General Council Meeting  
Tuesday, 8 March 2016, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.  
Student Union, Ventana Room

I. Call to Order  
At 6:10 pm  
Attendance: Jasmine Sears, Mariia Khorosheva, Sarah Netherton, Jared Brock, Joy Veluz, Preshit Ambade, Ryan Fagan, Alexander Karaman, Usir Younis, Sierra Fung, Anne Myers, Jennifer Sedler, Caitlin Harrison, Brandon Smith, Justin Ostrowski, Mark Ryan, Jahaira Vera, Delaney Stratton, Katie Strawn, Chandni Parikh (proxy by Sierra Fung), Adam Meier (proxy by Brandon Smith), Trudie McEvoy (proxy by Justin Ostrowski), Jim Carlson (proxy by Mark Ryan), Juhyung Sun (proxy by Sarah Netherton), Karthik Srinivasan (proxy by Ankush Nayak)  
Guests: Jason Harris, Zachary Brooks, Danielle Black, Elaine Yee.

Breathing Exercise
i. S. Netherton: Put out your left hand over the heart, right hand out towards the group. I will say a phrase and you will repeat it. “May you be happy, may you be free from suffering, may you know peace and joy.”

ii. M. Khorosheva: Can we have a discussion to approve the minutes from last meeting now?

iii. A. Karaman: Second.

iv. J. Sears: When do you want to discuss the minutes?
   1. Do you want to do it at the end of the meeting?

v. A. Karaman: Ok.

II. Old Business
a. Governing Docs Discussion
   a. Scheduling and minutes timelines
      i. J. Sears: There has been a proposal to amend the By-Laws timeframe for the secretary to send out minutes from 10 days to 11 days.
      ii. M. Khorosheva: As previously mentioned, the Governing Docs Committee did not approve all the changes to the By-Laws before they were proposed to the General Council.
         1. It was mentioned that they were approved by the By-Laws committee, however that is inaccurate.
         2. One of the changes not approved by the Governing Docs committee was the change to the 10-day timeline of sending minutes.
         3. Originally, the Secretary was asked to send the minutes anytime within a 2 week time frame, per the Constitution requirements.
4. However, in recognition of the need for reps to have some time to read the minutes, the minutes have been sent out earlier than 2 weeks this year.

5. I feel it is important to make sure that reps get the minutes earlier than 2 weeks, therefore modifications of the timeline in the By-Laws needs to be made for next year.

6. With my experience as a secretary this year, I feel it would be difficult for future secretaries to send the minutes out earlier than 11 days.

7. 10 days would mean that if we had a meeting on Monday or Tuesday, the Secretary would need to send the minutes out before the following weekend.

8. The detailed minute the Secretary needs to do requires lots of time to create, and of course we are all students that have our main duties to be students during most of the week.

9. 10 and 11 days is not a substantial difference to the amount of time.

10. However, if people want the minutes to be sent within 10 days next year, I am ok with that and understand.

iii. A. Karaman: I don’t feel I care about this.
1. I don’t think the Governing Docs discussion is important.
2. I would like the time for having minutes sent out to be smaller.
3. We need an abstract discussion about what is possible for a secretary, and not a discussion about the experiences of an individual secretary.
4. If this is a job and labor question, the number of days should be much smaller.
5. Having things come to us 24 hours before meeting is inconvenient.
6. I’d personally prefer to see the minutes around a 7 day mark.
7. I don’t want to overwork people.
8. It’s better if it’s out in 7 days.

iv. B. Smith: Talking about this 10 percent addition is a waste of time.
1. I think we should vote on the amendment now.

Vote: 0 for, 23 opposed, 2 abstain

v. J. Sears: We have a second proposed amendment about the Assembly Chairs duties.
1. The first part of the amendment to the Assembly Chairs position is in regards to when the agenda for the next meeting needs to be distributed.
2. I move that we change the amendment to say the preliminary agenda for the next GC meeting needs to be distributed 5 days before the upcoming meeting, not twelve days after the previous meeting.
3. We are having 2 meetings is a row, last week and this week.
4. With the original amendment implemented in regards to the 12 day timeline, that would mean that I would send the agenda after this meeting.

