General Council Meeting
Tuesday, 29 March 2016, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
925 N. Tyndall Ave, GWS 100

I. Call to Order
At 6:02
Attendance:


Absent: Sarah Kosso, Ankush Nayak, James Geach, James Carlson, Karthik Srinivasan, Caitlin Harrison, William Robertson, Victoria Moses, Trudie McEvoy, Levi Tappan, Stuart Gibson

Breathing Exercise

II. Call to Audience
This is the time for the public to comment. Members of the Council may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01(H), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.
Sarah not here

III. Approvals
a. January Club/POD Funding appeal recommendation
   i. J. Sears: We couldn’t grant greater than a 5 hundred dollars of honorarium to the Art History Association originally, we didn’t have enough information.
      1. They appealed the decision.
      2. Then the appeals committee found out what the honorariums were.
      3. It was for the flight of their speaker, they were using a different definition of honorariums.
      4. The appeals committee decided to approve a thousand dollars of funding.
      5. If council is not okay with this, we don’t have to approve the decisions.

   Vote: 20 for, 0 opposed, 6 abstain
ii. **J. Collins:** I motion to rearrange the agenda so that we move the Constitutional amendment before the reviews.
   1. Will determine if President is in supervisor position over officers.

iii. **J. Sears:** It will be between D and E.
   1. Any objections?

iv. **M. Khorosheva:** I motion to move the proposed “Governing Doc Changes” agenda item from Old Business to Priority Issues.
   1. It should go anywhere, probably after the constitutional amendment.
   2. [documents were sent with some ideas for Governing Docs amendments].

v. **J. Collins:** I second the motion.

vi. **J. Sears:** Ok, it has been moved.

### IV. Priority Issues

a. College-specific purchases votes
   a. Software, books, and equipment for Pharmacy Ph.D. program – U. Younis
      i. **J. Sears:** So we got Usir’s request first.
         1. We sent out a list of everything they were asking for.
         2. I think it best to split it into two list.
         3. One would be the software they have been asking for.
      ii. **U. Younis:** Quick statement- I know there was some issue if our request would be approved since technically it would have to be an office.
         1. Our lab is the office, we don’t have offices.
         2. Is it a technically we can work around?
      iii. **J. Sears:** This won’t impact the decision now.
      iv. **U. Younis:** I extensively asked all the different tracks within Pharmacy to get back to me for ideas if they wanted anything.
         1. Only 2 tracks came back to me for all College of Pharmacy PhD programs.
         2. If we have even more money left over I would like to submit another request to increase the equipment fund, any amount help.
      v. **J. Sears:** I recommend we vote on this separately
         1. First on all the itemized stuff and books, it would be about 3500 dollars.
         2. Then separately vote on whether we fund the 3 thousand request for the High Pressure liquid Chromatography machine.
         3. Any objections on the proposed ideas?
      vi. **A. Karaman:** We will discuss each item?
      vii. **J. Sears:** Yes.
      viii. **J. Sears:** First discussing software and book request.
      ix. **A. Karaman:** I stand behind this.
1. Great idea, shows initiative, falls within rubric.
   x. J. Sears: I move we approve 3500 even for software and books.
      
      **Vote: 24 for, 0 opposed, 2 abstain**

    vii. J. Sears: Next is the 3 thousand dollars request for equipment.

    viii. A. Karaman: I support the piece of equipment being funded if we don’t get enough clear proposals, an itemized list from other colleges.

       1. We need to give people clear deadlines for itemized lists to be voted on.
       2. I’m okay with giving colleges money over their allotment if there is a clear deadline.
       3. This should be an example of a clear proposal.
       4. It can be funded in the instance that we don’t meet those deadlines.
       5. If we meet them- we deserve the money.

    ix. A. Meier: I’d like to ask in general about buying the instrumentation.

       1. We have a hard time coming up with books and software, but we could easily come up with instrumentation.
       2. If we set a president of approving this, I would like to know of a hard deadline and if this is the sort of thing you can ask for or not.

    x. A. Karaman: Can you have a request as an ask, and also have a wish-list like item?

    xi. A. Meier: We could easily use money on instrumentation.

    xii. J. Sears: What you should do is include everything including instrumentation in the request.

    xiii. U. Younis: I asked them to do nothing in regards to research or travel, GPSC has these funds available already.

       1. Every college should be given time.
       2. But our college is on different timeline.
       3. I told people during our last meeting about the money, I feel people should have notified me by now.
       4. If we want to set a date in stone, we should do it by the next meeting.

    xiv. J. Sears: Next week we are having a crossover meeting with new reps and old reps.

