overfelt. He said that he thought that the specificity point was more meaningful and was interested in having the discussion as well. He asked the Resolution sponsors, Logan Jarrell and Aaron Yared, whether the Resolution could be made stronger to highlight additional “whereas” statements. He pointed out that the GPSS had a previous history of partnerships with UAW 4121 and that UAW 4121 frequently had the same goals as the GPSS. He asked whether some sort of statement about that should be included.

**Aaron Yared** said he was fine with it.

**Logan Jarrell** said he did not have any contest to it. He clarified he was taking over the resolution for A.J. Balatico who was recovering from illness.

**Jules Overfelt** said that she anticipated that the Senate would have something to say about it and that the Executive Committee should come up with a response. She said that the Executive Committee had a responsibility to figure out the answer before it voted on it.

**Aaron Yared** asked whether there was an argument to be made as to why the language should stay as is. He suggested changing the language immediately.

**Logan Jarrell** addressed Jules Overfelt’s point in the chat and said that the Resolution was drafted in the previous academic year. He said that the resolution was not able to come before the Senate because of the pandemic OPMA restrictions. He said that outside of the one line in the Bylaws, there was no other process for adding non-academic seats. He noted that Terrence Pope highlighted the relationship that the GPSS had with ASUW 4121 and said that the GPSS predated UAW 4121 by a number of years. He said that the GPSS used to work on some of the issues that the union currently works on through their collective bargaining process.

**Rene Singleton** pointed out that the original documents for supporting the union came directly from the GPSS and that there used to be a representative that went back and forth between meetings. She said that this representation was lost over the years and that the Executive Committee would be reinstating something that used to exist. She said that the GPSS used to send a representative to the union’s meetings but that the practice had been discontinued over time. She said that the union’s governing documents started from the GPSS.

**Jules Overfelt** said she had a question that was unrelated to Rene Singleton’s point.

**Terrence Pope** said that he wondered whether or not it was appropriate to use this mechanism to incorporate a partnership with the union in the first place. He wondered what the function of having a voting seat for the union was. He said that if the GPSS and the union already had a history of a partnership and cooperation, there was probably a different process that the GPSS could take to formalize the relationship. He said he was curious to hear about the development of the idea.

**Andrew Shumway** asked Kyle Kubler why the union should have a voting seat on the GPSS.

**Kyle Kubler** agreed that the GPSS and the union had a strong partnership over the years from his perspective as a graduate student of six years in the Communication Department. He referred to the 2018 contract negotiations that were starting again in 2021. He said that there had been different statements by the union or resolutions related to contracts that had been brought to the GPSS. He said he considered the non-academic seat as a way to formalize the relationship between the GPSS and the union. He said that his main form of engagement with the union was his work on the contract enforcement workgroup. He said that a lot of his time was spent figuring out whether any potential contract violations were happening to graduate students. He said that this job pertained to the graduate students as academic workers and students. He said that the seat would potentially provide more formalized and quicker guidance related to the contracts. He said that while the contracts were not that complicated, the union would appreciate having extra advice on different measures or other things that the GPSS does to gather student input on academic worker contracts. On behalf of the union, Kyle Kubler said that the union welcomed any GPSS members who wanted to attend union meetings.

**Logan Jarrell** moved to extend time by five minutes. **Monia Jensen** seconded. No objections.

**Monica Jensen** said Kyle Kubler and Rene Singleton highlighted the reasons for creating the seat through whatever process necessary. She acknowledged that the language of “underrepresented group” did not apply but said that the conversations between the union and the GPSS could be lost. She suggested formalizing the relationship by giving the union a seat and doing the reverse as well to maintain a strong relationship with the union.