5. Maria, do you agree to this change to your amendment?

vi. M. Khorosheva: I accept the change.

Vote: 22 for, 0 opposed, 3 abstain

vii. J. Sears: The other change proposed by Maria is for GC members to have at least 1 week of time to tell the Assembly Chair of their availability before the semester’s meeting time and date are set.

Vote: 20 for, 2 opposed, 3 abstain

viii. U. Younis: I noticed that the College of Pharmacy is not included in article IX (Alternate Graduate and Professional Student Governing Bodies), I propose to include it.

Vote: 20 for, 0 opposed, 5 abstain

b. Events Director – K. Chau

i. J. Sears: We are changing the agenda to have the events director report come next.

ii. J. Harris: The events director is sick.

1. There are some suggestions on how the events can work this year.
2. We added two major events.
3. We’ve sponsored over 41 different workshops.
4. We plan to do more this year, such as Grad slam workshops.
5. The GEP money went to other events.
6. The events budget covers the GPSC socials.
7. We had 33 socials, which is way more than any other year.
8. We have had 60 people come for happy hours.

iii. J. Veluz: It’s been from $2.50 a person to $3.68 per person.

1. I’ve kept track of the money spent per date.

iv. J. Harris: Our socials are super popular this year.

1. This year budget was passed without line items for events.
2. This is the only way to sponsor events without getting approval for every change in the budget.
3. Moving line by line would take a couple of weeks.
4. For future budget discussion, it’s important to leave the events portion of the budget as it was this year.
5. We’ve quadrupled our participation in events this year.
6. We could separate the general events section from the socials section.
7. We should leave events budget vague in order to allow GPSC to come up with events.

v. A. Karaman: Where would the anniversary events fall?

1. I’m comfortable with this to a degree.
2. I could only be comfortable with this if budget was set by the prior council.
3. So in the next few meetings we should decide how much money is set for what.
4. That way we would still have oversight.
5. There should be a better mechanism about communication around the budget.

vi. **J. Sears**: We can pass this on to Kevin.

vii. **J. Harris**: Kevin will underspend on the events budget this year.
    1. He has worked efficiently on the budget.
    2. In terms of my report we have finalized and approved the student services fee budget.
    3. We have GPSC childcare funding for another hundred thousand dollars, please spread the word among grads and undergrads.

viii. **B. Smith**: What is the amount?

ix. **J. Harris**: Its 100 different hundred dollar grants.
    1. I don’t know much about the process of selection.
    2. Its money from GPSC and the Student Services Fee.
    3. Spread the word about the childcare grants because it is important.
    4. For the other projects are funding cut, for some programs a little more severely than others.
    5. This year money from SSFAB was so out of proportion.
    6. Some programs were cut in half.
    7. For future budget discussions, we should put money from GPSC into Travel and Research grants to bolster them straight away, instead of waiting to put the money in at a later date.

x. **A. Karaman**: I have a strong reason to believe that the board would be more or less sympathetic towards something worthwhile, towards grad students’ interests.

xi. **J. Harris**: The GPSC Committees are on the website now.
    1. Talk to Sarah if you want to be assigned a committee.
    2. Though we may not have many openings.

xii. **J. Brock**: Are there any explanations for the acronyms?

xiii. **J. Harris**: No, I will clarify that.

xiv. **S. Netherton**: This is a good first step.

xv. **J. Harris**: I wanted to volunteer information about NAGPS.
    1. Legislative action days are in October or September.
    2. We took 5 people to DC to meet at NAGPS.
    3. There was training on current legislative issues, open access to federally funded research, discussions of loans and debts, visa laws.
    4. We got to meet some congressional representatives.
5. During the National NAGPS conference there were presentations and discussions of sexual assault on campus, and elections for NAGPS board.
6. At every event people were impressed by the number of UofA people we had.
7. The NAGPS event is continuing later this week.
8. We are taking 8 people with us.
9. If you want to get involved let us know.
10. You can also get involved at the Cats at the Capitol event or things we do at state level.

