1. [Action] Call to Order 5:39pm

Aaron Yared called the meeting to order at 5:39pm.

2. [Action] Approval of the Agenda 5:39pm

Angela Yang moved to approve the agenda. Pratima KC (Environmental & Forestry Sciences) seconded. No objections.

3. [Action] Approval of the Minutes 5:40pm

Pratima KC (Environmental & Forestry Sciences) motioned to approve the minutes. Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience) seconded. No objections.

4. [Information] Land Acknowledgment 5:40pm

Janis Shin (Molecular Engineering & Sciences) gave the land acknowledgement. The Graduate Professional Student Senate acknowledges the indigenous peoples of this land and the land, which touches the shared waters of all tribes and bands within the
Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations and the Duwamish peoples whose lands the university currently occupies. It is everyone’s role and responsibility as guests to understand how their impact entangles the caretakers.

Janis Shin (Molecular Engineering & Sciences) said that the Executive Committee had discussed whose lands the UW occupied. She said that senators could look at a map to see which indigenous groups’ land they lived on.

Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience) shared the link, https://native-land.ca/, in the chat.

5. [Information] Senate Check-In 5:42pm

Question: if you can go see anyone on a musical tour, whose would you go to? Past, present, or future.

Aaron Yared told the senators that he would send them into breakout rooms, like he had at the beginning of the year and throughout last year. He said that the goal was to allow people to meet each other and be more social. He asked Davon Thomas (Public Administration) for the icebreaker question.

Davon Thomas (Public Administration) asked “If you could go on any musical tour, who would you go to?” He credited Meshell Sturgis for the idea to bring back breakout rooms.

Aaron Yared said that the question could include people in the past, present, and future.

Senators were sent to breakout rooms for 10 minutes.

6. [Information] Student Representative Committee
Speaker 5:56pm

Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience) said that the neuroscience program had had some struggles with transparency on how it was run and how it dealt with student concerns. She said that students in her program formed a student representative committee to address these issues in response. She said that students in her department did not have any examples to draw from, so she thought it would be helpful to share her program’s student committee’s charter and their process for creating it. She introduced Kristen Drummey, a fourth year graduate student in the neuroscience program who helped design the committee and participated in its first year.

Kristen Drummey introduced herself and said that she had been heavily involved the committee from its inception. She said that the student representation committee (SRC) was a student-run liaison between the student body and the neuroscience program. She said that the SRC's main focuses were to advocate for students' needs, work with the program to address student concerns, ensure student feedback and concerns were routinely communicated to the program, and regularly communicate program priorities and progress back to students.
Kristen Drummey said that the idea for the SRC was conceived around summer 2020. She said that the students had serious concerns that the program was not adequately listening to or responding to student concerns. She said that the program leadership also felt frustrated because they felt that students were not aware of progress that they had made. She said that students responded to these concerns by setting up a task force which eventually created the SRC. She said that the task force had worked on the structure and charter throughout the fall of 2020, and that the first SRC elections were held in winter 2021. She noted that the SRC had been in existence for just over a year now.

Kristen Drummey said that the SRC gathered student feedback on program priorities and work that the program was doing. She said that the SRC advocated for students and addressed acute issues as they came up. At students’ requests, and depending on the issue, the SRC helped to interface with other groups, such as administrative committees in the program or the student union. She said that the SRC worked with program leadership on long term projects to improve student welfare and represented student interests at faculty meetings.

Kristen Drummey said that the SRC’s board was made up of both elected and unelected positions. She said that four positions were elected by the full student body, ideally five cohort representatives that are elected by each cohort. She said that there were also unelected volunteer positions. She said that the goal of the coordinator was to identify major student concerns or areas for improvement in the program based on student feedback that the SRC received. She said that the coordinator also set goals and long term projects for the quarter and worked with program leadership to create project plans and milestones.

Kristen Drummey said that she currently served as the SRC’s logistics coordinator and said that the role was responsible for keeping track of short term deadlines and milestones, scheduling meetings and short term projects, and organizing the SRC’s resources. She said that the SRC’s student feedback coordinator kept track of and consolidated feedback from students. She said that students could submit feedback through multiple different channels which she would elaborate more on later. She said that the role was also responsible for communicating goal progress back to students.

Kristan Drummey said that one of the major issues that came up when the students were forming the SRC was the students were not aware of what happened at various faculty meetings held by the program throughout the year. She said that the SRC made sure to have a student present at those meetings to take notes that would then be distributed to the broader student body so that the students were aware of decisions that were made by faculty in the meetings. She said that the SRC secretary took notes at all of the meetings and distributed them to students through a shared Google Drive that all of the student body had access to.

Kristan Drummey said that the last elected positions on the SRC were cohort representatives. She said that cohort representatives were elected by each cohort of students to represent the cohort's interests to the SRC. She said that the cohort representatives communicated cohort needs to the SRC and solicited cohort-specific feedback. She said that the cohort representatives were crucial for the program’s first year students. She said that it was instrumental to hear from each cohort and communicate these needs to the rest of the board.
Kristan Drummey said that the SRC also had unelected volunteer positions. She said that these positions were designed so that students could participate in the SRC without having to commit to a year-long term. She said that the SRC’s leaderships wanted students to feel like they could be involved as much as they wanted to be and did not want to overburden students who did not feel like they could commit to the responsibilities in the full time commitment of one of the elected positions. She said that volunteers could join at any time for any period of time. She said that volunteers were welcome to attend meetings, provide feedback to the SRC about goals and progress, and contribute to short and long term projects if they had the time.

Kristan Drummey said that the SRC had several different mechanisms through which it communicated with students. She said that the student body had a Slack and that there was a SRC channel within the Slack where the SRC posted announcements and held an open space for students to discuss issues or ask questions. She said that the SRC also had an open Google form that students could ask questions or submit concerns and feedback. She said that students could elect to add their name and contact info to the Google form if they wanted the SRC to follow up with them. She said that the SRC felt that it was important to have a mechanism where students could submit concerns without feeling like they had to attach their name to it.

Kristan Drummey said that the SRC hosted quarterly student town halls. She said that these town halls were open forums where the SRC gave short updates on any progress over the last quarter and then opened the floor to hear directly from students about any concerns. She said that though all these mechanisms were in place, students typically reached out directly to one of the SRC members, which was also helpful. She said that the neuroscience program had a cohesive student body, which was nice.

