GSO Steering Committee Minutes February 22, 2018 HTB Room 216

Members Present: Naomi Reid - Graduate Student Organization Co-Chair / Educational Review Committee Representative Stephanie Luczak - Graduate Student Organization Co-Chair / Educational Review Committee Representative, left at 6:35 p.m. Bree'ana Johnson - Graduate Student Organization Treasurer **Sam Lew** – Just Community Ariel Barber – Casework Sherise Truman - International Center Advisory Committee Student Representative Nelson Veras – iHeart **George Leboeuf** – Group Work **Rebecca Yungk** – Community Organization Jenevieve Johnson - SAMI Isabella Randazzo – MSW Student Michelle Jefferson – OBSWS, joined at 6:11 pm **Kenyatta Thompson** – Policy Practice (joined via phone at 6:26 pm) Natalie O'Connor – OSAS Program Assistant Milagros Marrero-Johnson - GSO Advisor

I. Ice Breaker

Meeting was called to order on February 22, 2018 at 6:06 pm

II. Ice Breaker

What did you do for self-care?

III. ERC Sub-Committee Update

A. Concerns were raised about GSO and its role with the ERC process and ad hoc committee. The meeting was filled with a lot of tension and various opinions regarding the matter. Also, leader's needed clarification on the recent petition that was circulated amongst some of the study body. Some leaders who signed the petition were under a false impression from what they were told when they signed the petition. The individual that initiated petition is not present at meeting to discuss concerns. Does a signed letter from GSO needs to be sent to individuals clarifying the petition? It was raised that part of the problem was the initial ERC letter sent was not voted on by leaders before being sent out.

1. R.L. - This is problematic and does not appreciate name associated with petition as it was an uncomfortable position to be in as a student rep. Students should have come up with ideas before circulating non-transparent letters.

- 2. J.A. Issue should have been brought to GSO for a vote to pursue. It was unprofessional and why was issue turned into a GSO problem?
 - A. Who helped write the letter? Why was committee created? Dissatisfied with process.
- 3. M.M.J. The process is extensive and may not be resolved this year. The group needs to come to a resolution on how to proceed since GSO took this on as a charge. The structures in-house were not utilized to address the issue first and individuals went outside beforehand, therefore, consequences have arose and the School of Social Work and GSO are receiving great attention. Working within a process is necessary, especially within higher education and how would individuals handle this issue in their own practice. It is important to advocate for student population but witnessing the change may not occur before some students graduate. This issue needs to be made right for the student body. Concerns need to be taken to field rep about placement difficulties. If there are no students in the ERC sub-committee, the meetings will continue. Kenyatta and Sam volunteered to be on the committee. There were concerns about how GSO is being portrayed and may need to be addressed.
- 4. S.L. Students should have a voice and believes there is run-around. Felt overshadowed during ERC meetings and inability to really speak up. Concerns about student rep at ERC was dismissed.
- 5. S.L. Can only commit once a month for ERC meetings and need more consistency
- 6. A.B. Clarifying about process and what ERC committee did. Students do not understand process of addressing issues about field placements
- 7. B.J. GSO meetings need to be advertised more for students to understand its role.
- 8. M.J. People complaining need to attend meetings to share concerns.
- 9. K.T. Agrees that there needs to be a schedule for meetings, possibly alternating schedules or rotational leadership. This may be too much for 2 students to take on and wants GSO to be portrayed better to others. K.T. is unsure if follow-up email will be beneficial.
- 10. N.R. A student came to GSO chairs seeking aid, chairs chose to support, and did not know it would become such large issue. Could a faculty speak to student misrepresenting letter?

IV. Voting on Student Survey

- A. Milagros shared that if students are interested in pursuing students' fees and the community benefitting from them to contact her. This was not raised as a concern at the recent GSO budget hearing meeting. It is important that we do not misrepresent the University as not being involved in the community since they are. This issue is specific to student funding. She suggested that a survey of students be conducted to gauge student interest to see if they are interested in their fees being used in this way.
- B. There is an opportunity for a student group to work with a community agency to offer HIV screenings to students. Please contact Milagros if interested.
- C. Vote:
 - Rebecca Yungk motioned for a vote to pursue examining student fees and how it relates to community
 - Sherise Truman seconded the vote
 - o 8 Voted In Favor, 0 Voted Opposed, 0 Abstentions

V. Spring Social

Location needs to be greatly considered because there are students in recovery and hosting a social all the time at a brewery is not ethically responsible as a social worker.

- A. J.A. Not satisfied with City Steam, another venue needs to be chosen
- B. N.R. Issue was presented last meeting and would GSO like to revote on location? Suggestions s for venue changes to be emailed to N.R. by Monday or it will remain the same.

VI. Voting on Expenditure Reports

- Ariel Barber motioned for a vote.
- Michelle Jefferson seconded the vote.
- 8 Voted In Favor, 0 Voted Opposed, 0 Abstentions

VII. New GSO Representative

George L. – Group Work Chair, would like to conduct educational seminars, help students develop clinical intervention skills, and provide certificates.

VIII. Vote to approve new GSO Leader, George Leboeuf for Group Work

- Jenevieve Johnson motioned for a vote.
- Naomi Reid seconded the vote.
- 8 Voted In Favor, 0 Voted Opposed, 0 Abstentions

IX. Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned at 7:28 pm.