xvi. J. Sears: Sarah and Maria went to National conference, maybe they have something to add.

xvii. M. Khorosheva: I went to the National NAGPS Conference this year.
1. There were many presentations I attended, and some were directly relevant to the major discussions we have on campus, such as the sexual assault prevention program for graduate students.
2. I was not very comfortable with the way GPSC voted during the national NAGPS conference.
3. One of our previous presidents was running for a president position.
4. He held the NAGPS vice president position that year.
5. When the two NAGPS presidential candidates stepped out, our president and vice president made speeches against our previous GPSC president running for the NAGPS president position.
6. They said he was horrible at his job, and had a bad relationship with the administration.
7. These speeches changed the way people saw the candidate, since our institution was officially speaking out against him.
8. GPSC also voted against him in the official ballot.
9. The result was that the speeches and votes prevented us from having a past GPSC president from becoming a president of the National Association of Graduate Students in the US.
10. We lost the possibility of having someone from the UofA be president of NAGPS.

ix. J. Harris: I don't feel safe talking about the elections.

x. J. Collins: Were there any other major decisions made?
1. Who is holding the next NAGPS conference?

xi. M. Khorosheva: I do not remember where it will be held, but the 3 universities from the UofA stood up at the last second, UofA was one of them, and suggested to hold the next NAGPS national conference.
1. It was too late for NAGPS to rethink its decision on where to hold the conference.

xii. J. Collins: Who is the past GPSC president we voted against?
M. Khorosheva: He is here today in this room.

S. Fung: I was there with everyone.
  1. Mariia also spoke out.

M. Khorosheva: No, I did not speak out against.
  1. I even abstained from our official vote on the ballot.

E. Yee: That is a malicious accusation.
  1. If Mariia was against our previous president from getting approved as NAGPS president, she wouldn’t be bringing up the topic of NAGPS elections now.

J. Sears: Who are you?

E. Yee: I am a constituent.

J. Sears: You shouldn’t be speaking.

B. Smith: Was it known before the conference who was running?
  1. Did we know what candidates where running?
  2. You should not be making the decision, and then not even sharing the decisions with us.
  3. You are representing us.
  4. GPSC was in attendance at that conference, not 4 or 5 individuals.
  5. We need to be more informed about what is going on at these events.
  6. The General Council should be able to relay their opinion.

A. Karaman: I am concerned about issues of transparency.
  1. Even when we didn’t sign a petition other students organizations on campus supported, there was no discussion about validity of issues.
  2. It was an unstrategic thing to do.
  3. These actions are illogical.
  4. Someone could describe these actions of GPSC members during the elections as an ethical difference.
  5. This was a strategic ability to place someone from GPSC and UofA on the strategic NAGPS association.
  6. GPSC spends funds on travel, so we should be informed of use of these funds.
  7. I can’t point out too many substantial advocacy things we aren’t and should be doing.
  8. It is disconcerting.
  9. I would like to yield my time to Zach.

J. Sears: You can’t yield your time to Zach, he is not part of GPSC.

M. Khorosheva: I would like to yield my time to Zach too.

J. Sears: Ok, Zach can have one minute, but you can’t speak for the remainder of the discussion.

Z. Brooks: I severed for 3 years as GPSC president.
  1. Last year I was the NAGPS Vice president.
2. I also ran for the NAGPS president position.
3. I wasn’t elected.
4. The GPSC members who went to the NAGPS national conference trip can tell you more about vote than I can.

S. Netherton: Firstly, I am a little concerned about this.
1. First of all, because it is a general concern.
2. I apologize if it is blown up for proportions.
3. When something like this comes up no one says anything.
4. I appreciate Sierra bringing something up.
5. I am not trying to hide everything, I would be glad to give you a recording of my speech if I had it.
6. This was a rough decision.
7. I am trying to see if I knew who was running for the positions before we went.
8. We as a university do not have the ability to elect an individual on our own, this was a decision of 43 other universities.
9. There was a lot of people present.
10. I did stand up and make statements about a candidate.
11. I was very complimentary of Zach and said he was a friend of mine.
12. He did a fantastic things for UofA, but he wasn’t the best of candidates for NAGPS.
13. If you want to paint that as vindictive and seeking revenge you can.
14. However I had nothing against Zach, I could not benefit personally from this decision.
15. There were 6 people from GPSC present at the conference, we all sat down and talked.
16. We came to a consensus as group.
17. If we want me to take a hit, this was not my doing.