Kristan Drummey said that the SRC also communicated with program leadership, specifically the program’s directors and program administrators. She said that prior to that SRC’s founding, the program administration held weekly program meetings where the directors and administrators would talk about the previous week and discuss things coming up for the next week. She said that since the founding of the SRC, an SRC board member attends these meetings, takes notes at the meeting, and then distributes the notes to the students so that students are aware what program leadership is up to on a weekly basis. She said that the SRC representative at the meeting will also update program leadership on any goals, progress, or student concerns that had come up in the previous week.

Kristan Drummey said that the SRC also hosted quarterly goals meetings where the SRC and the program leadership set goals for the quarter, discussed progress on previous goals, and communicated any major student concerns. She said that she thought the SRC had done well for a brand new group. She said that in its first year, the SRC had formulated some major goals based on student feedback. These goals were to improve program support for international students, develop an in-program reporting system for various student complaints and issues, adjust how the program communicated with the student body at large, and reestablish student community in a post-COVID world. She admitted that the last goal had not come into fruition yet.

Kristan Drummey said that the SRC had learned that a quarter was a very short period of time
and many of these goals had gone on to the next quarter and beyond. She said that the SRC had made some improvements and had an extensive page on its website specifically with resources for international students. She said that the SRC had made listservs and were able to email students by themselves. She said that the SRC had planned some student events in the fall which unfortunately had been canceled. She said that the SRC was making some progress on these goals and would hopefully meet more goals in the future. She said that the SRC was constantly looking for more resources and methods for improving on the issues that the students brought before them.

**Kristan Drummey** reiterated that much of the SRC’s time had been spent representing student interests at various meetings. She said that the SRC’s biggest time expenditure had been on addressing acute issues that have come up during the year, such as direct student complaints or concerns. She said that depending on the issue, the SRC had worked directly with the program directors, various administrative committees within the program, and the student union to resolve these issues. She said that the method of solution also depended on what the student wanted and had asked the SRC to do. She said that the SRC had served as a support for students in these cases and ensured followthrough on their complaints. She said that she felt that that was the most useful thing that the SRC has done. She said that it was extremely difficult to deal with these types of issues as an individual student and said that having a group advocate, find resources, and help resolve the issue on the student’s behalf was very useful.

**Kristan Drummey** added that the program leadership had come to rely on the SRC when issues arose. She said that she felt that the SRC had formed a good bidirectional relationship, both with students and the program leadership, which allowed the SRC to help both parties. She said that the SRC was currently running elections and transitioning to a new board in the next couple of weeks, which was exciting. She noted that the neuroscience program had many great incoming students and looked forward to seeing what they did with the SRC.

**Kristen Drummey** said that the SRC was officially recognized as a committee by the neuroscience program. She said that the SRC’s executive committee had voted on it last year with the charter, and had established the charter. She said that the SRC would continue to exist and help students into the future. She thanked everyone for listening and said that the SRC had been one of the most rewarding things she had done in graduate school. She said that she was always super excited to talk about it and welcomed questions from the senators. She also said that senators were welcome to email her.

**Marty Varela (Residential Community Student Association)** asked what financial support the SRC received. She asked Kristen Drummey if she received money from the program, the Student Resources Office, or a variety of sources. She hoped that this was not solely a volunteer effort.

**Kristen Drummey** said that the SRC was unfortunately a volunteer effort. She said that the SRC had brought up this issue. She said that because the neuroscience program was not a department, its funding structure was subpar. She said that it was worth the new board asking the Graduate School for financial support for this effort, especially since the SRC had proven that it was a useful resource that took up student time.
Catalina Burch (Marine & Environmental Affairs) asked how Kristen Drummey went about trying to implement the SRC and asked what first steps the students had to take to bring the committee to life.

Kristen Drummey said that it involved many conversations. She said that many students had been involved in the early planning stages.

Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience) said that she was also involved in the process. She said that the students had reached a boiling point when their concerns were not addressed. She said that it was difficult for students to address interpersonal issues within the program. She said that the students also felt that the neuroscience program did not respond well to the Black Lives Matter protests that were going on at the time. She said that this prompted the alumni and students to send letters to the program demanding movement on some issues. She said that the program responded by saying that the students could create a way for the administrators to work with them in a better way. Therefore, the students held many town halls and the SRC came into being. She said that the neuroscience students did not have a framework to go off. Thus, they wanted to present their experience to other senators as an example.

Britahny Baskin (Neuroscience) said that the neuroscience program had had some issues with professors and had been able to interface with the union and the Graduate School and the program directors to remove problematic professors from student-facing roles so that students no longer had to deal with that issue. She said that this feat was one of the SRC’s biggest wins of its first year.

Kristen Drummey agreed.

Davon Thomas (Public Administration) said he really liked the SRC’s logo.

Kristen Drummey thanked him and said that she made it herself.

7. [Action] Senator of the Month 6:14pm

Gabby Rivera explained that she was trying to implement a Senator of the Month program. She said that she had not received any nominations. She opened the floor for nominations. She said that she wanted to celebrate the hard work that senators had put into the Senate and beyond the Senate. She said that the nomination was a low-pressure chance for the GPSS to highlight its senators. She put the link to the nomination form in the chat.

Aaron Yared clarified that officers could not be considered for the recognition because the intent was to put a spotlight on the senators. He said that the officers already claimed enough of the spotlight.

Marty Varela (Residential Community Student Association) nominated Alexander Novokhodko (Mechanical Engineering).

Marty Varela (Residential Community Student Association) said that Alexander Novokhodko (Mechanical Engineering) had been a part of the GPSS for years in many different areas. She
said that he was a persistent and staunch advocate for every matter that was important to
graduate students. She said that she did not know how he managed to do all of it on top of his
academic load, but that his brilliance was evident. She said that though everyone was limited by
the same 24 hours, he seemed to do more.

Pratima KC (Environmental & Forestry Sciences) seconded the nomination.

Alexander Novokhodko (Mechanical Engineering) nominated Malikai Bass (Museology).

Alexander Novokhodko (Mechanical Engineering) said that Malikai Bass (Museology) had
put a lot of work into the recent resolutions and said that this effort should be acknowledged and
celebrated.

Aaron Yared thanked everyone for the nominations and referred everyone to the link to the
nomination form.

8. [Information] Blueprint Discussion 6:19pm

Meshell Sturgis said that Rickey Hall and Chadwick Allen would present the Diversity Blueprint
and some of the revisions that had been made for the years to come.

