

GRADUATE STUDENT SENATE (GSS)
Thursday, Oct 6, 2016; 9:00 – 10:30 AM; MUB 332

Minutes

I. Opening Business

A. Greetings, Check-Ins, Action Item Steps

1. Present GSS Senators and Guests: Drummond Biles, Andrea Jilling, Mark Anthony (Guest), Nate Stafford, Jordan Coulombe, Dante Broadbent, Saman Salari, Myles Lynch, Jovanna Milosavljevic, Joseph Jensen, Ezra Temko, Holland Prior, Jin Lee, Gökhan Kumpas

2. N. Stafford provided department liaison update; sheet passed around indicating if contact made with constituency about liaison

B. Approval of minutes

Minutes approved

II. External Business

A. Undergraduate Student Senate

Absent

III. Internal Business

A. Reports

1. J. Lee provided updates on Faculty Senate Student Affairs meeting regarding Title IX compliance within the Navitas program. Concerns were raised by lecturers about whether they are given enough support to comply with Title IX requirements. Also students may not fully understand if and how issues are reported and may feel that they lose a sense of agency when they choose not to report things to the police. Committee acknowledged a need for clarification between police, dean, and faculty about reporting needs. She also noted that currently, TAs and faculty are advised to have the students go to the dean's office if issues arise; faculty are concerned this may scare the student. Otherwise, Navitas students are not satisfied with some of the programs between the university and Navitas. Lastly, faculty is concerned about level of English proficiency they have; some struggling and problems are emerging.
2. Selfie with advisor competition. Goal to work with grad office more to publicize events.
3. D. Biles provided updates from the most recent Grad Council meeting. He noted that the annual report is uploaded on MyCourses detailing the main priorities for the school. Additionally, data on admissions include departmental level and grad school as a whole. A major priority is to increase visibility – students are asked to submit picture to grad school with our research/what we're up to. Lastly, D. Biles called upon GSS members to each submit a picture.
4. Lewis Burke Associates report provided details on fellowships that are available to graduate students. Office of research has only last year's booklet, but it will be updated;

may find other opportunities not usually advertised via the fellowship office or office of research.

5. D. Biles contacted by Community Tee's about GSS t-shirt. He noted that the T- Shirt contest will begin at Flight Event on Oct 20th and is looking for someone in GSS to help with the design.
6. Holland Prior reported on Faculty Academic Affairs meeting. She noted the common exam hour included a time change that was originally approved for a 2-year window while Hamm Smith was offline. She questioned if we return to the original schedule. For grad students it is the time when we often have department meetings, events, seminars, workshops, etc.
General feeling about moving time:
 - D. Biles – should go back to original time period
 - E. Temko – passed a resolution last year asking Senate to revert back to original schedule at first opportunity
7. J. Milosavljevic provided update from Faculty Senate. She noted VP Clement was the guest at the most recent meeting. She also discussed conversations around shared governance; need for clarification of shared governance (definition and role at university). Last year, had held discussions about budget advisory committee (BAC), but BAC suddenly stopped meeting. Lastly, she noted VP promised that the committee will be reestablished and will have faculty and student representatives from USS and GSS, and that the representative be appointed by GSS.
8. J. Milosavljevic also mentioned the faculty were presented new software for advising students and to track student progress. She noted that faculty likes idea, but worried about time required to adjust to new software. Does not exactly pertain to graduate students, and unclear if grad students would be involved with this process.
 - D. Broadbent asked if the software only served faculty or if students access as well? J. Milosavljevic responded that it is mostly for faculty to advise students so they have a comprehensive profile of students.
9. Campus planning stated that priority is shared governance.
10. M. Anthony introduced resolution on restroom signage. He noted that work on signage for restrooms aims to increase inclusivity. He also mentioned that the goal is to increase accessibility by turning single occupancy restrooms into gender inclusive restrooms. There has been pushback or a preference using "Universal Design" as an alternative. The restrooms should be immediately accessible and visible regardless of your background, but LGBTQ+ commission voted unanimously to turn them into "Gender Inclusive" restrooms. The resolution proposes to make all 105 single occupancy restrooms gender inclusive by spring 2017.
 - E. Temko asked if there had been conversations about the specific language and word choice (Gender inclusive, gender neutral, all gender, etc.)? M. Anthony responded that the commission held a vote over the summer and "Gender Inclusive" won over the other options. He also noted that there is a national trend in selecting these words specifically.
 - D. Broadbent asked if single occupancy restrooms are currently not gender inclusive? M. Anthony responded that there are single occupancy, but they are designated as one of two genders (gendered) and thus not safe for Transgendered individuals. This is an opportunity to educate the campus on the use and meaning of "gender inclusive" language. The LGBTQ+ Commission wants to send out