J. Collins: Back when I was Vice president we were already a member of the NAGPS.
1. I worked hard to get us back in.
2. I went to the NAGPS conference before.
3. A lot of great stuff happened during those conferences.
4. The people who were at the NAGPS conference made a decision.
5. When we vote in council we vote on what the constituents want.
6. I think that when people go to NAGPS they shouldn’t be making personal choices.
7. In the future we should know ahead of time what is coming up on conference, and let the GC council give feedback.
8. Maybe we can even put some pressure on the national council to put up some skype facilities we can use as a council.

M. Khorosheva: Can I speak?
xxix. **J. Sears:** I don’t need to call on you.
   1. I called on you before.

xxx. **J. Harris:** I am a constituent and was present at the NAGPS national conference.
   1. I am an actual graduate student at the college of education and did make a decision.
   2. On the topic of elections, we have 4 candidates for Executive vice president, 1 petition for an administrative vice president position.
   3. Because only 1 person is running for the administrative vice president position, we are extending elections for this position by 1 more week.
   4. We have two people running for the president position.
   5. Campaigning can start on Thursday.

xxxi. **A. Karaman:** Is the extension by 1 more week possible for all positions?

xxxii. **J. Sears:** Only for president and VP positions if there is just one person running for these positions.

xxxiii. **B. Smith:** Where can you see list of candidates?

xxxiv. **J. Sears:** On the website.

xxxv. **J. Collins:** Can we get the names of people who are running?

xxxvi. **S. Netherton:** Zach and I are running for president.
   1. Jacon Wilson from higher Ed college, Maria, Mark Ryan, Jude- I can’t remember his last name- are running for the Executive Vice President Position.
   2. Jasmine is running for the Administrative Vice President.

xxxvii. **J. Sears:** There can be no campaigning during a GC meetings.
   1. Are there any other questions about the elections?

c. **Tuition Discussion – S. Netherton**

i. **S. Netherton:** We have arrived at our tuition numbers.
   1. We are looking at a 3 percent increase for in-state and 4 percent increase for out of state students.
   2. This is the university concept that we had to approve.
   3. These are the numbers across the board.

ii. **J. Brock:** Can you talk about the differential tuition?

iii. **S. Netherton:** That is just the base tuition.
   1. It applies to professional schools but not really.
   2. It can be any X amount dollars for a degree.
   3. We have a lot of MA programs who do that.
   4. It’s not direct association of tuition as for undergraduates.

iv. **B. Smith:** How do they rationalize or justify the increase in tuition?
   1. Many of my constituents are out of state and out of the country.
   2. The tuition is already expensive.
   3. How do they justify placing more burden on students?

v. **M. Ryan:** We are the only land grant institution in Arizona.
vi. **B. Smith:** Is the system continuing to drive in that direction?
   1. We are a very diverse group of individuals.

vii. **J. Brock:** Since we are an in-state institution, we are heavily subsidized by tax revenues.
   1. The differential out of state tuition was justified due to the sentiment that Arizona education should cost as less as possible.
   2. They are sticking to in-state difference as a compromise.
   3. I agree with your sentiment.

viii. **A. Karaman:** I can understand both camps from the graduate perspective.
     1. There are a number of potential downsides to this decision.
     2. Arizona is a small state.
     3. Any percent increase is inherently differential.
     4. It is ok if increase is equal across the board.
     5. I am not informed about GPSC, what role we play in this tuition decision, who is on the committees.

ix. **J. Sears:** Juhyung previously spoke up against differentiated increase at one of our meetings.

x. **A. Karaman:** I would like to know more about the process, we haven’t been informed about this before.