Rickey Hall introduced himself as the Vice President for Minority Affairs of Diversity and the
university's diversity office. He said that the first Diversity Blueprint had been drafted in 2010
and was active for the periods of 2010 through 2014. He said that he had arrived at UW in 2016
and explained that the diversity council at the time was in the process of drafting the second
iteration of the Diversity Blueprint. He said that the diversity council had waited for his arrival so
that he could review the document. He said that some of the language in the document was
changed, and the document was in use from 2017 to 2021. He said that the diversity council
had revised and drafted the new blueprint for the last 10 months and said that the new
document would be used for the years 2022 through 2026. He said that he and Chadwick Allen
were the co-chairs for the diversity council.

Chadwick Allen introduced himself as the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement. He
said that he would explain the role of the Diversity Blueprint. He said that the last version of the
blueprint had a message from the President as well as a message from himself and Rickey Hall
as co-chairs of the diversity council. He said that he and Rickey Hall would write introductions to
frame the new diversity blueprint as well once they had finished soliciting feedback from all over
campus. He said that there was a list of the high level goals and suggestions for how people
could localize the goals in their particular units, whether it was an administrative or academic
one.

Chadwick Allen said that the blueprint contained a set of high level aspirational goals for the
whole tricampus university community. He said that the blueprint provided an overarching
framework for diversity, equity, inclusion and access efforts rather than a specific action plan for
individual units. He said that the blueprint did not tell units what they had to do. He said that its
purpose was to set high level goals for the units to localize. He said that individual units,
whether academic or administrative, were expected to design local strategic action plans in
alignment with the broad goals of the blueprint.

Chadwick Allen said that the 2017-2021 blueprint had contained six high level goals. He said that these goals were defined by the diversity council, which was the university’s most representative diversity body across the three campuses with representatives from every academic unit and every administrative unit. He said that there were goals about climate, students, faculty, and staff. He said that goal number six was about improving accountability and transparency. He said that when the goal was written in 2015-2016, many considered the sixth goal to be the most important goal and chose to have it as a separate goal rather than having it folded into all the others.

Chadwick Allen said that when the blueprint was rolled out in 2017, the diversity council did a number of activities to support it. He said that it solicited feedback like he was doing now and had met with various groups of leadership across the three campuses. He said that the diversity council launched a series of workshops that focused on specific goals to give people concrete ideas about how they would implement the goals in their own units. He said that the diversity council hosted workshops on strategic planning, on mentoring and supporting diverse staff, and how to develop and use a climate survey. He said that at that point, the UW did not have a major tricampus climate survey that looked at students, staff and faculty in many years, so people were really unfamiliar with it. He said that the diversity council was not sure if it should develop its own survey or hire an outside consultant. Chadwick Allen said that the diversity council invited consultant Sue Rankin from Sue Rankin and Associates run the climate survey workshop. He said that over 200 people showed up to the workshop because there was a lot of interest on the topic.

Chadwick Allen said that the diversity council also launched the Diversity Seed Grants program. He said that the program was funded by the Office of Minority and Diversity. He said that Rickey Hall gave the program $45,000 a year to support small seed grants. He said that projects could receive up to $3,000 and that the projects could be launched by a single unit, by units working together, or students, staff or faculty, or people working together. He said that the project needed to align with one or more of the high level goals. He said that the diversity council had facilitated six rounds of seed grants and had witnessed amazing projects from all three campuses. He said that topics ranged from things focused on campus, things focused off campus, doing outreach, and pathways programs. He said that as people completed their projects, they turned in short reports which were then posted on the diversity council’s website. He said that the diversity council also had people come and report on their project to the diversity council.

Chadwick Allen presented the new version of the Diversity Blueprint and said that the diversity council had been working on revising and updating the blueprint for the last 10 months. He said that the new blueprint would apply to the years 2022-2026. He said that the diversity council decided to keep five of the six goals because they are familiar and still important. He said that the language for those goals was updated.

Chadwick Allen said that the exception was goal number five. He reminded everyone that the old goal number five was to assess tricampus diversity needs. He said that the diversity council decided that this goal was not something that could be localized in every unit. He said that the
diversity council decided to highlight and embed tricampus efforts in every goal, and create a new goal five: develop place-based education and engagement to advance access, equity and inclusion.

**Chadwick Allen** said that the first goal was “Cultivate an accessible, inclusive and equitable climate.” He said that the old first goal was “Cultivate an inclusive climate.” He said that the addition of the words “accessible” and “equitable” highlighted the ideas that the diversity council felt were really important. He said that the goal’s specific description was “The university must actively work to create and maintain learning, working, living and health care spaces in which students, faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds believe they can thrive. Our goal is to foster a welcoming climate that is accessible, inclusive and equitable across our campus, research, health care and virtual environments.” He said that part of the update was to not only specifically mention learning spaces and working spaces but also living spaces, healthcare spaces, and virtual environments. He noted that everyone had spent so much time in virtual environments for the past two years. He said that the diversity council had become attuned to the need to make sure that virtual spaces and physical spaces were accessible, inclusive, and welcoming.

**Chadwick Allen** said that goal two was “Attract, retain and graduate a diverse and excellent student body.” He said that this was another goal that was carried forward, but that the language had been updated. He said that it now read: “The university must continue to actively recruit and support a diverse body of undergraduate, graduate and professional students. The University must increase its capacity to serve students from communities that are underrepresented in higher education, including students who identify as indigenous, Black and People of Color; students from low and modest income families; students who identify as disabled, LGBTQ+, veterans and alumni of foster care; international students; transfer students; and students who are part of recent immigrant populations.” He said that the new language emphasized that active recruitment, support and serving must continue. He said that the diversity council wanted to call out some more specific populations, so the newer language included indigenous, Black and People of Color. He said that the diversity council had also added groups like alumni of foster care which had not been included in the past and noted that the University of Washington happened to have great programs to support alumni of foster care. He said that the list was not meant to be an exhaustive list, but was meant to do a better job of indicating some of the groups underrepresented in higher education that the university especially wanted to attract, retain and graduate.

**Chadwick Allen** said that the third goal, “Attract and retain a diverse faculty,” had also been updated. He read “The University must increase efforts to recruit faculty, postdocs and other academic personnel from backgrounds that are underrepresented in higher education, including those who identify as indigenous, Black and people of color. The University must increase efforts to retain diverse faculty at all ranks and to support the success of diverse academic personnel across the full arcs of their careers.” He said that the major update was the language of “must increase efforts.” He said that the diversity council also called out postdocs and other academic personnel to ensure that all faculty roles, clinical faculty, research faculty, other types of faculty, were captured. He noted that postdocs often were left out of discussions of faculty, particularly in discussions about faculty recruitment and retention, so language had been added to include them.
Chadwick Allen said that the fourth goal was to attract and retain a diverse staff. He said that the language was very similar to the faculty language. He read “The University must increase efforts to recruit staff from backgrounds that are underrepresented in higher education, including staff who identify as indigenous, Black and People Of Color. The University must increase efforts to retain diverse staff at all ranks and to support the success of diverse staff across the full arcs of their careers.”