**Jules Overfelt** said that the GPSS should be careful not to double represent individuals. She said that she had spoken with Giuliana Conti in the past about people who were dual enrolled and technically had two representatives. She said she was more concerned about dual representation from the union than the D Center because students from the D Center were more marginalized to a smaller population and the GPSS did not have much of a history working with the differently-abled community or D Center. She wondered what the reason for creating a voting seat was and the specific context of not having double representation

**Aaron Yared** said Jules Overfelt had a good point and that a possible compromise was giving the union an ex-officio seat. He said this solution would allow the GPSS to have the union as a resource for expediting the process of asking questions about the contract. He said that the union would still have a voice to represent its perspective but that it would not be able to vote.

**Terrence Pope** said that the double representation question made him wonder how the interests of the GPSS and the union compared. He said he was trying to figure out whether the union had an identifiable constituency or whether there was room for a discussion.

**Kyle Kubler** said that the union would be happy with whatever came out of this Resolution and was happy to formalize its ties with the GPSS in any way. He said that the union did not have a particular stake in the outcome aside from one that would be mutually beneficial. He said that in the majority of cases, the union would not vote in a way that would put student interests against worker interests. He said during his experience working with the union, there had not been a big division of students as students versus students as workers. He said the main thing that the union wanted was having a quicker turnaround on some of the briefing or advice around the contract. He said that the union was also committed to some political work and said that it would be nice to discuss certain issues and share information with the GPSS. He said that the union needed to know who to contact or how to reach out to the GPSS. He said that previously, there were people involved in the union that were a part of the GPSS. Whenever these people graduated, the union always sought to find replacements. He said that it would be helpful to have this position in the GPSS. He said that the union did not appoint things, so it would probably go to an internal vote. He said that the union would appreciate having a clearer channel of communication with the GPSS.

**Terrence Pope** asked whether this discussion had happened among other members of the Executive Committee at any point in the past. He asked whether it would be appropriate to have a union person be on the Executive Committee and continue to invite union members to attend the GPSS meetings. He said that the GPSS had already established that the union members were welcome to the GPSS meetings. He said that the union represented students as workers like a political organization. He said that the union was like a special interest group. He wondered if the union could have a seat on the Executive Committee which dealt more with policy and direction instead of the minutiae of proceedings during general Senate meetings. He asked if this option felt like an appropriate compromise or if it was too involved.

**Logan Jarrell** said he had a similar thought to Terrence Pope’s. He said it was apparent that the Executive Committee was not in favor of the Resolution as it was currently written. He said that the inclusion of such a seat on the Executive Committee was unprecedented, but he could be unaware of events that happened more than a decade ago. He said there was nothing that disallowed it, but that adding an ex-officio member to the Executive Committee would be effectively changing its composition and thereby require a Bylaw change and a Constitutional change.

**Andrew Shumway** clarified it would require a Bylaw change but not a change to the Constitution.

**Logan Jarrell** agreed and noted that the Executive Committee’s composition was not established in the Constitution.

**Jules Overfelt** said that if the Executive Committee was planning on making Bylaw amendments, the Executive Committee should discuss the possibility and add it as a goal to achieve this year.

**Terrence Pope** moved to extend time by five minutes. **Monia Jensen** seconded. No objections.

**Andrew Shumway** asked if it would be better and more appropriate to have a liaison position specifically for communicating with the union. He said that the GPSS’s partnership with the union was very important, especially since this year was a bargaining year. He said it would probably involve less technicalities than amending the Bylaws to change the composition of the Executive Committee.

**Monica Jensen** asked whether having a liaison meant that the Executive Committee would not create a Senate ex-officio seat. She said that modifying the Executive Committee and not having a formal union representation were separate conversations that the Committee should entertain.

**Marty Varela** asked if the Executive Committee’s objection to adding a non-academic seat was the concern of double representation and if the concern could be addressed by adding language to the parameters around the seat. She said that if the GPSS and the union shared a history, the GPSS should work to maintain the connection instead of trying to maneuver in other ways to have a relationship. She said that the current proposal on the table solidified the relationship and a bidirectional relationship could result from it. She said that the GPSS could set parameters on the relationship because it was the GPSS’s prerogative. She said she thought this was a better thing to do than to try to do something and dilute the standing and position of this role. She said that the union’s voice needed to be heard since a lot of graduate students fell into categories that were covered by the union.