xi. **S. Netherton:** The way it works is by invitation only.
    1. The president and ASUA president get to be in a conversation.
    2. They run a bunch of numbers for us, such as this is how much we have planned for expenditures, etc.
    3. We have a voice and get to be part of a conversation.

xii. **A. Karaman:** None of the ABOR presidents will stand up and say no to this?

xiii. **S. Netherton:** I want to see funding for diversity issues.
     1. I was told this funding would come from new money.
     2. We support that for this reason.

xiv. **M. Khorosheva:** We were discussing this at our last EB meeting.
    1. We haven’t had a new EB meeting yet, so the minutes have not been officially approved.
    2. However, from my recollection Sarah told us during the meeting that we would not stand against tuition increases and we wanted the staff and faculty to get a pay increase.
    3. We thought that faculty and staff were getting paid substantially less than at other states and institutions, and so we were ok with the tuition increase.

xv. **J. Ostrowski:** This tuition increase goes to ABOR.
    1. We have the ability to say we support or oppose the tuition increase.
    2. We can decide what to say.

xvi. **J. Harris:** When is the ABOR meeting?

xvii. **S. Netherton:** The tuition hearing would be here.
     1. It’s on March 29 from 5-7 pm.
2. Each of the universities proposes their budget.
3. There is a call to the audience.
4. I can stand up and say whether I am for and against increase.

xviii. **J. Ostrowski:** Is it possible to come up with an official position on tuition increases?

xix. **J. Collins:** I went to a couple of those meetings when I was president.
1. It’s all blatantly manipulative.
2. I motion that GPSC does a survey on student opinions.

xx. **J. Sears:** I second the motion.
xxi. **B. Smith:** Can we make sure that there is a question about the amounts of increase being for in and out of state?

xxii. **U. Younis:** Can certain colleges abstain from this?

xxiii. **J. Sears:** Yes.

xxiv. **A. Karaman:** To what degree are you confident that this tuition increase will go to diversity programming?

xxv. **S. Netherton:** This won’t go through student engagement, it will go through student affairs.

xxvi. **A. Karaman:** Will you keep track of this for us.
1. It’s disconcerting that meetings have been happening for a while.
2. I certainly would preferred to have been told about these meetings.
3. I agree that we should do a survey.
4. In this way students can report on what they want GPSC’s position to be.

xxvii. **S. Netherton:** Juhyung previously sent out a fill-in sheet to everyone over email.
1. It was asking graduate students to respond where they would like money from a tuition increase to go.
2. So there would be specific examples.
3. Apologize if it wasn’t clear about that.
4. I like the idea of doing a survey, especially as we have Survey Monkey.

xxviii. **J. Sears:** There has been a motion to do a survey on student preferences.

**Vote: 12 for, 0 opposed, 13 abstain**

xxix. **A. Karaman:** I agree that diversity programs should have more money.

xxx. **S. Netherton:** I read all the comments from athletics survey.
1. If anyone wants a specific question for the survey let me know.

xxx. **M. Khorosheva:** Many of my constituents did not participate in the fill-in sheet that Juhyung previously designed.
1. I had people email me stating they could not understand what the sheet was all about.
2. They also weren’t sure whether to infer from the sheet that GPSC was supporting tuition increases.
3. They refused to fill it out.
4. I previously mentioned this fact to Juhyung.

xxxi. **J. Collins:** We should find out what tuition increase people want.
1. And ask: “what percentage of tuition increase would cause you severe hardship?”
2. And Brandon will write questions about in-state and out-of-state things.
xxiii. A. Karaman: It’s important to making all relevant information accessible folks who are writing the survey.
2. The responsible step would be to send the survey to students saying: “Would you be ok for tuition to be increased for this thing?”