Chadwick Allen said that the fifth goal was the new goal: “Develop place-based education and engagement to advance access, equity and inclusion.” He read “The University must provide all students, staff and faculty with opportunities to better understand the environments in which their learning and work lives take place. In particular, the University must rigorously explore its histories of racial, ethnic and other forms of exclusion and actively engage the histories of the diverse communities within which its Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses are located.” He said that the new goal was a response not only to events since 2020 but from the last decade. He noted that there were a number of terrible, racially motivated activities at various universities around the country in the last decade.

Chadwick Allen recalled that in 2017 at the University of Virginia, a white supremacist and a counter activist was murdered in the event. He said that in the aftermath, people at the University of Virginia suddenly became more aware of how disconnected their faculty and even some of their students and staff were from the local history, in regards to understanding the state of Virginia, understanding the history of slavery, Jim Crow, and ongoing racism. He noted that the University of Virginia had participated in eugenics research in the 1920s. He said that most faculty who worked there had not been raised in Virginia and did not know any of its history. He said that faculty disavowed their responsibility for responding to that history.

Chadwick Allen said that the University of Virginia created a summer program for the faculty to learn about local history and the history of their university and how to start incorporating place based education into their curricula and into their pedagogy in the wake of the tragedy. He said that the UW decided that it needed something similar, not only for the faculty and not only a one-off summer program. He said that the UW needed an ongoing program to give people opportunities to learn the history of the university, the history of the cities where the universities were located, and the history of the larger state and region that UW-affiliated people served and worked in. He said that everyone needed to learn where the students came from and what communities the UW served and interacted with.

Chadwick Allen said that many people were very excited about the new goal. He said that he had already seen people moving in this direction by learning more about campus monuments, campus artwork, street names, building names, the history of activism on campus, and the diverse histories of the communities. He said that there was also much excitement about student-led projects as well as faculty and staff-led projects. He said that he was particularly invested in this new goal.

Chadwick Allen said that the final goal had been updated: “Improve accountability and transparency at all levels.” He explained that the earlier version was simply “Improve accountability and transparency” and noted that the focus was primarily at the highest levels of
accountability such as the President, Provost, and Board of Regents. He said that while those levels of accountability were still important, the diversity council felt strongly that the UW needed to emphasize that accountability and transparency needed to be at all levels. He said that the new language read “University leadership must commit to working towards established goals for diversity, equity, access and inclusion. Leaders at all levels must accept accountability by implementing new initiatives to achieve these goals; ensure that best practices are disseminated across three campuses and across all of our research, health care and virtual environments; and make clear the University's community's responsibility for advancing diversity, equity, access and inclusion.” He said that the diversity council had expanded the language to clarify that it was everyone's responsibility to contribute to these goals and be accountable.

Chadwick Allen said that under each new goal, there was a short list of concrete examples of how someone could localize the goals in their unit. He said that the diversity council had tried to keep the examples down to 8 or 10. He said that the examples were not meant to be exhaustive. He said that the diversity council was working on a blueprint scorecard whose purpose was to track high level accountability, such as at the college, school, and campus level. He said that the diversity council was also developing an online tool kit with resources for localizing the goals. He said that the online tool kit would include links to relevant materials and would allow the diversity council to deposit new project results into the tool kit for people to access and use as examples for their own work.

Chadwick Allen said that the diversity council was also considering whether to change the name of the Diversity Blueprint. He said that the name had been given to the document's first iteration in 2010 and that the name had been carried forward in 2017. He said that some people thought that the language was dated while others liked it because it was familiar and well known. He said that the diversity council had discussed options such as continuing to use the word "blueprint" to retain the brand recognition. He said that the name could change to “UW Blueprint for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion,” or just “Equity and Inclusion,” or “Access, Equity and Inclusion.” He said that some people had suggested that the diversity council keep “Diversity Blueprint” and add a subtitle. He said that he and Rickey Hall were interested if anyone had any suggestions about potential language for the name.

Chadwick Allen said that the next steps for the Diversity Blueprint was soliciting feedback. He said that he had already spoken with the diversity council, UW Diversity Leads group, the President and cabinet, board of deans and chancellors, and ASUW leadership. He said that he would meet with the ASUW staff organizations and the Board of Regents soon.

Pratima KC (Environmental & Forestry Sciences) asked if there was a timeline for keeping units accountable. She said that there was a lack of diversity in her department among the students and faculty. She said that it might be possible to recruit a diverse student pool if the admission process was changed, but asked how a diverse pool of faculty might be attained. She asked if the timelines for increasing diversity amongst students and faculty were different.

Rickey Hall said that he tried to upload a PDF of the goals into the chat. He said that he would send a copy to Aaron Yared and Meshell Sturgis afterwards. He said that the PDF contained the goals and examples of localizing. He said that the UW was a large, complex institution and that
each college or school was in a different place of progress than another. He said that there were many reasons for these differences such as budget models. He said that he and the Provost were working to increase faculty diversity across the university. He pointed out that there had been a recent announcement about how the incoming cohort of faculty that came in this fall was probably the most diverse ever. He said that the UW needed to make sure that it retained the faculty. He said that these new hires might not apply to her department or school.

Rickey Hall said that he was meeting with the dean of the College of the Environment tomorrow to discuss diversity issues. He said that one of the questions that the dean would want to discuss would be what the college was doing in terms of diversifying faculty. He said that this was a good time to raise these questions, especially with the dean. He said that the students should also continue to emphasize the importance of this issue with the Provost, because the Provost was an important driver of these initiatives as well.

Meshell Sturgis motioned to extend time by 5 minutes. Pratima KC (Environmental & Forestry Sciences) seconded. No objections

Davon Thomas (Public Administration) asked if the blueprint that had just been presented was for 2022 and the next few years.

Rickey Hall said yes.

Davon Thomas (Public Administration) asked if it was possible to see the successes of the 2017-2021 Diversity Blueprint. He said that the diversity council could create a blueprint, but said he wanted to see the products of the blueprint and what had changed before the next blueprint was issued. He suggested that Rickey Hall and Chadwick Allen come back to present on what had been successfully accomplished from the previous blueprint and what had not.