       1. I feel it would be nice to ask the new reps.
       2. I don’t know how you feel about giving news reps another week to get everything in.

    xv. A. Karaman: The next meeting is the last meeting with all of us?

    xvi. J. Sears: No, two more crossover meetings.

    xvii. A. Karaman: Are we also reps?

    xviii. J. Sears: Yes, both of you are.

    xix. T. McClintock: I contacted my reps but they haven’t submitted a book list yet.

    xx. J. Sears: There may still be money even in May, but no guarantee that we will hold on to the money.

    xxi. J. Collins: Can I ask about non-degree students money soon?

    xxii. J. Sears: Yes, will talk about it soon.
xxiii. **A. Karaman:** I want to make a specific motion.
   1. I move to set a deadline for proposals for next meeting.
   2. As outgoing reps develop lists, new reps don’t have access to constituents yet needed to develop this information.
   3. I move to set the next meeting as the deadline.
   4. I don’t want to preemptively approve this.
   5. I move to set the deadline for 2 weeks.
   6. Have it on the on agenda for 2 weeks.
   7. Have proposals from colleges.
   8. There could be initial proposals for allotment amount, and then also for after allotment amounts.
   9. It was brought to my attention that non-degree seeking students were not given an allotment, and there are 5 hundred of them at any given time.
  10. I have taken out speculative comments on international students.
  11. Each percent enrolled for each college gives you another additional 50 dollars towards your department.
  12. Non-degree seeking students end up having 3 thousand dollars as their allotment.
  13. For pharmacy, you would have another 250 dollars actually.

xxiv. **J. Sears:** I second the motion Alex proposes.
   1. We will table Usir’s request for equipment.
   2. There will be a hard deadline next meeting for funding request for other colleges.

xxv. **M. Khorosheva:** What is the allotment?

xxvi. **J. Sears:** Alex has it in the spreadsheet.

xxvii. **J. Collins:** The amount for non-degree seeking students is an estimate.

xxviii. **A. Karaman:** These rough estimates should still give us guidelines.

xxix. **K. Strawn:** Outreach College is not in the spreadsheet too.

xxx. **A. Karaman:** These numbers represent the program numbers for colleges they are housed it.
   1. Not all outreach colleges are housed in additional programs.

xxxi. **J. Sears:** I wouldn’t worry about this, numbers are estimates.
   1. Motion to vote.

Motion seconded

xxxii. **J. Sun:** Remember that we are comfortable to vote beyond the allotment

xxxiii. **J. Sears:** All in favor of tabling Usir’s request to next meeting and setting a hard deadline for next meeting to get request from colleges.

**Vote:** 16 for, 1 opposed, 9 abstain

b. Software, books, computers, and furniture for College of Education – S. Seavey
i. **A. Karaman:** I am thinking for the agenda for our next meeting.
   1. Maybe proposals can be sent at least a day ahead of meeting, so we have opportunity to read them ahead of time.

ii. **J. Sears:** Ok, here is the spreadsheet from the College of Education.

iii. **S. Seavey:** Jasmine has sent the spreadsheet out to all of you.
   1. They are way over allotment
   2. There is a 5 paragraph letter.
   3. I have a list in the order of priorities.
   4. The College of Education has many graduate students.
   5. However, there is nowhere to print dissertations.
   6. The College of Education government is asking for two computer with software, books, and a bookshelf.
   7. They are also asking for the Cap and Gown for 4 people who are graduating.
   8. There is printing supplies.
   9. The apple stuff pushes it over, but if you take the windows computer and put software on office computer, things to create an office space, and a copy machine, caps and gowns...
   10. It is under the 4 thousand allotment.

iv. **U. Younis:** I would like to move that we give as much to the college as allotted since Pharmacy was given that much.
   1. And stuff get tabled for next meeting.
   2. Their allotment is 4400 dollars.
   3. I would move we approve that money now.

v. **J. Sears:** College of Education can come up with what is a priority for them.
   1. We can give you money and you give us receipts.

vi. **S. Seavey:** We are approving what we are spending money on?

vii. **U. Younis:** We will vote on the remainder of the money later.

viii. **S. Seavey:** Anything on list people re against?

ix. **J. Sears:** I think ink and paper should be paid for by individual students in some capacity.

x. **A. Karaman:** We should be voting in the following way.
   1. We should have a line item proposal for the allotment, and a second part of proposal beyond the allotment.
   2. I’m not sure exactly what is included in the allotment and in the wish-list.
   3. I think we should be voting on the line items that allow us to have oversight on what money is being spent on specifically.

xi. **S. Seavey:** We can take out the Apple computer bookshelf.
   1. This is in order of priorities.

xii. **U. Younis:** I am against the Kurig and microwave.

xiii. **M. Khorosheva:** I was at the EdGov meeting when we were creating the list.
I met with our College of Education Associate Dean of Students Rene Clift and she mentioned the need for us to allocate some money for the TLS colloquy, maybe we could ass it to our list.

