Western Washington University Associated Students
AS BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Tuesday, November 22nd, 2016 Viking Union 567

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Members (Stephanie Cheng (President), Erick Yanzon (VP Academics), Alex LaVallee (VP Activities), Mary Moeller (VP BusOps), Aleyda Cervantes (VP Diversity), Bryce Hammer (VP Governmental Affairs), and Wayne Rocque (VP Student Life)
Advisor(s): Eric Alexander (Advisor)
Guest(s): Marya Rybalka (AS Business Director), Tori Engström (AS Personnel Director), Henry Pollet (AS REP Director), Trisha Patterson (Students for Renewable Energy), Ignacio Perez (Students for Renewable Energy), Jacob Tafejiar (Students for Renewable Energy), and Seth Vidana (Office of Sustainability).

MOTIONS
ASB-16-F-40 Removal of the Outback Farmhand Job Description from the Agenda. ***Passed.***
ASB-16-F-41 Approve Funding for the Vietnamese Student Association Hotel for Conference. ***Passed.***
ASB-16-F-42 Approval of the Academic Support Committee Charge and Charter. ***Passed.***
ASB-16-F-43 Approve All Committee Appointments.
ASB-16-F-44 Approve Lauren Vasquez and Sabrina Chau for the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee. ***Passed.***

Stephanie Cheng, AS President, called the meeting to order at 5:35pm a.m.

I. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

The guest for the Legislative agenda will not be able to make it to the meeting so the Legislative agenda will be moved to Information Items for the Board.

MOTIONASB-16-F-40 by Moeller
Motion to remove the Outback Farmhand Job Description from the agenda.
Second: Hammer Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passes

II. PUBLIC FORUM *(comments from students and the community)*

III. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

A. Minimum Wage Discussion

Moeller introduced guests and explained the timeline, the increase goes into effect in January. Alexander said there were a couple directions for the board to consider. One being how they move forward with wage increases this year, the minimum wage is up to $11 an hour. The second item is what they want to ask the budget authorities to keep in mind for next year as they build budgets for next year by January 10th 2017. They are looking for either a motion or for directions from the board. Tori rose to describe the increase that will be taking place this next year. Any employee who is currently under $11 per hour will be raised, one of the questions they are asking today is what will happen to the salaried employees? The first option is to keep the Board and coordinators at their current rate, which is above $11. The second option is that the board could set new classifications at the same percentage

above $10.63, which would result in having all of the positions be at or above minimum wage. The personnel office recommends the second option of percentage increase to the Board because of concerns about having a more equal wage tiers for salaried employees who do very different amounts of work and have different levels of responsibility. Their third option is to have $11 perhour as the base level, putting everyone, including the tier one employment, above the $11 marker. Moeller asked Alexander to address potential deficits in the next year's budget. Alexander said that due to one of the tech-mangers going un-hired currently and the new ROP personnel not yet hired, they can cover any option for the next year. The year after this will be much more difficult. He then posed to the committee the question of which option they theoretically supported. Hammer asked why personnel recommended the second option to them, Tori said that they had selected the tiered one that would be the cheapest just because they didn't know which would be most appealing to the board. TaVallee asked Alexander what was going on with the next year. Alexander asked Pollet, who said that the issue will keep coming up because it's going to increase every couple years, the Board will be constantly redoing this discussion to compensate. Hourly employees have to either reduce hours or the budget has to get increased to pay those employees. Moeller asked Alexander if that meant that hourly employees would be doing the same amount of work in less time, he clarified that if the budget didn't go up hourly employees would work less hours but still make the same amount of money in wages. The personnel office has to create the job posting in February which means Sabrina Houck needs to know the hours and salary for the next year. Hammer voiced a preference for the third item because students have pressing financial needs and giving them as much as possible is the best choice, particularly within the 19-hour cap. TaVallee said that he would like to avoid the first option because of the inequity for workers, Moeller agreed that the first option would push down personal buying power even more then the initial proposal. TaVallee and Hammer asked what the consequence would be for jumping to $13 immediately rather than waiting. Moeller said that the concern about not getting the S and A fee decoupling from tuition during this congressional cycle could negatively impact the ability for the AS to have those funds available for paying. Hammer said that the AS doesn't get state funding, the S and A fee is temporarily decoupled, and the permanent decoupling ought to pass in the legislature, all of which could alleviate Moeller's concerns about funding. Cervantes said that they currently have the funds, so they could see how the next year goes with the third option and then return to this discussion. Cheng agreed and said that the Board would formally recommend the third option to the Personnel. Hammer said that they should not recommend cutting the hours of the hourly employees and Cheng and Cervantes agreed. Alexander asked the Board what philosophy they wanted to recommend for the budget creation process for the next year. Marya Rybalka explained that Option one is a zero percent increase for budget workers which results in cutting time for the program. Option two is minimum wage-based income increase only, the current estimate is around $150,000 more to the budget which would increase S and A fees for students every term. Option three is minimum wage increase and opportunity for program dollar increase (decision package). The other options include cutting positions, eliminating programs, moving some positions to hourly, and possibly increasing the fee in another four years. Hammer asked how this would be effected by the AS Structure Review, and Alexander said that most of the issues here are theoretical a couple years out because of that. Alexander added that the second option is a best case scenario. The first option has less increase to student fees which is always good, but they believe that our programs are important and they would like to add to them. The short term options are using up reserves, which kicks the can down the road, given structure review process though, that might not be the worst thing. TaVallee said that they may end up going to S and A fee increases or reduction in personnel every year while the min wage increase is happening. Moeller said