Rickey Hall said that Davon Thomas (Public Administration) raised a good point and that he and Chadwick Allen would be happy to come back to a future meeting to present on the initiatives that had been done from a central level as well as point out things that had been accomplished at the local level. He reiterated that accountability should be held at all levels.

Davon Thomas (Public Administration) addressed Chadwick Allen and said that he agreed with his point on the fifth slide about the importance of acknowledging the space and the place that the university currently occupied. He said that his previous university always reminded people that even though so many of the students were low-income students who were also looking for housing, it was the students who also caused gentrification in the same neighborhoods they were getting their degrees to serve. He said that this was just the unfortunate reality of capitalism. He said that this was clearly an unhealthy dichotomy that university students played into. He suggested that Rickey Hall and Chadwick Allen work with the American Ethnic Studies department. He said that people in sociology departments were the best resources for many community-based research and projects. He said that the GPSS had discussed the purpose of land acknowledgements and expressed excitement about the new goal.

Rickey Hall said that Davon Thomas’ (Public Administration) question touched on
accountability, which was important. He said that he had worked for a couple of years with the Provost's office and the budget office to add a question about resource allocation towards DEI efforts at the local level in UW's budget review documents. He said that it was very important to include that question. He said that every college's budget documents were posted online. He said that students could see whether colleges and schools were doing what they said they were doing. He said that it was easy for people to say things were important, but if they did not devote resources to it, then it really was not important to them.

Aaron Yared said it was one thing to educate people on the significance of certain building and street names. He asked what the UW was doing to change those names if they stood for bad things.

Chadwick Allen said that he could point to some successes. He said that there was a new indigenous walking tour that was available to download from the American Indian Studies department. He said that the tour had been designed as a capstone project by Owen Oliver, a student who had graduated last year. He said that the UW had also renamed Whitman Court, behind the Intellectual House. He said that the Intellectual House was surrounded by the colonial narrative: Lewis Hall on one side; Clark Hall on the other; Stevens Way in front, named for Governor Stevens who put everybody on reservations in the 19th century; and Whitman Court, named for the Whitman family of missionaries who brought measles on the Oregon Trail. He said that the street was now called sluʔwiɫ, which meant little canoe channel. He said that it was named after the creek at the bottom of the trail there. He said that the renaming of the street was a real achievement that the university could point to. He said that it was an example of the university learning about its local history. He expressed hope that this achievement would inspire multiple projects like that from multiple communities. He said that the timeline for change was sometimes slow, but was possible.

Chianaraekpere Ike (Law) asked how Rickey Hall and Chadwick Allen had measured the success or failure of the blueprints. She asked how they held people accountable and what the accountability measures were. She said that the JD program had very low levels of diversity. She said that the students had spoken with the admissions committee to ask what the problem was. She said that they said that one of the major reasons for the lack of diverse recruitment was the lack of funding. She asked how the blueprint was connected with money and how the diversity council would ensure that funds were provided to things that needed change.

Rickey Hall said that he measured the success of the blueprint in a variety of ways. He said that he had been at five different institutions and said that he had never been in any place where every institute had a DEI framework or plan. He added that he had never been in a place where so many people talked about the blueprint. He noted that the regents talked about the blueprint and had a board of regents DEI committee. He said that there was a lot of awareness surrounding the blueprint. For example, the School of Nursing’s DEI plan is aligned with the Diversity Blueprint. He said that the Diversity Blueprint only served as a framework because the university was large and complex. He said that the intention was not to create a plan but to develop broad goals that every college, school, and administrative unit saw themselves in. He said that the plans were at the college, school, and administrative level. For example, the School of Nursing’s plan was aligned with the Diversity Blueprint, but there were specifics about who was doing what by when--this was an example of accountability. He said that it was
impossible for him to hold everybody accountable across campus. He said that accountability needed to be held at the college and school level.

**Rickey Hall** said that the accountability regarding funding would be reflected in the budget documents. He said that people could track that over time. He said that accessing data was extremely difficult because people would not allow him to have access to the data. He said that the diversity council now had different scorecards for topics like business equity, making sure that the university was doing work with women and minority-owned businesses. He said that the university created a monthly report and used a scorecard to assess faculty and student diversity. He said that there was still a fight for who had access to that information. He said that currently, only the Board of Regents and a very select group of people were privy to the information, and said that the information needed to be made more transparent.

**Rickey Hall** said that funding was a very local decision at the college and school levels which he, nor the President, was involved with. He reiterated that if the college or school cared about diversity, there should be alignment between their diversity goals and the Diversity Blueprint. He said that since colleges and schools had to report on diversity effort allocation as part of their budget process, the diversity council would track their spending to see if there was any change such as fellowships or other things.

**Pratima KC (Environmental & Forestry Sciences)** moved to extend the time by 3 minutes. **Davon Thomas (Public Administration)** seconded. No objections.

**Pratima KC (Environmental & Forestry Sciences)** asked if there was a DEI committee in each department. She said that her department had one. She asked if each department’s DEI committee had access to the Diversity Blueprint. She asked if it was possible to mobilize the DEI committee of each department and give the committees some power in order to hold departments accountable at the local level. She said that this might help accelerate the process of increasing diversity within the department.

**Rickey Hall** said that most colleges, schools and some departments had a DEI committee. He said that most colleges and schools also had an assistant or associate dean of DEI. He said that some administrative units had a director or associate deans of diversity. For example, the Athletics department had an associate director for DEI. He said that the College of Environment’s director of DEI had left and said that he anticipated that the dean would discuss her plans of filling the role with him tomorrow. He said that these diversity roles were supposed to collaborate with the diversity councils to ensure that there was accountability and that the work was being advanced. He said that he and Chadwick could not work at every college, school, or place all the time. He said that it was necessary to have people in the units who were well-versed in these issues, knew how to move the work forward, and attend these meetings. He said that it was important that people serving on the dean's cabinet and council raised people’s concerns at those meetings and spaces. This would create demand and accountability.

**Rickey Hall** said that he had previously served in that sort of role at a different institution. He said that he knew about what people talked about regarding fellowships and said that he had been involved in helping to create those types of programs to ensure that the department was being held accountable. He said that he had been able to show people how the department had
advanced in terms of recruitment and retention of certain populations. He said that the Diversity Blueprint would not change the faculty demographics overnight, but articulated what the university was currently doing to get there. He said he relied a lot on the DEI personnel and said he would meet with them every 5-6 weeks. He said that much of the meeting was about information sharing so that people could learn from each other.