J. Sears: Seems the priority list is: a work station (3 thousand dollars), caps and gowns, and all the books minus one bookshelf.

M. Khorosheva: Maybe also TLS Colloquium funding put in if we have any extra money.

J. Sears: Now is not the time to bring up new things.

U. Younis: Can you also request POD funding?

M. Khorosheva: Ok, that’s a good suggestion, thank you.

A. Karaman: You can suggest to use the rest of your allotment next meeting on the colloquium or on other things.

1. Is it one or several colloquy?

M. Khorosheva: Just one.

S. Seavey: I will let them know and bring it back next meeting.

U. Younis: I will approve whatever they want.

J. Sears: Its coming out to be slightly over the allotment.

A. Karaman: If we are going over allotment, and something needs to be cut, Caps and gowns aren’t a unique department need.

J. Sears: One HP color printer is also included in this.

1. There is miscellaneous basic software.

2. Caps and gown are the first on the chopping block.

S. Seavey: I’m at 4364 dollars without caps and gowns.

M. Khorosheva: Can we do fewer of them, say two, and still include them?

A. Karaman: Can you go back to spreadsheet?

1. Is this adjusted for not giving international money?

J. Sears: No.

A. Karaman: I think we can safely accommodate caps and gowns.

J. Sears: Yes, we can do it because you are still below allotment.

U. Younis: I agree to do it.

J. Sears: I am moving to approve everything highlighted.

Vote: 16 for, 1 opposed, 9 abstain

J. Sears: I forgot to list Ryan’s stuff on the agenda.

R. Fagan: The main request we got was for Landscape Architecture program for a drone, for site analysis and site map development.

1. It costs $3348 dollars for one option, was recommended for those who work in the field.

2. The second option was for $1678

3. We have an allotment of 7 hundred dollars.

4. Also an interest in water bottle refilling stations, we can put up to three in the building.

U. Younis: How much does a lesser drone cost?
xxxvii. **R. Fagan:** Its $1678 for a lesser drone.

xxxviii. **U. Younis:** If I were you, I would ask for a better drone.

1. How much are the water stations?
2. I would request all of that at the next meeting.
3. Is there anything for 7 hundred dollars that you can ask for now?

xxxix. **S. Seavey:** The water stations are 7 hundred dollars.

xl. **A. Karaman:** But there is installing them too?

1. Buying a drone is cool, as long as we are not doing something creepy with it.
2. I think this is something a lot of people can potentially use, as I imagine, we could consider as a second round item.
3. We can change our metrics from allotment for person.
4. Or we can change our metric from allotment per person to being: is this expenditure better than another one based on a different metric.
5. When we are judging something like this: we say they didn’t get allotment, so we are given you 8 hundred additionally.

xli. **J. Sears:** Is it at all possible for the drone to be able to be checked out thing outside CAPLA?

xlii. **J. Ostrowski:** Another department is requesting a drone, Sarah Netherton says.

xliii. **J. Sears:** It’s Physics.

1. I would count the drone and split the allocation between CAPLA and the College of Science allocation.

xliv. **U. Younis:** Alex, what you said is great.

1. Deciding on a new metric is complicated for next meeting.
2. We should stick to what we are doing now.
3. We would be determining the importance...

xlv. **A. Karaman:** I am proposing a new rubric for stuff over allotment.

1. Throw it out with other additional proposals?

xlvi. **U. Younis:** College of Science, would it possible for you to share it?

1. Would you want a more or less expensive drone?

xlvii. **R. Fagan:** Yes, we can share it.

xlviii. **J. Sun:** If there is equipment for multiple departments, but they don’t want to store it, and make sure none of it is checked out, then the library could store it.

1. Though it does not necessarily like doing that.
2. It has been done in the past.
3. That is the potential outlet.

xlix. **T. McClintock:** Can you also give it to the OSCR?

1. **J. Sun:** I don’t know about other libraries and storage spaces.

li. **A. Karaman:** This could be what GPSC would like to own.

1. What SBSS will be asking for—it would benefit SBSS and GPSC if GPSC owns it.
2. Maybe creating a system of priority for colleges.
lii. J. Sears: Thomas and Ryan, what drone do you want?
liii. T. McClintock: Will decide after the meeting.
liv. J. Sears: We will vote next meeting on the drone.
lv. U. Younis: Can you make this an agenda item on the next meeting?
lvi. J. Sears: It will be below Club and POD funding for March.
lvii. U. Younis: When is our next meeting?
lviii. J. Sears: On April 12.

1. The deadline for submitting requests is that meeting.
lx. P. Ambade: Regarding College of Public Health, when do we need to explain the proposal?
lxi. J. Sears: Send out the list before our next meeting, giving us a day or two to read it.