d. EB/GA Travel Grant Replacement – M. Khorosheva
i. M. Khorosheva: I wanted to open a discussion of the EB travel grants.
   1. People have been trying to find out information about how much money has been allocated to the EB Travel grant and what its location is in the budget.
   2. There hasn’t yet been a clear answer on this.
   3. I tried asking about where the Travel grants were located in the budget at an earlier EB meeting about 1.5 months ago, but was not given an answer.
   4. The Travel Grants were introduced by the GPSC president at the beginning of this year.
   5. There were discussions of one and multiple EB travel grants.
   6. There were no clear guidelines as to the process of receiving the EB Travel grant other than the EB were to receive these grants for any any trip they did for up to 750 dollars in exchange for evaluating a travel grant.
   7. The EB could get travel grants based on evaluating one GPSC Travel grant.
   8. The GC needs to evaluate a travel grant as part of their responsibilities, but they don’t receive any $750 dollar travel grants in return.
   9. Did everyone read the emails I sent on this topic?
10. I would like to have some the following questions answered: where are the travel grants in the budget, how much are they, as well as any additional clarification given.

ii. S. Netherton: If people are upset about this and what was brought up in the emails, I wonder why I haven’t had one inquiry about what happened.
   1. There hasn’t been one cent spent out of the money allocated for the EB Travel Grants.
   2. It was budgeted as Professional Development.
   3. Nobody gets any money until we are on the same page.
   4. We are advocating that we don’t spend any of this money if there is no transparency.
   5. We have always had this professional development money.
   6. It has been 4 hundred dollars for staff.
   7. About a year ago I talked to Deya and Cameron.
8. Cameron had never been able to utilize the travel grants.
9. We started doing a professional development program for the office staff, and then the EB.
10. The whole motivation for the professional development was to avoid a conflict of interest in judging travel grants.
11. We have so many travel grants that need to be judged at the end of the day.
12. Joni who is in the office, Zach and Deya did a bunch.
13. If we structured the program with EB Travel Grants in this way we have back-up judges.
14. We talked about this, and thought we came up with an idea that seemed good.
15. We started talking to our office staff and to Cameron and he didn’t think it was equitable and fair.
16. We didn’t think it through enough.
17. I brought it back to the EB.
18. We were discussing whether we should get money in any different way than as we apply it through the Travel Grant money system.
19. We though if we used the same rules as with travel grants, there would be no differences as to how people are treated with travel grants in general.
20. Because there is contention on the issue, we though that it is not worth it.
21. We won’t do it.
22. We haven’t done anything with the EB Travel Grants.
23. I wish I could give Cameron a travel grant.
24. Everyone in office still judges an insane number of travel grants.
25. But is something we did not decide to go through with.
26. None of the EB Travel grants money will be spent.

iii. J. Sears: Do people still want to discuss this topic after the clarification?
iv. A. Karaman: Of course we still do.

v. J. Collins: There is a big hullabaloo around this issue.
1. I have been thinking about the situation for a long time.
2. Originally in GPSC the officers where the ones doing most of the work.
3. This is what ended up happening.
4. Then the officers started calling themselves the Executive Board.
5. The executive board started doing things without talking to the GC.
6. Now the executive board has been doing more and more things and not discussing it with the GC.
7. It’s clear that the EB does more things than the GC, and it’s frustrating to see how much needs to be done.
8. A lot of board members don’t do anything.
9. It’s my perception but I think it would help to air things, so that information will be out there.
10. How many travel grants at a time do you need judges for?
   vi. S. Netherton: Two to three.
   vii. J. Collins: I would be glad to be a guaranteed judge all the time.
   viii. S. Netherton: I am moving that next year the EB does not have power to make decisions.
   ix. B. Smith: The way that this information came to GC was a problem.
   1. I am still hazy on the timeline when the ideas were conceived and shifted.
   2. This is an unethical use of money, it doesn’t matter whether you think it is solving issues.
   3. We are keeping in house money.
   4. The concept of professional development sounds strange.
   5. The GPSC professional development events are already built in.
   6. I don’t think you can look at it at any other way.
   7. This should be killed and nothing similar conceived again.
   8. I will let everyone else say their peace.
   x. M. Khorosheva: The issue of travel grants was purposefully prohibited by the president from being brought to the GC council, as it was stated the council would not have it approved.
   xi. J. Sears: That did not happen, it is not stated anywhere.
   xii. M. Khorosheva: Yes, I don’t have this in writing, as I was previously prohibited by the President to take detailed EB minutes.
   1. However, much of what I have otherwise brought up in regards to EB Travel Grants is available either through emails or EB minutes.
   xiii. A. Karaman: As a labor issue, everyone should have professional development funds available.
   1. There are two things that bother me.
   2. A lot of us do free labor for GPSC.
   3. If I have the option of doing travel grants, how many rounds of travel grants can I do?
   4. It’s 7 rounds of GPSC Travel Grants total, about 2 hours long each.
   5. It’s a total of 14 hours of work for 750 dollars.
   6. I would be paid 50 dollars and hour.
   7. Sign me up for this!
   8. This is an administrative mismanagement issue.
   9. This has ethical issues, as it is overseeing a budget issue that directly supports you.
   10. I don’t understand why this issue wasn’t self-evident and the EB Travel grants shut down with the next breath.
11. This is indicative of a much larger problem.
12. It is the same thing about the anniversary budget.
13. One of the people involved in the decision on how to allocate the funds serves on the board and it is a dancer, therefore funds are spent on dancers.
14. This is a huge ethical thing.
15. We could have supported it if it was brought up to the GC.
16. This needs to be broadly publicized, this issue is huge and troublesome.