that she supports spending down reserves and not increasing S and A fee, she would like have the program increase options not getting proposed this year and waiting for the comprehensive restructure. Hammer said that she didn't think there was much access spending to cut, Roque agreed that he hadn't seen any as did Aleyda, citing recent cuts in the ROP. Pollet attested that the REP has only been able to do stuff because they spent down reserves, next year if they get a cut in budget they will not be able to be as effective in their work. Tori said that as a chair of Budget Committee they see the Second Option as the best option. LaVallee said that Option Two creates going to the S and A fee every year for increases which is unfortunate. Hammer asked if it was atypical for the S and A fee to go up every year and what the last increase went to. Alexander added that the increase had gone to programing and staff benefits because the state stopped paying for stuff. There was a $15 increase to S and A during the recession, the last couple years it has been $5-8, the student fees are as common as market fluctuations themselves. Hammer asked about the campus ree budget for employees, Alexander explained that they come from the ree budget and that both they and student housing are big student employers. Pollet that the S and A fee has been tied to tuition historically because people assumed that tuition would always rise, and when it doesn't that does some significant harm to our funds. Hammer explained that Tim Eyman, the conservative proposer of things, was the initial proposer of the coupling to protect students from S and A fee gouging.

Roque left at 6:18

Cheng asked if there were any particular options that people felt good about. LaVallee said option one or two would be a preferable philosophy for this year's budgets because of the Restructure Process. Moeller said that programs should be allowed to increase the budgets but the slack should be picked up elsewhere in the AS. Hammer said that this would be more productive after programs submit their budget requests.

Rocque returned at 6:20

Moeller said that paying salaries means nothing if they don't have money to do their jobs. It isn't a question of what they do, it is where it comes from. Hammer said that philosophically she was fine with increasing fees to all students so that they could have access to opportunities, but that the Board should take the advice of programs, reminding them of the tightness of budget. Moeller said that the reserves are high right now and having students pay more while they are so high is unethical. Hammer said that the reserves should be this high in case of a rainy day. LaVallee said to refocus that they are being asked for advice about the potential solutions and that the offices should give recommendations, and then once they have those recommendations they need to look at where the money comes from. LaVallee said that they shouldn't discourage programs from radical ideas just because of funding trouble, and then they can get into the funding process. Alexander reminded the committee that the will vote and pass the final proposal anyway. Hammer recommended that they should allow for program increase, LaVallee said that the third option would be the best because they are asking programmers to reimagine their budgets and saying absolutely no increase might stifle that insight. Cheng called for a vote on the recommendation. Cervantes asked for a descriptor of where the funds come from, Alexander said that the money comes from Student Lees, either from reserves or from an increased fee. Moeller said she would advocate for the third option with strong encouragement for not increasing programing without dire need. Cervantes said that she is uncomfortable with the increase but she and Hammer agreed that they will have to increase eventually. Hammer suggested that they

move to a straw poll vote. Roque abstained from the vote because he wanted more context for the information surrounding the vote. Rybalka said that the Budget Office needed the Boards input before the end of the term because they have to get the budgeting process underway sooner rather than later. LaVallee said that he was comfortable supporting Option three because the offices are going to be able to imagine what their budget could look like "at its best" and he would like to see the way that they put things together without hindering themselves financially. Moeller added that budget authorities sometimes look at budgets they see infinite money, so including strong language would be beneficial. Alexander then suggested a final straw poll to voice their support, Option three received 4 votes from the 6 members who were voting so the budget guests left.