1. Everyone, please send out a list before next meeting.
lxii. U. Younis: After today’s votes, can you send out what is still available?

1. We voted on approval money for different colleges, can you send out how much money remains?
lxiii. J. Brock: As long as I have the minutes in a timely fashion.
lxiv. M. Khorosheva: The GC recordings are now sent out.
lxv. J. Sears: Jared, I will send you the list.
lxvi. J. Brock: Ok, as long as I have the recording in a timely fashion.
lxvii. J. Collins: About non-degree seeking requests.

1. Non-degree students aren’t in a department.
2. I have contact information for about 5 hundred people.
3. I have been asking for some ideas and opinions.
4. The non-degree seeking students are spread out between other departments.
5. I will be sending out some ideas.
6. I am also putting forwards suggestions for non-degree seeking students specifically because they aren’t in a program.
7. These could be research grants programs.
8. There could be some stipulations, that there will be an entrepreneurship program...
lxviii. J. Sears: This is not the time to discuss this.
lxix. J. Collins: This is, as these are the items that will be on the list.

1. Related to what we are discussing now I am sending out information.
2. Maybe you can talk to your constituent about these ideas.
3. Because these ideas for non-degree seeking students could benefit the students in your department as well

lx. J. Sears: Anything else?
lxx. T. McClintock: I have a booklist and a department request for items.

1. Should I send it separately or together?
lxxi. J. Sears: Together.
lxxii. J. Sun: Be ready for a long haul even if we do approve your stuff.
S. Seavey: Tell your constituents to write why you are requesting something.
1. Do it for next week.
2. Put it in the order of priority.

II. 2016-2017 budget discussion and vote – J. Brock
   i. J. Sears: Is there anything you’d like to inform us of?
   ii. J. Brock: Has everyone had the chance to look at the updated budget from last meeting?
      1. We understand what people’s concerns are.
      2. The funding resources are locked in.
      3. Is everyone ok with the GA compensation?
      4. Are people ok with the numbers?
   iii. J. Sears: There are 4 GAs different from the other two.
      1. These 4 do not include supplemental compensations for the summer.
      2. We can leave it as is.
   iv. A. Karaman: As a point of clarification, is this factoring the ERE?
      1. The positions in GPSCS get paid less.
   v. J. Sears: Last time we checked, we were below average.
      1. Any objections to this?
      2. Regarding officer stipends, this should be in the workload review.
      3. Is everyone comfortable with postponing it?
      4. Administrative compensation?
   vi. J. Brock: I don’t think this is very contentious.
   vii. J. Sears: The events director would prefer a lump sum of money, so it’s not line item by line item.
      1. This is his estimate of how money will be spent.
   viii. A. Karaman: Things should be revisited in terms of the GPSC mission.
      1. Some things are not tangible benefits.
      2. We need to clarify what are the things.
      3. Our funds should be serving people who serve on GPSC.
      4. We should have the option of line items for certain things.
   ix. P. Ambade: Maybe events director would let us know what is happening and giving cost estimates by coming to our meeting once every three months.
   x. J. Sears: I will pass it on, it’s a good idea.
   xi. J. Brock: Do you want to revisit specific events or everything?
   xii. A. Karaman: Specific events.
      1. I do not personally know what some of these things in events are.
      2. For example, I do not know what GPSA week is.
   xiii. J. Sears: That is our most popular series of events.
   xiv. A. Karaman: I haven’t seen any regular assessment of this either.
   xv. J. Brock: Perhaps if we had more regular reports.
      1. So there is some cause for transparency.
A. Karaman: What are the GPSC awards?
1. I have been to that and I can’t understand how it costs 5 thousand dollars.
2. Is this the only once a year opportunity, maybe we could have Kevin come here talk about this?

J. Sears: I can tell you now it won’t be the only opportunity, it is the starting point, we can decide to revise the budget at any time.
1. He tried to come but was sick when he wanted to come to our meeting.

J. Sun: Kevin is a very competent guy.
1. You know how difficult Kevin’s job is.
2. I understand to vote on specific events, I would caution a line-by-line blanket restriction, so our events director can’t do his job.
3. Our events director reported being happier with how the budget was organized this year.
4. If we do want more regulation, we should air on the side of picking out specific things we don’t like.
5. The blanket impositions would tie his hands.

J. Sears: Are any events you are objecting to us continuing in the future?
1. Are there any potential items to veto?

M. Khorosheva: I think we should first decide if we want to discuss the budget line by line or veto specific items?

J. Sears: So any specific items we can veto now?

A. Karaman: I would love to have Kevin here.
1. He could describe and verify things.

M. Ryan: The events budget could get approved, then it would get bumped up and down.

A. Karaman: There should be someone in GPSC who cares enough to defend these things as a budgetary item.
1. There is no difference in contingently voting or tabling.
2. I’m ok with approving it contingently if it makes the process go faster.