**Monica Jensen** said she agreed with Marty Varela about addressing the possibility of double representation. She said that judgment was not outweighed by the benefit of having the union more formally represented.

**Aaron Yared** noted that the double representation issue came up because of dual majors or programs. He said that in that case, people were represented by two departments whereas in this case, people were represented by an academic department and a different entity. He said it was difficult to compare the two, but that he agreed with Marty Varela and Monica Jensen that the benefits outweighed the costs. To address Terrence Pope’s point, he asked what the value of the union’s vote would be. He said that he was unaware of any issues where the UAW and the GPSS had opposing views.

**Jules Overfelt** said she was most concerned with what the Senate had to say. She said that the reasons presented at today’s meeting were insufficient to satisfy the Senate. She asked Logan Jarrell to encourage the Executive Committee to have an opportunity for a more robust conversation and present it to the Senate then.

**Logan Jarrell** withdrew the Resolution on the grounds of the issue of double representation. He said he would seek consultation from the Judicial Committee and pursue other options for union representation

**Aaron Yared** said that he thought the ex-officio seat was the best option as it was easiest to explain to the Senate. He said that the union’s representation, regardless of voting power, was valuable.

**Logan Jarrell** thanked Kyle Kubler for his time and said he would speak to him and the UAW 4121 Joint Council later.

**Kyle Kubler** thanked everyone for their time.

**Logan Jarrell** apologized for not allocating more time in the agenda for the current item.

**Jules Overfelt** said the Executive Committee members thought that the proposals were going to be a formality until they started asking hard questions.

# 6. [Action] Senate Meeting Agenda 6:16pm

**Aaron Yared** said that the next Senate meeting would not have a speaker.

**Logan Jarrell** said it was fine not to have a speaker because there was Senate business.

**Genevieve Hulley** said there were a first reading and second reading scheduled for next week.

**Aaron Yared** proposed having a section, preferably earlier on in the meeting, for open comments. He said that the virtual platform did not allow opportunities for Senators to freely talk to Executive Committee members in the hallway. He said that it resulted in issues getting shunted into random points of the meeting. Aaron Yared said that it was not fair to the Senators, and proposed that the open comment period last five minutes

**Logan Jarrell** said there was nothing that prohibited the GPSS from having public comments. He said that technically, the announcements item served as the public comment period, but it was probably not the best way to solicit comments.

**Ashlee Abrantes** asked whether someone would moderate the open comment period. She said she was concerned that one or two people would dominate the conversation.

**Britahny Baskin** asked whether it was possible to open the Zoom meeting before the official meeting. She said she missed having people coming together and chatting before the actual meeting started.

**Jules Overfelt** asked if someone could stay in the Zoom lobby during working group meetings so that the Senators could have a space to chat.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the Executive Committee could make the open comment period very formal. He said that if people wanted to speak, they could make it known during the approval of the agenda. He said that opening the Zoom meeting early meant that someone had to be there early to hold the space. He said he could not be the one to do it because he had a commitment before the meeting. He suggested creating a room for an open comment period during the working group period. He asked if the space was for things like what happened at the end of the Senate last week or for smaller conversations between other people.

**Aaron Yared** said he was thinking about what happened at the end of the meeting.

**Andrew Shumway** said that the best thing could be to tell the Senators to stick around after the meeting and talk one-on-one. He proposed using the working groups that did not have many members as a means of talking to members of the Executive Committee. He said that this method would not take up everyone's time while still giving people access to the Executive Committee.

**Terrence Pope** said that he had used the breakout room idea in his lab and it worked well. He said that people who didn’t feel what they had to say was important enough for the meeting would have a space to talk.

**Aaron Yared** said that there might be some issues that people did not feel comfortable saying in front of everybody else. He supported creating an extra working group for talking to Officers.

**Logan Jarrell** shared his screen and showed topics that the Senators were interested in, noting that there were not many responses. He said he did not know if it meant that people didn’t care about working groups or because people did not understand the request during the meeting.