B. Green Energy Proposal

Wayne introduced the guests from Students for Renewable Energy, and Patterson explained that Western has the opportunity to invest in a windfarm outside of Lewiston, which would cut our energy by 1/3. Lewiston showed us the details on cost implementation and student willingness to pay additional funds, both of which are supportive. They will be going to the Sustainable Action Lund tomorrow morning to explain firrther and get support from that group of student representatives and they will be working out the details, but as of now, the external information is solid. Hammer asked if all of the stakeholders listed on the document had committed their investment and support. The SAL has not, because they haven't been addressed yet but the VPs they have talked to on an admin level have all committed. Hammer also asked where the admin's side of funding would come from, there isn't complete certainty, she deferred to Seth Vindana who explained that the SAL currently allocated $50,000 per quarter to invest in RECs and has done so since 2005. Vindana would like to see those funds shifted to the Wind Larm, he has been checking with the various utility bill payers to see how they feel. They want to hear tentative yes, as long as students are into it, which is why he is here tonight. The funds are there, the people who foot the bill are there, all that they need is the student and SAL seal of approval. University Residences has a higher stake and there are a few questions that still need to be answered but ultimately the project is a go. Patterson said that they have passed petitions in Red Square and on Lacebook and 500 have signed on in the last week, showing strong student support. Hammer asked about the environmental benefit of RECs versus the Wind investment for the campus. RECs essentially make the investment in wind more lucrative in comparison to coal by decreasing costs for investing. There is little tangible impact because the money largely is untraceable, and many campuses are turning away from that. Puget Sound Energy came to us in light of that and said they will build the farm if they promise to invest at a certain rate. Essentially, one is a market mechanism and the other is an investment that helps to create an actual windfarm in central Washington where it is windy enough to make that a viable option. Vidana is excited about this project, they had hype about RECs when they first came to campus and this is like RECs but better in every conceivable way. Hammer asked if they can legally do this without running a referendum, Vidana said that PSC advertises their product as a REC even if it isn't really like one. The fee category that it falls into is a special one for offsetting in the same way as RECs, so because there is no significant increase. Alexander agreed that it is legal both in letter and spirit of law. The only thing that looks funny is the 100% offset that is in the ballot language, they won't be offsetting that much by the new method, however they haven't ever actually ever offset 100% in practice, so this isn't much of a difference. Roque asked how this would impact students in terms of seeing the progress, particularly when using SAF funds. Vidana said that they could put our logo on the turbines, they could also take

students to the wind farm, particularly those in clean energy majors, or they could have live feeds of our wind farm on the dining hall televisions. He suggested that the RECs are forgotten by students and they could make them more aware through this new project. They could also use SAF for trips, or doing movie screenings hosted by Student's for Renewable Energy. The guests added that the wind turbines with Western's logo would make good advertising for the school and the Board voiced approval.

C. AS Wind Energy Resolution

Patterson introduced the SRE recommendation to the Board. The only thing that was added from the Green Energy Proposal was a point about just transition key to help communities most impacted by climate change and former coal based areas. They then requested that the Board to Take a position. Hammer and Cheng proposed condensing the language before its passing as an action item on the 30th so that it was easier for students toread.

У. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

A. Vietnamese Student Association Proposal

Aleyda said that the funding would come out of reserves. This would have gone to steering but they have another club funding item coming up. This only covers hotel everything else is done by fundraiser by the club.

MOTION ASB-16-F-41 by Hammer
Approve funding for the Vietnamese Student Association hotel for conference
Second: Roque Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passes

Cervantes lefi at 7:04 PM

B. Academic Support Committee Charge and Charter

Yanzon said that the only change was one undeclared member was added.