J. Brock: Yes, it would make process go faster.
1. If Kevin or whoever likes the event, if no one is against it, we can continue.
2. We can unvote tomorrow and undo all events.

J. Sears: I will ask Kevin to come and talk to us either next meeting or the meeting after.
1. The Social Events are next.
2. Any concerns about the amount allocated?
3. This is based on how it has been going this year.

J. Brock: Moving on to travel.
xxviii. **J. Sears:** We don’t know events we will go to, but similar to this year
   1. There are some day trips to Phoenix, and some flights for NAGPS, and some flights for legislative action days.

xxix. **A. Karaman:** People outside GPSC don’t know what travel is taking place.
   1. I’ve been on capitol trips before.
   2. I don’t think it’s an effective use of money or advocacy.
   3. I think it appeals to folks’ who have aspiration in graduate and professional student council stuff.
   4. It’s more of a club than what has affected us.
   5. What has been done at NAGPS has not trickled down much.
   6. I would much rather have travel money going to advocates than to executives.

xxx. **J. Sun:** We try to get as many graduate students as possible.
   1. I do some lobbying on the side.
   2. It's slow work and not fun.
   3. If you don’t speak up they ignore you.
   4. The 4 current issues we talked about.
   5. Limited amount of issues we can work on as people on the capitol have limited attention spans.
   6. This is partly my bias.
   7. I would oppose the idea that it is useless.
   8. It’s not.
   9. Alternatively, we get ignored.

xxxi. **U. Younis:** I don’t mind approving this if we get updates from travelling people, if people want to do it, they should get involved.
   1. Maybe there could be more transparency: this is who went, where we went and what we discussed.
   2. It can even be something typed up and sent to the GC.

xxxii. **M. Khorosheva:** I agree that we need transparency.
   1. Not only in discussion of who went and what was discussed.
   2. But also transparency in choosing who was going, and transparency in telling people what’s going on, and what’s the plan for the event.
   3. For example, for the national NAGPS conference, the agenda was there for the conference for some time and it was clear that voting would be going on during the conference.
   4. But some people who went, during the GC meeting, said they didn’t know voting was going on.
   5. Was that lack of communication between the president, vice president, and other members?
   6. Was it people actually weren’t informed?
   7. If not informed, why weren’t they informed?
8. Why weren’t they given an agenda?
9. Why weren’t they told where to find the information?
10. Why weren’t they told what the purpose of the NAGPS trip was, that the voting was going to be part of it?
11. From my understanding, Juhyung and Sarah both knew...

xxxiii. **U. Younis:** I think we are repeating stuff, we should move on.

xxxiv. **J. Brock:** With the events thing, people don’t oppose things, its whether the money is used in the best way.

1. GPSC can spend money productively.
2. We may do things that may not be clear to an outsider at first glance.
3. You sometimes have to advocate against what people want.
4. The whole reason we have GPSC is because we can leverage influence.
5. Being on the executive board we are all advocates.
6. I didn’t go to any single national event this year.
7. Its what you make it.
8. We have more openness and inclusion than what may seem.
9. Problems of this year: we have so many moving parts that its hard to prioritize what we spend our meeting time on.

xxxv. **J. Sears:** Who want to approve it as is and who wants to reduce it?

xxxvi. **A. Karaman:** I do not see why this is different from other decisions.

1. We should have people advocate for this.
2. We don’t have metrics and assessment, to show that its benefitting.

xxxvii. **J. Brock:** The reason why we need to approve this budget is so the people responsible can tell us how it’s going to be spent.

xxxviii. **J. Sears:** I move that we cut it in half.

1. And pass to next EB board that they need to give much better updates on anything that happens.
2. The amount can be increased later depending on what remains.

xxxix. **J. Sun:** We could pass the allocation, and then have a motion if we don’t want to have specific expenditure go at all.

xl. **J. Sears:** I’m actually opposed to this in the abstract.

xli. **M. Khorosheva:** I think we should be giving updates on trips, but also updates before trips about what’s on the agenda.

1. For example if Zach told Sarah and Juhyung...

xlii. **J. Sears:** That is not at all relevant.

1. You are wasting our time.

xliii. **M. Khorosheva:** Please let me finish.

xliv. **J. Brock:** Can I call the question on this budget item?

xlv. **A. Karaman:** Objection.

xlvi. **J. Sears:** Now we vote if we want to stop the discussion.

**Vote:** 5 for, 8 opposed, 13 abstain

xlvii. **M. Khorosheva:** I move that we get updates on upcoming trips, what’s on the agenda.
1. In regards to the NAGPS trip, based on my information, the president and vice president were both informed that there was going to be an election, and that Zach told them he was running for the office of NAGPS president.