**Terrence Pope** volunteered to do the new working group because his original working group had extensively merged its efforts with the union and had been working closely with it. He said that his working group did not use the time after the meetings but met at a different time.

**Jules Overfelt** said that people were not attending her group so she would be happy to stay in the lobby after the meeting. She said that there could be several members of the Executive Committee in the lobby and that the members could work on a rotating schedule or step out individually in a breakout room to talk to the Senators one-on-one. She said she was totally available because no one ever came to her work group.

**Aaron Yared** said that the Executive Committee could do a test at the next Senate meeting, see how it goes, and make adjustments from there.

**Logan Jarrell** said that there would be eight breakout rooms next week. He said that one breakout room would replace the International Students room for that week.

**Aaron Yared** said that Logan Jarrell should keep the eight breakout rooms and add a ninth one. He said that Terrence Pope should hop from the International Students room to the new one.

**Terrence Pope** said that the International Students room should continue to be open to hold a space for students who did not know that the working group was working with the union or were curious and wanted to chat with someone. He said he could commit to being in the room for the first few minutes.

**Aaron Yared** said that Marty Varela handled the land acknowledgment very well last week, but proposed that the Committee come up with a script.

**Marty Varela** said that the Executive Committee should write a land acknowledgment. She said she found several from UW and other sources. She advised the Committee to pick one and make it available for anyone that agreed to read the land acknowledgment.

**Jules Overfelt** said it would be good to have a handful of land acknowledgment statements as jumping off points. She said it would give people the flexibility to either read one or write one of their own.

**Marty Varela** suggested that the Committee say “present the land acknowledgment” instead of “read the land acknowledgment” so that the presenter knows they are doing something for the particular meeting and can make it unique and applicable to that meeting only.

**Britahny Baskin** said the Executive Committee should know the basics of what to cover in the land acknowledgment to be respectful. She said that naming the correct lands was important.

**Antonio Gonzalez** said that the statement he shared in the chat was the one that the ASUW used. He advised the Executive Committee to solicit the input of indigenous people and voices.

**Ashlee Abrantes** said that the statement should be vetted by indigenous people such as the University’s Tribal Liaison.

**Britahny Baskin** offered to present the land acknowledgment at the next Senate meeting. She asked for help pronouncing some of the words because she thought it would be disrespectful for her to try for the first time at the meeting.

**Monica Jensen** also volunteered and said she could learn how to pronounce the words. She asked if it was okay to use ASUW’s land acknowledgment statement.

**Antonio Gonzalez** said he would reach out to the ASUW leadership and said that the statement he put in the chat was pretty standard but that he could not talk for those stakeholders.

**Logan Jarrell** asked if the Executive Committee could add an activity to the agenda.

**Aaron Yared** suggested making breakout rooms for the activity.

**Jules Overfelt** said that most of the Senators would not enjoy that. She said that while building community was important, some people may be resentful of having to participate in a required meeting. She said that if the Executive Committee hosted optional activities, the Senators should be able to opt-out if they were uninterested.

**Britahny Baskin** asked if there was an activity that would benefit the Senate such as the parliamentary procedure primer.

**Logan Jarrell** suggested using the breakout rooms to allow people to decompress and reflect. He said that the Committee members could also give tips to the Senators on how to write a resolution.

**Terrence Pope** said that most Senators would appreciate having a shorter meeting. He said that there was value in the Senate’s professional training and resources and suggested asking the Senators what workshops they would be interested in hearing about. He said that a proposal or an amendment proposal resolution writing workshop would also be good.

**Marty Varela** asked why the Executive Committee was reluctant to have a short meeting. She said that many Senators expected robust meetings that went over time. She said that the Senators should be gifted with a short meeting and that there was nothing wrong with short meetings. She clarified that she was not opposed to having training opportunities and providing professional development chances, but unless someone had a pre-packaged presentation, the Committee risked trying to fill time for no reason.