MOTION ASB-16-F-42 by Hammer
Approval of the Academic Support Committee Charge and Charter.
Second: Yanzon Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action: Passes.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

A. The Legislative Agenda

Hammer will be working on the Agenda pamphlet to give to the Board after the break. Moeller asked what the changes might be, Hammer responded that other than some slight changes in wording the only difference would be the Student Trustee item will be a campus by campus decision on selection due to some disagreement with other campuses at the WS A meeting last weekend.

Cervantes reentered at 7:08 PM

LaVallee asked if that would affect the change to RCW, Hammer answered that the only change is how trustees get selected, and there would be no change to the proposal. LaVallee asked if this is an unusual amount of items to have on the agenda, Hammer said that there was only one new item and they had reorganized to slim down the pamphlet. The admin has a much longer list and other schools ask for less because they have a less extensive history of successful lobbying. They also address specific legislators, so having items to go to different people is a strategic choice and additionally this is a fiscal year, meaning that our requests are more likely to be met.

B. Sexual Assault Prevention Taskforce

Hammer gave the background for the requirement of campus sexual assault taskforce which was organized by the Washington Student Achievement Council. Each Title IX coordinator in the state sat on the taskforce, there are nine recommendations they have given and the Board needs to give them feedback before the 28th. Moeller suggested highlighting communities of color, Hammer offered to look over statistics. Cervantes added that the reporting without identity was suggested earlier on, and that could be helpful. Hammer asked if they could include school covering costs for medical and psychological care.

C. Resource and Outreach Programs Taskforce

Cervantes said that the group is on phase two which includes looking at the women's center, the DOC, and the QRC. Representatives from those centers won't be sitting at every meeting, only the relevant ones. The implementation will be the school year after next year and they will also be looking at the way that those centers interact with the AS in whole. A concern was mentioned that there are only

VII. **CONSENT ITEMS** *(subject to immediate action)*

A. Committee Appointments

Student Technology Fee

Jane Tarabochia Junior Psychology and Spanish

MOTION ASB-16-F-43 by Hammer
Motion to approve all committee appointments under A.
Second: Yanzon Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passes

B. Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee Appointments

Yanzon asked for people's top two picks for his appointments to the committee. After some short discussion of preferences Alexander suggested that the Board go into executive session.

They were in executive session without record of minutes from 7:28 PM to 7:47 PM.

MOTIONASB-16-F-44 by Yanzon
Approve Lauren Vasquez and Sabrina Chau for the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee.
Second: Hammer Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passes.

VIII. BOARD REPORTS

President

Stephanie Cheng, the AS President reported that about 50 people showed up to Sabah's first listening session to talk post-election and the next one is December 1st.

VP for Activities

Alex LaVallee, the AS VP for Activities reported that there are a couple new clubs, Global Zero, Society for Asian Scientists and Engineers, and Japanese Conversation Club. He also went to the Suicide prevention committee which has a new coordinator named Cass who talked about upcoming events with the counseling center and a big reassessment of resources on campus for mental health. There is also now a 24-hour helpline setup.

VP for Diversity

Aleyda Cervantes, the AS VP for Diversity reported that there was no steering council meeting this week, and Equity Alliance had an emergency meeting on Monday to discuss making Western a sanctuary campus. They are currently waiting for Sabah, to make a more substantial statement then the current position. She is currently supporting them in that process.

VP for Governmental Affairs

Bryce Hammer, the AS VP for Governmental Affairs reported that the WS A this weekend passed several items including Support for Survivors, VOTE, and Race and Equity (a proposal from UW that was more of a mindset than a legislative action). If you want further information, contact her. Additionally, they are planning for local lobby day, around Housing Rights and local safety issues. Western Lobby Day has 160 people registered and Structure Review has tentatively found the make up for the Senate, how the budget process will function, and the division of fees. Also, 5,000 people used the permanent ballot drobox during the election, which is an impressive number.

VP for Business and Operations did not give a board report.
VP for Academic Affairs did not give a board report.
VP for Student Life did not give a board report.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Eric Alexander noted that they are finally able to hire a new IT Manager and asked if any Board members wanted to be a part of that. Hammer asked what time the committee would be busiest, Alexander said that it would be busy in January and February, much to the disappointment of Hammer.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 7:56p.m.