2. There are facts, Sarah and Juhyung did say they would support him, however that was not brought to the attention of people who were going to the conference.

xlviii. **J. Sears**: You were not there.

xlix. **M. Khorsheva**: I have some information I can send if necessary.

1. **J. Sears**: Ok, send it if you want, but don’t say it now, people can’t defend themselves.

li. **M. Khorosheva**: Ok, but it is a fact that NAGPS elections was on the agenda, but people travelling with the Vice President and President did not know about happening elections.

1. Why wasn’t there any discussion of the elections, who are we voting for?

2. In the future, if people who are travelling know something will be happening, and are thinking of making decisions that directly affect GPSC and the University of Arizona, they should bring it up to the attention of GPSC and have GC decide what they want the outcomes of the events to be, what we want the votes to be, what we want the decision to be.

3. So it’s not one person or two people making the decisions for the whole GC, especially if it can negatively affect GPSC or the University of Arizona.

lii. **R. Fagan**: I would say this isn’t necessarily a travel issue.

1. Its an issue of graduate students and GC being properly represented and having a say.

2. Where EB is supposed to be a voice.

liii. **M. Ryan**: If advocacy is an issue, if we were trying to make metrics, would it make more sense to make it a legislative and congressional legislative budget?

1. Whatever amount of money we approve would make it easier.

liv. **J. Collins**: The point Mariia is struggling to make I think, is that maybe we should put some requirement on the travel. Advanced notice of travel given.

1. There could be a lot more interaction with our constituents.

2. This could be giving advanced notice and a description.

3. So people are asking: what are the issues that you want brought up?

4. We need to make thing more inclusive and effective.

5. We should codify it in some way as we proceed.

6. In a couple years, it can happen again that people can travel for an NAGPS trip and forget to report about it.

lv. **S. Seavey**: Would codifying travel for a specific reason limit people?

1. I get it as an issue being more general.
2. Being more specific can make it challenging too because things change year by year.

Ivi. **J. Collins**: What I was proposing is we can put something in a document.
   1. If travel money is spent, they have to say what they are going on and why.

Ivii. **S. Seavey**: If we make other graduate students do it, then I don’t see why we don’t need to do it.
   1. But who approves and denies this?
   2. Who would debate what is professional for us or not?
   3. Would it go to staffing?

Iviii. **K. Strawn**: I think giving advanced notice and having them weigh their opinion is appropriate.
   1. I get nervous saying that we will tell people how to vote.
   2. Even us as an elected position we can have a right to decide how we want to vote.
   3. We discuss items and I can change my mind.
   4. It is true that there should be advanced reports to say what is going on.
   5. But people are right to vote in a way that is best.
   6. It is dangerous to say how people should vote.
   7. There should be a description of what is going to happen at an event.
   8. But it should be a delegate decision.

Ix. **A. Karaman**: Fundamentally GPSC isn’t an advocacy organization.
   1. We should implement this as a matter of practice.
   2. We mostly do service and programming.
   3. Advocacy is one thing we say we do, but we provide few resources for advocacy.
   4. Because we call ourselves representatives, it gives one students a stand in for 9 thousand students on a committee.
   5. What ends up happening is that other advocacy groups get shut out of conversations.
   6. We should accept that GPSC doesn’t do any advocacy at all.
   7. We should open up some space for people from diverse groups.
   8. The way we are sending people to DC, the ways this has happened, is a ceremonial not a practical thing.
   9. GPSC has refused to stand up to the administration, which is where things happen.
   10. We should get rid of advocacy.
   11. This is liberating.
   12. We should admit what we do well and what we don’t do well.

Ix. **A. Meier**: More than one group can do advocacy.
1. Just because we don’t do it effectively, doesn’t mean we shouldn’t do it at all.

lix. A. Karaman: As long as GPSC claims itself as sole representative...

lxii. J. Sears: We have changed it to primary.

lxiii. A. Karaman: We limit our advocacy in substantial ways.
1. People don’t stand up to power.

lxiv. J. Sun: The Mizzou people organize conferences primarily.
1. It doesn’t preclude local engagement.
2. I don’t think the travel is a secret.
3. We want as many people to go as possible.
4. I’m not trying to accuse anyone of lack of engagement.
5. We want as many people to go on the trip as possible.
6. From our perspective, we think we are doing as much as we can.
7. What more should we be doing?

lxv. S. Seavey: I am still confused.
1. Are we voting what we want to put the money towards?
2. What has it been historically used for?
3. Should we name it as National Conferences?
4. Should we name it as State conferences?

lxvi. S. Netherton: Historically all national is NAGPS.
1. This is what I was thinking when we built the budget.
2. This is all I’ve ever seen it used for.
3. It is anything that would further our organization.
4. In the past it was just NAGPS, ABOR or legislative action.