**Logan Jarrell** moved to approve the Senate agenda. **Britahny Baskin** seconded. No objections.

# 7. [Information] Tri-Campus Meeting 6:41pm

**Aaron Yared** announced that there was a tri-campus meeting on Saturday.

**Logan Jarrell** said that the Officers wanted to invite the Executives Senators to attend the meeting but that their presence was not required.

**Aaron Yared** asked whether any veteran Executive Senators had ever attended a tri-campus meeting or if they had been expected to.

**Antonio Gonzalez** said that the tri-campus meeting was advertised to him as an opportunity to meet his counterpart at a different school.

**Aaron Yared** said that the GPSS was organized so differently from the rest of the student government that it would be tough finding a counterpart. He said someone had reached out to him to try to figure out who his counterpart and other Officer counterparts would be. He said that Executive Senators had previously been invited and that some Senators had attended the tri-campus meeting.

**Abbie Shew** said that she had previously attended a tri-campus meeting. She said that the entire external team went two years ago, so it was not unprecedented for various people from GPSS to be there. She asked whether other graduate students or graduate student representatives that were not a part of GPSS would be there.

**Aaron Yared** said there would not be unless the ASUW of Tacoma or Bothell sent elected graduate students. He said that the GPSS would be the only group representing graduate students. He said that the entire Executive Committee was welcome to attend the meeting.

**Logan Jarrell** asked if the Executive Committee was required to give a presentation.

**Aaron Yared** said he took the orientation presentation and deleted a few slides. He asked Antonio Gonzalez if ASUW was planning on doing a presentation or if they were just introducing themselves.

**Antonio Gonzalez** said that is what they were doing.

**Genevieve Hulley** said they could do it on Friday during the Officer meeting.

**Jules Overfelt** asked Aaron Yared to share with Antonio Gonzalez why the Executive Committee was creating a presentation. She said that Aaron Yared was not prepared last time.

**Aaron Yared** said he had been the Director of Government Relations at ASUW Bothell about two years ago. He said he attended his first tri-campus meeting which was held in Seattle. He said that his president had a Type A personality and had a ten-point presentation ready to go. He said that as she was presenting, ASUW Seattle and the GPSS scrambled to create PowerPoints as fast as they could. He said that ASUW Tacoma completely gave up on making presentation slides, wrote their names on the board, and talked about themselves. He said that anyone who was interested was invited and should send him an email so that he could send them the information. He said that the meeting was on Saturday from 11am to 1pm. He said that the purpose of the meeting was to meet and greet each other’s counterparts and promote tri-campus collaboration.

# 8. [Information] Constitution and Bylaws Ad Hoc Committee 6:48pm

**Logan Jarrell** said he had not yet discussed this topic with anyone although many people had expressed interest in it last week. He said that the feedback from the Executive Committee last week was especially helpful and he had thought about the composition. He noted that other ad hoc committees did not have a set composition, which contrasted them from standing committees, and often had only one required individual, oftentimes the chair, and sometimes an Officer. He said that in an ideal situation, there would be diverse GPSS representation and the ability for any interested persons to participate. He said that he did not come up with a set number of individuals for the committee like is typical for an ad hoc committee.

**Logan Jarrell** said that there needed to be representation from at least one Officer and volunteered to be that Officer. He said it made the most sense for the Officer to be either the President or the Secretary. He said that there should be at least one Executive Senator because of the unique role that they serve in the GPSS. He said that at least one member from each of the standing committees could be required to be a part of the ad hoc committee. He said it may be excessive for all of the committees to be represented, but those were the only groups he required. He said that the chairship was currently rotational.

**Aaron Yared** asked if it would be worthwhile to add a representative from the Equity and Accountability committee (E&A) because the Executive Committee had discussed changing E&A at the beginning of the year and raising its level of authority.

**Logan Jarrell** said he was not opposed to it, but that the Secretary already represented E&A.

**Monica Jensen** said that there was routinely an awkward, dead silence when the Executive Committee asked people at Senate to volunteer for more committees. She asked if not having so many requirements would be better.