- information about the changes and sees this as educational opportunity
- D. Broadbent noted that is difficult to go from gendered to something that is not actively inclusive. He was curious if we could go to universal signage like what we have in Europe (“Universal Design”). He suggested more universal signage as an alternative, such as a picture of a toilet. M. Anthony responded that the opinion is shared among many others on campus, but from the perspective of the commission and folks who are directly affected by sign, they don’t support that choice. It’s more affirming, much safer to have the “gender inclusive” language explicitly.
 - D. Biles asked if “gender inclusive” is translatable? M. Anthony responded that for this reason, they will need a toilet symbol.
 - G. Kumpas stressed that even with this change, folks will still need to go to different buildings to find appropriate bathrooms. He asked if there is a map available showing where these are located? M. Anthony responded that there is in fact a map (and associated app) available on the community equity council website.
 - N. Stafford asked if we force the language in the resolution, would that require another resolution in the event that the language changes in a year or two. He would not want the administration to feel like they wasted money on signs and suggests that the GSS leave out the specific language the resolution. This would leave the discussion open so the appropriate bodies who make the ultimate decision can determine the language. GSS will not force their hands.
 - D. Broadbent adds that he would rather see more universal design rather than something that would be changed as our language changes.
 - J. Jensen asked if we put gender inclusive on sign would there be a place for people to go who prefer regular single occupancy? D. Biles responded that this change opens the door for everyone whereas the door is currently closed to some individuals. M. Lynch added that this is an important issue to think about. It forces the administration to realize the national trend. The expense of changing the signs is minimal and the educational benefit is very important.

Final vote on Resolution:

- 9 For
- 4 Abstain
- 2 Against

***Resolution Passes**

B. Graduate Liaison

1. N. Stafford reopened conversations about grad liaison and shared governance. He reminded everyone that under GSS organization folder on MyCourses there is a Word document titled *Departmental Governance*. He expanded that the goal is to have grad representative from each department involved with faculty departmental, or program meetings; such as if dealing with departmental committees, curricular changes, tenure decisions, social events/colloquium. Specific departments, like Sociology and History, have graduate student caucuses and graduate student organization similar to GSS. This includes elected or volunteer positions where they have either voting or nonvoting privileges and sit in on department meetings to weigh in with voice of graduate students. N. Stafford asked senators to contact constituencies and administrators; need to identify someone to

serve as liaison. He added if they have contacted departments without any response, contact again, adding that this role is a great professional development tool and opportunity to get students involved. Lastly, he noted it encourages communication and transparency – still direct conversation with students; have ability to weigh in on that rather than receiving information after decisions and changes have been made.

- J. Jensen asked what Senators should do if there are students identified and in that position, but they are not very involved? N. Stafford suggested they ask the Senator to approach the faculty with the liaisons to open the conversation.
- J. Milosavljevic asked if students would be left out of confidential matters and further asked to clarify the meaning of confidential in this case. N. Stafford responded that confidential matters include tenure review or departmental review. He added that once liaison is identified, department and liaison will have to negotiate what is confidential and where the lines are drawn specifically; decision may be department specific.
- J. Lee asked what the protocol is if faculty members are against the idea of having students in their meeting? N. Stafford responded that some departments have faculty meetings that are exclusive to lecturers. The ultimate goal is if lecturers or research associates aren't represented, we can align with those groups to encourage departmental-wide meetings. He added that if there is wide push-back then at the very least, a meeting with grad program coordinator or department chair would work. Here, meeting minutes could be directly conveyed to that person.

C. Break out into brainstorm session

1. D. Biles explained purpose of exercise is to split into groups of two so that everybody has one fee or financial affair issue they will look into, investigate, etc. At end of activity, list top 3 and relevant action items.
2. D. Biles added that the main function is to:
 - Participate in Fee discussion
 - Represent Grads in Committees
 - Provide community

D. Action items

IV. Upcoming Events

A. Flight events

October 20th from 4:30pm+ at Flight
10-15% off

B. Debates

October 19th from 9pm + at Thompson Tavern

V. Check-outs and Evaluations

VI. Adjourn

Respectfully Recorded,

Andrea Jilling, Financial Affairs Officer
Graduate Student Senate
University of New Hampshire

Respectfully Submitted,

Jessie Bolin, Communications Officer
Graduate Student Senate
University of New Hampshire