lxvii. J. Sears: This is a section of the budget for next year.

lxviii. S. Netherton: We have a trip in August.
1. Last year we didn’t go to a leadership development because there was no budget.

lxix. M. Ryan: NAGPS is not inextricable pulled apart from advocacy portions.
1. We paid our professional dues to NAGPS, we are a member.
2. We have an expert in Mizzou, we could become better advocates.
3. You can look at the position that me, Mariia, and others are running for.
4. For the executive position, it is built-in to lobby with the administration.
5. To say we pull this apart means we neuter a major aspect of what we as GPSC do.
6. ASUA does a decent job.
7. There is no reason that we can’t do things better for advocacy and the professional development.
8. I don’t’ think you can separate the two- advocacy and networking.
9. This is how things work: through networking and advocacy.
A. Karaman: I have no problem with that with advocacy and professional development taking place simultaneously.

1. There are concerns with transparency and how advocacy has influenced us at the university.
2. The NAGPS endorsed Columbia students.
3. The Columbia students were doing grassroots organizing to stand up to the administration at the university.
4. NAGPS issued a statement of support, even after other meaningful in routes were made.
5. There is frustration around budgetary items.
6. Amendments and other things are reactions to people not to processes.
7. Better people would not have these problems come up.
8. We are responding to people and not to processes.
9. To our constituents what we have talked about over the past months would seem like utter nonsense.
10. There are concerns for me and other reps and hundreds of grad students.
11. Advocacy is multilevel.
12. GPSC claims advocacy as what it does, but it is shutting off advocacy on other levels.
13. It is stiming the advocacy question.
14. We should be getting rid of travel as symbolic to getting rid of our claim to advocacy.
15. And letting constituents decide about what they want to know.
16. Constituents would then know that these benefits won’t benefit us, and pay attention to advocacy itself.
17. If we want to put it into professional development money, if we want to call it professional development- leave it open.
18. Leftover money can be used to travel to NAGPS and not to prioritize our executives.

J. Collins: I would put on the agenda for next meeting: what should GPSC be doing for other groups to do advocacy.

1. Let’s move on our agenda to the next item.
2. I second the motion that we cut the amount of travel money in half.
3. Call the question.

J. Sears: We could consider increasing it in the future if transparency requests are met.

1. We are cutting the amount in half and imposing better transparency around State and National travel.

Vote: 14 for, 2 opposed, 10 abstain

J. Sears: We have memberships, what is this group?
lxxiv. **S. Netherton:** It is similar to NAGPS.
   1. I worked with this group on a white paper on student health.

lxxv. **J. Sears:** We talked about operations last time and people sounded like they were mostly ok with things.

lxxvi. **R. Fagan:** What is the dropbox renewal?

lxxvii. **J. Sears:** Its 100 dollars.

lxxviii. **R. Fagan:** You know you can use box and its free right?

lxxix. **S. Netherton:** We can’t because it doesn’t work with our website.

lxxx. **A. Karaman:** 750 for EB and REAP.
   1. Where is the 1500 coming from?
   2. If we don’t know who will be there yet?

lxxxi. **J. Sears:** Potentially it could be more people.
   1. Up to 8
   2. Actually up to 9: for 6 EB and 3 directors.
   3. Research and Travel Grants people can’t be cut, they are not voting members.

lxxxii. **S. Netherton:** I would say give it to the Travel Grants director since they cannot apply for the travel grant, and if we decide we want to have one more person.

lxxxiii. **J. Sears:** For now we are just leaving it at 1500?
   1. Any objections?
   2. The next council can always vote too.

lxxxiv. **J. Collins:** There is 5 thousand dollars for IT support.
   1. Maybe we can have Wei Ren actually review the expenditures and what they have done for the last couple of years.
   2. We need to see if its 5 thousand dollars worth of work.
   3. Can we get the same stuff done for 5 hundred dollars?

lxxxv. **J. Sears:** If its an unreasonable number, we can revisit it.

lxxxvi. **J. Collins:** Maybe if Wei Ren can report on what SAGE did for 5 thousand dollars and how much it requires to get tasks done?

lxxxvii. **A. Karaman:** I would just codify its 750 for REAP and Travel Director.

lxxxviii. **J. Sears:** Any other objections to operations?
   1. We have a balanced budget at this point.
   2. I move that we approve it as is.
   3. I move that we approve budget, and Kevin will justify the events.

**Vote: 20 for, 0 opposed, 6 abstain**

III. Discussion and vote on sponsoring tickets to NAGPS Western Regional livestream – J. Collins

i. **J. Collins:** GPSC could buy a bunch of livestream tickets for students who want to attend the NAGPS conference.
   1. The tickets cost 10 dollars.
ii. **J. Sears:** And we can put it in the newsletter tomorrow and the next week that tickets are available.

iii. **S. Netherton:** We are allocating 100 dollars.
   1. It is first come first serve.