Rickey Hall thanked everyone for their time and put his and Chadwick Allen’s email in the chat. He said that he was happy to answer additional questions and engage with the ideas that people raised.

Aaron Yared said that people could also email him to relay their questions to Rickey Hall and Chadwick Allen if they wanted their questions to be anonymous.

9. [Information] GPSS Budget Discussion  7:00 p.m.

A.J. Balatico recognized that there were new senators at the meeting and said that he would cover a lot of information but that they were welcome to stop him at any time. He said that he would be giving an informational notice to the Senate about the ongoing budget discussions. He said that the F&B had nearly every single week to discuss how to tweak the budget in order to make it more effective. He said that the GPSS would have a lot of money in its general fund, i.e. the reserve, moving forward. He said that the GPSS general fund contained about $400,000 and $300,000 of it was usable. He said that the GPSS did not have much of a history of spending very much besides on personnel.

A.J. Balatico said that the budget timeline was as follows: the F&B would make its penultimate recommendations on Friday and the Executive Committee would meet once more to make any last changes. He said that the Executive Committee had confirmed that it would keep officer budgets the same with the exception of the Vice President of External Affairs’ budget and that the Executive Committee had one more meeting to make any changes. He said that he had obtained new information to ruminate. He said that the following Friday would be F&B’s last meeting before the Senate would examine the proposed budgets.

A.J. Balatico said that the budget discussions were probably important and that whether the GPSS wanted to choose between hiring new officers or staff was important. He said that as far as the SAF was concerned, the decision between new officers and staff did not make a difference because the GPSS was deficit spending. He said that this meant that the GPSS was taking in less revenue than it was spending and that its main income sources would be the SAF request, the Provost money, and small amounts of interest from various sources. He said that this meant that the GPSS would utilize its reserve much more and that its SAF requests would have to eventually increase year over year for the revenue to catch up with spending.

A.J. Balatico referred to the graphics on the slides. He posted a copy of the budget into the chat.

A.J. Balatico said that everyone had commenting privileges in case there was a line time that people had questions about. He pointed out the GPSS’s historical spending and said that the spreadsheet showed the GPSS’s financial history back through FY17.
A.J. Balatico said that the slides represented a one pager of the different officers' budgets. He said that the numbers did not include personnel costs which were reflected in the spreadsheet. He said that different time periods, such as the summer or during the academic year, had different costs. He said that the budget had not undergone much change and that the GPSS was operating on the leanest budget that he thought possible. He said that the only uncertainty was on the Vice President of External Affairs’ budget because the legislative session last year and this year had been virtual which meant there was little spending. He said that based off FY19 and FY20, the budget reflected the anticipated costs.

A.J. Balatico said that the Vice President of Finance’s budget was an exact amount. He said that the presence of a copy machine in the GPSS office cost exactly the amount shown on the screen which meant that there was little to cut out.

A.J. Balatico said that the Vice President of Internal Affairs, the President, and the Vice President of Equity and Inclusion had different levels of discretionary funding based on their programming. He said that the GPSS could supplement the funds with what the GPSS referred to as the Provost money or the programming budget. He said that this money was completely unrelated to our SAF request and came from the Provost discretionary funds. He said that the Provost discretionary funds could be used for items like food or speaker honoraria. He said that there were other limitations to SAF money because it was money paid by students through the Services and Activities Fee.

A.J. Balatico said that to add an additional officer to the GPSS, the GPSS would also have to add an Executive Senator to balance out its Executive Committee. He said that this would cost roughly $58,000 a year. He said that if more staff members were added, assuming that the $5 staff wage increase would be approved, it would cost about $17,000 to hire each new staff member. He said that the GPSS would enter deficit spending mode no matter what. He said that if the GPSS agreed to the $5 increase, it would cost the GPSS about $36,000. He said that this meant that the time frame that the GPSS would exit deficit spending mode would either be FY25 (the 2024-25 school year) or later depending on what it decided about adding more positions and how aggressively it wanted to ask the SAF.

A.J. Balatico reiterated that the GPSS had $420,000 in its general fund in addition to the money allocated by SAF from last year and that it was allowed to spend up to $315,000. He said that the GPSS’s endowment was also another source of money that it had but never used. He said that the GPSS had drawn interest from it, but said that there was an additional $100,000 that was available.

A.J. Balatico said that the graphic on the slides reflected the historical trend of the GPSS’s SAF requests over the years. He noted that after 2017, the GPSS’s requests had flatlined. He said that though the amount had increased, it had decreased by $8,000 last year. He said that the GPSS had saved a bit of its money, had made adjustments to its budget, and had asked for $8,000 less. He said that the GPSS did activity-based budgeting based on actuals, and that the figure was where the GPSS had landed last year.

Matthew Mitnick (Public Administration) asked if A.J. Balatico had any recommendations for
A.J. Balatico said he would address the question at the end because his recommendation depended on whether the GPSS created new positions.

A.J. Balatico said that the GPSS had added a new officer position between 2014 and 2016. He said that the vice president role had been split into the Vice President of External Affairs and Vice President of Internal Affairs so that the GPSS could send somebody to Olympia. He noted that the GPSS’s budget shot up by $150,000 at that time. He said that the GPSS had made some corrections to the budget over the years and that the total budget value decreased. He said that the $13,000-18,000 increase that the GPSS would ask the SAF for would not be an unusual amount for the SAF. He said that the maximum the GPSS could ask from the SAF was 10% of what it asked for last year. He said that the GPSS would only ask for 3 to 4% more each year, which was about how fast the SAF grew each year.

A.J. Balatico said that the GPSS did not want to exit deficit spending mode because its reserve was so large. He said that the GPSS needed to figure out a way to spend it or address different ways on how to use it in a useful manner that would set future GPSS bodies for success. He said that the green bands on the slides were time period windows where the GPSS would have to consider deficit spending. He said that the first line only reflected the staff raises which cost about $36,000. He said that this was slightly under the $40,000 mark and said that the GPSS would be deficit spending most for the next two years. He said that if the GPSS wanted to add an officer position, it could increase its SAF request by 3-4% and would have to consider the number of years it would deficit spend. He said that the GPSS still had hundreds of thousands of dollars in the bank, but that it would not receive a revenue greater than what it was spending.