**Logan Jarrell** said that it would not be determined on votes from the Senators. He said that if people showed up, their input was received. He said this system was currently how the GPSS’s ad hoc committees worked which explained why the GPSS had two or three empty committees.

**Aaron Yared** thanked Logan Jarrell for the update

**Logan Jarrell** asked people who were interested last week to follow up. He said that the work would not get done this quarter otherwise. He said it would be a detriment if the Executive Committee did not have something like this, and that the strategic plan outlined three blocks of Bylaw review. He said that combining the three blocks into one would be more efficient. He said that the Committee had been outlining dramatically new solutions this year to problems that members were well aware of; some of the members had faced the problems for several years.

# 9. [Information] Announcements 6:52pm

**Aaron Yared** asked for feedback on the possibility of creating a survey.to ask graduate and professional students how they felt about reverting to in-person operations during Fall quarter. He said he had received an email from President Cauce that Spring quarter would be held virtually. He said that if the vaccination schedule stayed on track, the fall quarter would be in-person. He said he wanted to create a survey to ask graduate and professional students how.

**Genevieve Hulley** said she had heard of the university shifting to more hybrid classes due to student demand.

**Aaron Yared** said knowing how people felt about hybrid classes was valuable.

**Andrew Shumway** said that the future was uncertain. He said that it was probably too early to ask people how they felt about returning to in-person classes. He supported sending out a survey in the spring quarter.

**Ashelle Abrantes** said that President Cauce had asked, literally right before the GPSS Executive meeting, what the impacts of reverting to in-person classes in the fall would be. She said she and Aaron Yared were only two voices for all the graduate and professional students amongst the many undergraduate representatives. She said that most undergraduates were not parents, whereas there were a significant number of graduate students who were. She said that she and Aaron Yared wanted to get a sense of what people were thinking. She said she was looking for graduate and professional student priorities to relay back to President Cauce.

**Bill Mahoney** explained that two university committees were working on this matter: the Back-to-Work and Back-to-School Committees. He said there were many layers of conversations going on on-campus. He said that he told Dean Williamson-Lott, a member of the Back-to-School Committee, that graduate students should be treated in this setting more as faculty than as students because of their responsibilities. He said that many students had not left campus; his medical students had been gone for two weeks and came back into the lab with little change except with the addition of facemasks and special approval to work. He said that this arrangement was common across the departments in environment and engineering and other main parts of campus.

**Bill Mahoney** said that the worst part was that the students had not been treated like faculty. He said that the students were on campus more often than faculty. He said that the vaccine rollout plan did not prioritize graduate students. He said that the university was pushing off opening classrooms until the faculty members were vaccinated. He said he pushed Dean Williamson-Lott to do the same for graduate students who were asked to be in that setting. Bill Mahoney said he agreed with Andrew Shumway that it was a little early to have people make a statement of whether they would come back to in-person classes because the future was uncertain. He advised the survey writers to frame the survey as “assuming rollout goes well, assuming the vaccines work and are effective, are you okay with it?” He said it was a good idea to frame the survey as “what has happened during COVID in terms of asynchronous learning that you hope will be continued even if you are allowed to come back to campus?” Bill Mahoney said that the suggestions could be related to classroom settings and research, but also how many students were using telehealth services. He said he would hate if the My SSP program was terminated after COVID. He said that the Executive Committee might want to frame the survey in a way that would inform the Committee of what positive changes or financial considerations that the students wanted to keep.

**Logan Jarrell** asked Bill Mahoney if it was a good opportunity for the Graduate School and the GPSS to collaborate or whether the Graduate School was not interested in soliciting this type of feedback so early.

**Bill Mahoney** said that he suspected that Dean Williamson-Lott would think it was too early. He said she had been leaving everything up to the working groups to make those decisions. He said that President Cauce and Provost Richards created the working groups to give them guidance. He asked if there was a GPSS representative on the Back-to-Work or Back-to-School Committee.