**Vote: 19 for, 0 opposed, 7 abstain**

IV. Description and discussion of Chris Hargraves’s role – C. Hargraves

   **J. Sears:** Chris is not here today.

V. Constitutional Amendment discussion and vote – J. Collins
   a. **Amend that the last sentence of Article IV, Section 1 read as follows:**
      "Responsibilities in addition to the duties stated below may be specified in the GPSC Bylaws or at the request of the president. Any changes to an Officer’s responsibilities which are made after his or her election require consent of that Officer. Neither the GPSC president nor any of the GPSC Officers have any supervisory authority over other GPSC Officers or representatives."

   i. **J. Sears:** Jim wants to add the 2nds and 3rd sentences to the section.
      1. Can I modify it to say “their”?

   ii. **J. Collins:** Ok, that fine.
      1. The reasoning for this is that I’m trying to codify what we have been doing.
      2. There has been confusion on this point.
      3. Presidents in past have told representatives in the past that they were their boss.
      4. Some people have been carried away.
      5. Because its not clear.
      6. The wording I am proposing to add expresses what we are thinking the way it should be.

   iii. **J. Sun:** Is there any supervision at all?

   iv. **J. Sears:** The Staff positions report to the President.
      1. No one else does have the reports line.
      2. There is a section in the governing docs that explains how to establish if someone doesn’t deserve their stipends.

   v. **J. Sun:** So far the Dean of Students and administrators have been loath to do much supervising of us, since it was assumed the President was in charge.
      1. I am loath to have the Dean of students be in charge.
      2. It will be either zero regulation, or it will be up to the Dean of Students to put in a regulatory structure.
      3. I’m not saying it as a threat.
      4. It might be interesting to what the Dean of Students office will do.
      5. If we don’t regulate ourselves, the next in chain of command would be those who are giving us money.
vi. **A. Karman:** This is responding to a problem that now doesn’t exist in code, existed in the past, that might arise in the future.
   1. It’s a possibility that someone is tyrannical in their use of power.
   2. I don’t see a problem of preventing this in the code.
   3. There is nothing in code from preventing the administration from stepping in on.
   4. I agree to this because I support representatives and officers not overseen by an elected person.
   5. This should not be debated much more.

vii. **S. Netherton:** Question about how this will be interpreted by future councils.
   1. We have a method for impeachment and recall.
   2. Do we want to codify that there is no one supervise anyone?
   3. We do have stipend and rep reports.
   4. I don’t know if it will cause a problem.
   5. We don’t have anything is being supervised by anyone else now.

viii. **J. Sears:** There have been problems in the past.
   1. People who weren’t here so don’t know about these problems.
   2. There is so much codified for responsibilities now I don’t think there is a risk of saying there is no supervisor means that the responsibilities won’t be enforced.
   3. I don’t there will be any concerns there.

ix. **J. Collins:** If the administration doesn’t like what we are doing they will intervene.

x. **J. Sears:** I just realized we don’t have quorum of 2/3 to vote on a constitutional amendment.
   1. Since we can’t vote on this now, I move to adjourn at 8 pm.

VI. Discussion and possible ratification of EB and Officer decisions

VII. Stipend and Workload Review of GPSC Officers

GPSC Officers will present a summary of their major actions and decisions throughout the year. The Council may discuss any item and vote on stipend changes.

V. Reports and Summaries of Current Events (Representatives)

Any GPSC Representative may present a brief summary of current events pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02(K). The Council will not discuss or take action on any current event summary.

VI. Reports and Summaries of Current Events (Officers)

a. President – S. Netherton
b. Vice President – J. Sun
c. Assembly Chair – J. Sears
d. Secretary – M. Khorosheva
e. Treasurer – J. Brock
f. Social Chair – J. Veluz
Any GPSC Officer may present a brief summary of current events pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02(K). The Council will not discuss or take action on any current event summary.

VI. Reports and Summaries of Current Events (Staff)
   a. Events Director – K. Chau
   b. President’s Chief-of-Staff – J. Harris
   c. Elections Director – M. Stoecklein
   Any GPSC staff member may present a brief summary of current events pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02(K). The Council will not discuss or take action on any current event summary.

VII. Old Business
VIII. Open Meeting Laws discussion – J. Sears
IX. Archiving of previous Governing Docs versions – M. Khorosheva
X. Proposed changes to Governing Docs – M. Khorosheva

VII. New Business
   a. Discussion of GPSC Elections – Elections Commission

XI. Items for Future Agendas
The Board may decide to place matters on future agendas.

XI. Call to Adjourn
   At 8 pm.