A.J. Balatico said that the SAF would also increase. He said it was unlikely that the SAF would decrease because the items that it funded always became more expensive. He said that SAF increases were capped at 4%, so the growth of SAF was predictable. He said that since the GPSS would only ask for a small percentage, though it might be able to receive more if it asked. He said that the SAF only cared about the preliminary financial values, not the specific line items. He said that the only line that would change from the previous preliminary financial sheet would be “graduate student appointments,” depending on whether the GPSS decided to add an officer or a temporary staff member.

A.J. Balatico said that the GPSS’s general large expenditures were the biggest ticket items that had not been budgeted. He said that besides the office refrigerator, the foreseeable recurring expenditures were buses to Olympia, which had cost the GPSS $1,740 in 2019, which rounded up to $2,000. He said that if the number of students participating in Huskies on the Hill increased, then it would cost about $2,000/bus.

A.J. Balatico said that the CART captioning for GPSS meetings should be funded through the STF. He said that the GPSS could receive block funding and not have to apply for funds every year. He said that the GPSS would have to negotiate, since only student governments were asking for CART captioning. He said that the STF could cover regular meetings and events sponsored by the GPSS. He said that the STF also covered the purchase of the Zoom webinar. He said that food and drinks were funded by Provost money. He said that there was nothing in
the SAF allocation which could change with the addition of more officers and increased GPSS capacity, but that the GPSS could build up to it.

**A.J. Balatico** said that most of the GPSS’s expenditures were personnel, so hiring more graduate students would probably lead to the most changes. He said that the GPSS needed to address Washington Student Association (WSA) funding and suggested that Aaron Yared review the WSA’s funding mechanism. He said that it was about choosing to donate $3 when registering for classes and said that the system might look a little different next year. He said that this change would affect how the GPSS paid for the next legislative reception. He noted that half of the attendants of that event this year were graduate students. He said that the most likely way the GPSS would address the matter was by asking for more Provost money or using part of the Provost money.

**A.J. Balatico** said that he wanted to hear the Senate’s opinion on senator compensation. He said that it was still on the table, though the entire Senate would not be able to be compensated. He said that it was possible to compensate nonacademic seats or particular programs that had not been represented in the past. He said that the Senate also needed to be more diligent about proposing the exact logistics of the compensation program before adding it to the budget.

**A.J. Balatico** said that he also wanted to hear the Senate’s opinion on spending down the general fund. He said that the GPSS elected to donate the remaining travel, departmental, and special allocations grants to the financial aid office’s CARES and the Emergency Aid fund. He said that he tried to reach out to the financial aid office if they were planning to keep the fund. He said that it was possible that the financial aid office also received a lot of federal money to disperse that whatever the GPSS contributed might be just a drop in the bucket. He said that the GPSS’s donation was able to directly help about 200 students with a full grant for a month’s worth of rent.

**Aaron Yared** said that WSA was currently funded through the STAR system. He said that this was the system where students could choose to donate money to WSA, WashPIRG, and United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) when registering for classes. He said that the system was renewed every four years by collecting signatures. He said that there had been a miscommunication between past iterations of these organizations and the current iteration of these organizations which led to a questioning of the funding model. He said that he spoke with Denzil Suite, the Vice President of Student Life, and said that Denzil Suite had agreed to give all three groups an extension until next year to work with the Student Activities Office to finalize the methodology for collecting signatures, whether that be digital or physical or some hybrid of the two. He said that it was not relevant for this year’s budget request, but would be worth discussing next year, depending on how easy it is to collect signatures and get the system renewed.

**A.J. Balatico** acknowledged that he was getting many messages in the chat about very particular things. He said that he could talk about it later or that people were free to ask.

**Andrew Shumway (Earth & Space Sciences)** noted that adding a new officer would cost $58,000 per year. He asked if this expense would still be reasonable three to four years later when the GPSS was no longer in a deficit spending mode? He expressed concern about
setting up future GPSS bodies for success by adding $58,000 to the budget.

**A.J. Balatico** said he had considered the decision long term. He said that the GPSS’s SAF requests would catch up. He noted that the green boxes shown in the slides were the years that the GPSS was out of a deficit spending mode. He said that SAF increases would also always be more than the staff expenses.

**A.J. Balatico** said that the GPSS had a lot of money on hand. He said that the 4% increase for SAF requests was more of a guideline based on SAF’s growth rate. He said that the GPSS had a history of asking for a $75,000 increase over two consecutive years. He said that the GPSS could do that again and that this would avoid a deficit spending mode. He addressed Matthew Mitnick’s (Public Administration) question about spending down the money. He said that when the GPSS went into a deficit spending mode, it would have to keep a certain amount of money on hand. He said that if the GPSS chose the 4% increase, it would save the GPSS more money in the long run because the GPSS would be spending SAF’s money, not its own money. He said that if the GPSS did not hire guest speakers that cost $10,000-$100,000, it had no other good method of spending down the general fund besides personnel costs.

**Davon Thomas (Public Administration)** said that the Senate should make a decision whether or not to compensate senators. He said that ideas should not be introduced and then pushed back for the rest of the year. He asked whether compensating senators was cost-effective. He said that the GPSS’s priority seemed to be adding an officer position and increasing staff pay. He asked if senator compensation was still a priority and said that he thought it was a worthy cause. He said that he thought it was an equity issue in the sense that the majority of the GPSS staff members were predominantly masters students, but many of the senators were PhD students. He said that this presented a pay equity issue and that paying people for their labor was important. He said that it was a privilege to show up to this space for two hours and not expect any type of compensation for it. He asked the Senate to take a firm stance on the issue.

**Meshell Sturgis** said it was not an equity issue. She said that if all senators were paid, then it was not an equity issue. She said that someone had brought up the idea of paying a select group of senators who happened to be international students. She said that if getting paid affects those students’ visa status or something to that effect, then it became an equity issue just for those students specifically. She said that she was happy to explain what equity meant.

**Aaron Yared** asked Meshell Sturgis to clarify how she was defining equity so that people could understand why it was not an equity issue.

**Meshell Sturgis** said that at best, senator compensation could be an equality issue. She referred to the cartoon of three people standing in front of a fence trying to see a baseball game. She explained that everyone in that cartoon was of a different height so not everybody could see over the fence the same way. She gave another example and said that if the fire department came to one’s neighborhood and gave each house two gallons of water even though there was one house on fire, that would be an equity issue. She said that giving each house two gallons of water for general use such as running a shower or watering the lawn was not an equity issue.