xiv. **J. Sears**: No one in GPSC is allowed to increase their own stipend.
1. This does not agree with what counts as a stipend increase.

xv. **R. Fagan**: We need an action to kill the travel grant.
1. A second motion effective as soon as possible.
2. The EB should not be making decisions without the GC informed.
3. We also need to do a lot of other things besides this discussion, such as discussing the budget.
4. My understanding was that our treasurer was here today to discuss the budget, and that we would have a shortened meeting.

xv. **J. Sears**: I motion to move the budget to the next item.

*Vote: 23 for, 2 opposed, 0 abstain*

xvi. **M. Khorosheva**: There has been a lot of misinformation of the GC.
1. If the EB Travel Grants hadn’t been brought up to the GC, no one would have ever found out about them and the EB would still be having them to this day.
2. I support the decision of the EB not making decisions without the GC approval and for a more open discussion of GPSC events and decisions in general.

e. **GPSC 25th Anniversary Event Budget – S. Netherton**

III. **Staff Reports**
   xviii. Events Director – K. Chau
   xix. President’s Chief-of-Staff – J. Harris
      a. NAGPS
   xx. Elections Director – M. Stoecklein

IV. **Representative Reports**

V. **Officer Reports**
   a. President – S. Netherton
      a. NAGPS
   b. Vice President – J. Sun
      a. NAGPS
   c. Assembly Chair – J. Sears
   d. Secretary – M. Khorosheva
      a. NAGPS
VI. Other Business
   a. Archiving of previous Governing Docs versions – M. Khorosheva
   b. Proposed changes to Governing Docs – M. Khorosheva

VII. Funding
   a. Initial Budget – J. Brock
      i. **J. Brock:** This is the budget for next year.
         1. It is a big “haircut” from last year’s budget.
         2. Permanent funding is not 2 hundred thousand anymore.
         3. We have been told “it is not permanent funding, I’ve altered the deal, pray I don’t alter it later.”
         4. Admin compensation is slightly different, we underspend these.
         5. Events funding keeps going up every year.
         6. You can see on the bottom of the excel spreadsheet there are different tabs.
         7. You can compare how we allocated money this and last year.
         8. Memberships are cut down to SAGE.
        10. POD, Research grants, etc. should also be self-explanatory.
        11. This proposal has yellow highlights: these are what we would vote on.
        12. Total budget is 878, total income is 820.
        13. We always have different things we don’t spend money on.
        14. We hope for a 50 surplus.
        15. There is nothing in by-laws to deal with over or under-budgeting.
        16. Before we finalize budget I would like to explicitly state who gets money if we go under budget.
        17. I will send this out so you can bring it up to your constituents, and to hear your feedback.
      ii. **S. Netherton:** The professional development is still on this budget in the operations, I took it out now.
      iii. **J. Brock:** So now we have more money surplus.

VIII. Call to Adjourn
At 7:58 pm.