**Aaron Yared** said he was not aware of any.

**Bill Mahoney** encouraged the Executive Committee to advocate for a position. He said that the Back-to-Work committee was headed by HR’s Mindy Kornberg and other HR personnel. He advised the Committee to say something along the lines of “We understand that we weren’t included in this when it started, but now that we're getting closer and starting to make these decisions, we think that a student voice should be represented.” He said that the GPSS could collaborate with ASUW to get both voices on the working group. He said that this position gave GPSS the opportunity to advise the Back-to-Work Committee and adds intention to the survey.

**Bill Mahoney** said that the back-to-school committee was headed by Ed Taylor and Dean Williamson-Lott. He encouraged the Executive Committee to reach out to them about getting their voices heard. He said that the Back-to-School Committee might be a bit less helpful because graduate students have responsibilities that more similarly resemble those of faculty members.

**Britahny Baskin** said she agreed with Andrew Shumway in that it was too early to ask this question. She said that if President Cauce was asking now, it was appropriate to solicit the information both on the asking about accessibility standpoint, but also comfort regarding COVID. She said that she had received the first dose of her vaccine, but it did not change her routine to how she acted pre-COVID.

**Jules Overfelt** said that it was worth putting out a survey, even if people said it was too soon to tell. She said she was not willing to make a commitment that would say something as well. She said that people could not make plans about their living situation and that some people were remote. She said that some people had moved away to somewhere with a lower cost of living. She said that the administration should make sure that people had enough time to move. She said that the survey would be useful even if the answer was “I don’t know.” She said that it was concerning how little warning students would get, especially since her number one concern was always “where am I going to live?”

**Janis Shin** said that the GPSS should ask the administration if the administration was planning to have a transition period. She noted it was hard to get out of a lease which was typically a year long.

**Monica Jensen** said that most of the people in her program did not move to Seattle. She stressed the importance of having enough notice to decide where to move and knowing how to lobby departments if necessary. She said that the decision would break down to a departmental level and would probably not be consistent across the campus. She noted that the medical and engineering students were mostly still on campus but that other programs where students were not on campus.

**Logan Jarrell** said that long discussions such as this one could be put on the agenda in the future.

**Logan Jarrell** motioned to extend time by three minutes. **Britahny Baskin** seconded. No objections.

**Logan Jarrell** said that he would be attending a meeting on the Free Speech forum later this week.

**Britahny Baskin** said that she would meet with someone from the union on Tuesday to talk about the gap in insurance that happens every year and that her working group was workshopping different health insurance options at UW and how it compares to other schools. She said they were trying to calculate how to cover the most amount of people as possible, including undocumented and international students. She asked people to email her with any information or direction.

**Bill Mahoney** said that the GPSS had previously held a webinar with Patricia Atwater a year ago on the Core Programs website. He referred Britahny Baskin to Jaye Sablan for help finding the webinar. He said that the webinar addressed AppleCare, international student health care, and other topics regarding local resources. He said that the university had not done a cross peer analysis for other universities. He asked whether the “gap in insurance” meant the time that happened at the beginning of the quarter before insurance was updated with the list of people or a different issue.

**Britahny Baskin** clarified that it referred to the gap that annually happened in October where the insurance company was unaware of who was covered by the plan. She said that the insurance company was willing to back pay, but that people still had to pay out of pocket and that was an issue.

**Bill Mahoney** asked whether the union had an answer. He referred Britahny Baskin to Helene Obradovich, the Director of Fellowships and Awards at the Graduate School. He said that she sends an email to every graduate program reminding them to compile a list of students to send to LifeWise. He said he never understood why the list could not be made sooner, especially for continuing students.

**Britahny Baskin** said she had spoken with many people and they all said that it was the GAIP that did not send the list to LifeWise. She said she did not know why they waited until October, and their excuse was that students would receive back pay. She said that the union had already filed a grievance and was working to file another grievance about the gap in insurance.

# 10. [Action] Adjournment 7:11pm

**Logan Jarrell** moved to adjourn the meeting. **Terrence Pope** seconded. No objections.

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