**Meshell Sturgis** said that giving each person involved in the GPSS money was not an equity
issue. She said that if an issue were to spring out of doing that, then it would become an equity issue. She said that, at best, it was an equality issue because everyone received the same amount of pay. She said that there were different kinds of people in the Senate body. She said that there were certain seats that were assigned to representatives like the Q center and veterans students. She said that if the GPSS were to give those students a certain amount of money that was different than given to all the other senators, then it would not be an issue, but could be an equity initiative.

Janis Shin (Molecular Engineering & Sciences) thanked Meshell Sturgis for the explanation. She asked Davon Thomas (Public Administration) whether he was suggesting that the Senate make a decision prior to the passing of the budget or whether he was referring to the entire rest of the school year.

Davon Thomas (Public Administration) said he just wanted to ensure that issues did not die during the summertime. He said that he was fine with whatever decision that the Senate made, but that he did not want to keep bringing up the same topic only to put off the decision-making for next year.

Britanny Baskin (Neuroscience) said that beyond the equity issue or solution, part of the problem with paying senators was also a logistics issue of making sure who attended each Senate meeting. She said that the GPSS did not currently log the activity of current senators because it would be hard to access. She said that if the Senate was going to suggest paying senators, it would also need to present a logistical plan to execute the idea, since it was much harder than paying a single person.

10. [Information] Officer and Committee Reports 7:32 p.m.

Aaron Yared said that he had been in conversations with WashPIRG, WSA and USAS to figure out the STAR system because it seemed that funding was in jeopardy for all the groups. He said that he was able to resolve the matter today. He said that he had met with other presidents to start the Student Regent selection process this week. He said that if anyone was interested in the process, then they should be on the lookout for the application. He said that the position came with a tuition waiver and much more responsibility than a GPSS officer, but there were also cool perks such as traveling to different states to see medical facilities and free admission to some of the football games with a seat in the president's box. He said that the student regent also acted as the student voice on the Board of Regents, which was a powerful and important position.

Gabby Rivera said that U-PASS would be voting on the fee increase this quarter. She said that she could set aside time to go over each of the fee increase options if people wanted her to. She said that some options did not require an increase, but if the fee was not increased next year, then the following year would have a very large increase in fee.

Gabby Rivera said that she was also working on updating the GPSS personnel policy. She thanked everyone for coming out to trivia night yesterday. She said that the last GPSS event for the quarter would be on March 10 in the South HUB ballroom. She said that the event would be similar to the packaged dinners that the GPSS hosted in the fall, but that this time there would
actually be space to eat the food. She said that the GPSS had many events planned for spring quarter. She said that she was looking for some great ways to do outreach and asked everyone to let her know if they had any particular strategies for best reaching their program.

Joel Anderson introduced himself as the Policy Director and said that he did not have any official updates from Payton Swinford. He said that last Thursday’s Huskies on the Hill event went well. He said that more than 30 students had participated as volunteer advocates and had helped the GPSS fill in for over 40 lobby meetings with legislators. He said that most of the legislation the GPSS was advocating for came from the House of Representatives and had already passed through the chamber. He said that there was still continued movement on things like establishing a student-based student loan program as well as expanding Washington college grants and what that type of funding could be used for. He said that there was also a lot of energy behind improving outreach and funding for outreach initiatives for FAFSA and WAFSA completion rates. He said that the external team continued to feel hopeful about many of their legislative priorities this session. He said that he was not sure if LAB was meeting tomorrow, but he was prepared to start the meeting at 11 a.m. He invited those interested to come to the meeting.

A.J. Balatico encouraged everyone to apply for departmental allocations. He said if everyone applied at the same time, then the fund would run out of money. He said that the same thing applied to travel grants. He said that he had seen an uptick in travel grant applications and said that travel grants funded domestic, international, and virtual conferences. He said that applications were open to everyone and would be open until the summer. He said that the GPSS could not fund summer conferences due to the change in fiscal year.

A.J. Balatico said that SAF would review the Campus Sustainability Fund (CSF), ASUW, and Student Legal Services at its last orientation. He said that the Student Technology Fee (STF) needed a lot of help from graduate students to get more projects proposed. He said that the average amount approved was around $40,000 and that the STF currently had $7 million. He said that the STF was currently discussing how to address the fee for the next academic year, whether that means to lower it or to change that rate.

A.J. Balatico said that both the SAF and the STF had open seats. He said that one of the GPSS’s long term senators was graduating so a SAF seat would become available. He said that the GPSS wanted to have as much graduate student representation on SAF and STF as possible. He said that any interested students should email him if they were interested and noted that the students did not have to be affiliated with GPSS.

Chianaraekpere Ike (Law) asked why travel grants could not apply to summer conferences.

A.J. Balatico said that it was because there would be a change in the board and fiscal year between June and July. He said that there would also be a decrease in the number of workers on campus, so it would be difficult to perform over the summer.

11. [Information] Announcements 7:39 p.m.

Davon Thomas (Public Administration) asked if the GPSS could bring back the speakers
from the earlier Diversity Blueprint presentation.

Aaron Yared said yes.

Davon Thomas (Public Administration) said he wanted to hear about the successes of the previous blueprint because the act of making blueprints alone was redundant. He said that he also wanted to hear how the speakers had failed and how they planned to address they failures. He said that the presentation had been very broad without specifics or details on how the goals were going to be accomplished.

A.J. Balatico referred to the slides and said that the UW Institutional Chemical and Physical Safety Committee of Environmental Health and Safety was looking for a student member in order to convene. He said that student would be a voting member on the committee and said that the committee did not deal with biological waste. He said that interested student should email Aditya Ramnathkar. He said that he just received a message from somebody who had applied and said that the GPSS could appoint them.

A.J. Balatico said that the president of his academic area, Na'ilah Saud Nasir, had given an address on the current political climate of academic freedom. He said that the ASUW was hosting elections and said that all registered students would be allowed to vote. He said that there might be some valid initiatives that might be pertinent to graduate students.

Aaron Yared said that all graduate and professional students were eligible to run for ASUW positions. He said that if there was a position that matched someone’s area of expertise or interests, they should apply for it. He said that they could still work with the GPSS in many different capacities.

Andrew Shumway (Earth & Space Sciences) said that the Judicial Committee met last week to review some of the proposed bylaw changes regarding the potential amendment to add the officer position. He said that the Judicial Committee would meet again to continue to go over those changes.

12. [Action] Adjournment 7:44 p.m.

Janis Shin (Molecular Engineering & Sciences) motioned to adjourn the meeting. Pratima KC (Environmental & Forestry Sciences) seconded. No objections

Meeting minutes prepared by Janis Shin, GPSS Senate Clerk.