

Western Washington University Associated Students Board of Directors Meeting

Wednesday, May 31, 2012

VU567

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Anna Ellermeier (President), Fabiola Arvizu (VP Academics), Travis Peters (VP Bus Ops), Deng Duot (VP Diversity), Iris Maute-Gibson (VP Governmental Affairs) and Sara Richards (VP Student Life) *Absent:* Mario Orallo-Molinario (VP Activities)

Student Senate Representative: Kendall Bull, Chair

Advisor(s): Kevin Majkut, Director of Student Activities

Guest(s): Peg Godwin (AS Bookstore Manager), Ben Crowther, Ethan Glemaker, Angela Tsui (AS Business Director)

MOTIONS

- ASB-12-S-48** Approve the revised Bookstore Improvements Reserve section of the AS Reserve Policy, B, 1, as proposed. *Passed*
- ASB-12-S-49** Approve the proposed "Policy for AS Bookstore Net Revenue Distribution" as submitted. This policy will be in effect from approval until June 30, 2014. *Passed*
- ASB-12-S-50** Approve the AS Program Standards as stated in Doc. 6 with the addition of "genetic information, gender identity/expression" in Section 2.2. *Passed*
- ASB-12-S-51** Approve the 2012-13 AS Employment Policy with the addition of the new wording for 8.04 "Supervisors must maintain communication with their directors and staff managers with their staff director on issues of employee performance. Prior to any significant action beginning, including establishing a performance contract or recommending discipline/suspension/termination the supervisor should meet with their director."; add to 6.01vii add a sentence at the end "This additional member may not however be the current position holder"; and add to section 6.01x after "except those reapplying for their jobs" "unless approved by the Personnel Office". *Passed*
- ASB-12-S-52** Approve Consent Item A. *Passed*

Anna Ellermeier, AS President, called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA-** Move Information Item-D Board to Information Item Guest-D because the Business Director is in attendance.

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

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

- A. Viqueen Lodge Mission and Vision (10 minutes) Peters Doc. 1
- Peters said there was a request for funding earlier this year and the Board asked that a mission and vision be created. A task force was created and they have been meeting consistently to discuss and create this document. Majkut asked if this represents a change from the current model. He feels that it is currently used by a lot of individuals. Peters said that it isn't too different from what the lodge currently does and what they hope it will continue to do in the future. Maute-Gibson sees the mission as a contract with the people who are using the facility. What seemed to be important was the description of the facility and making it more accessible. She wondered how this will help future Board's make decisions. Ellermeier thinks that the vision will help guide the decision making about future plans for the facility. In their conversations, the task force thinks that increasingly accessible means: access to the island, financial access because it is expensive now to get out there, physical accessibility for people with disabilities, as well as creating accessible learning environment, which could include things like having running water. Duot would like to see the usage rates. Brockman would like it to be called the AS Viqueen Lodge since the AS owns the property.

- B. Fee Reports (5 minutes) Peters Doc. 2
Ellermeier said that fee areas were asked to submit a short report to the Board if they were not requesting an increase, in lieu of coming to present to the Board. This is their report of how the fee was used this year and other useful information. This item does not require action.
- C. AS Bookstore Request (15 minutes) Peters Doc. 3
Peters said that these are requests from the Bookstore Reserves. Peg Godwin, AS Bookstore Manager said that one of the funding issues is the bags that the bookstore gives out. They are trying to get new bags that will be biodegradable. These bags cost 3 times more than the bags that they currently use and are made in the US. They will comply with the new Bellingham law about banning plastic bags. The store currently uses about 30,000 bags per year. They also give out about 10,000 reusable bags at the beginning of the year and if students use them they get \$.05 off their purchase. They would be happy to use the AS logo on these bags to help advertise for the AS all over campus as thanks for funding this expense. Another item is the Sherpa updates that will change the way that they rent books and allow them to use the inventory they have in the store. Right now they are using a 3rd party rental area. The real benefit to the new system is it allows the purchase of a book once and then rent it out several times. They are doing about 1.3 million in online sales now, so they are asking to improve their online services. Maute-Gibson asked if they would have a long term contract with Sustainable Plastic Products for the new bags. Godwin said that it is a year to year contract. The Bookstore is part of an association that negotiates prices for them to help reduce costs.
- D. AS Budget 2012-2013 (30 minutes) Peters Doc. 7
Angela Tsui, AS Business Director presented the budget. Peters said that the budget in the document has the comments listed; the copy that Tsui printed out has the newest numbers. Peters feels that they really need to discuss the three items on the budget that Tsui handed out. Ellermeier said that through the budget process organizationally and through Budget Committee (BC) she wondered if this is something that people can agree upon. Tsui said that they have sent out the budget for stakeholder feedback. Some concerns were already addressed. The remaining ones are the three that are up for discussion now. Maute-Gibson asked what kind of outreach they have done to get student input. Tsui said there are 6-7 students at-large on the committee. Maute-Gibson asked about the decrease to voter education and registration when they had requested the new position. Tsui is not sure why this has decreased overall and will look into it. Arvizu wondered why the Student Senate budget has decreased because they are hoping to increase involvement. Tsui said that Senate will not be advertising for itself, it will be rolled into the overall committee advertisement which is under the new committee position. Duot asked why the Women's Center (WC) budget was reduced. Tsui said the reduction was requested by the department. The BC looked at each budget and the WC admin was not all used historically. Tsui said that the Disability Outreach Center didn't take into account revenue. Duot asked about Building Unity Training. Tsui said that a budget request was not turned in for this item. Tsui said that last year there was \$1,000 added for ESC Travel at the Board meeting but this was not added to the spreadsheet, so to the BC it looked like they were requesting an increase. BC is in support of club programs staying the same. Tsui would recommend adding \$1,000 to the budget to keep it at the same level as this year. ESC Admin requested that two student positions be increased as 4 quarter positions. A request never came to the Board to increase the position, so BC did not fund this. The other ESC reduction was that the operating supply budget was reduced by \$700 because for the past few years they have not used all of these funds. Nathan Panelo has just begun his position as ESC Coordinator; he was unsure of the needs for the ESC budget and wanted to stay with the current requests. If in the future he sees more need he will address it then. Maute-Gibson asked about the increase to the Communications Office, she feels they are very effective but this is a significant increase. Tsui thinks that their budget should be structured differently because it looks like they are

providing \$27,000 worth of programming. But all of the Summerstart, Transitions and Info Fair expenses for the entire AS are located in this budget. In the past this was paid for out of Board discretionary. Tsui is thinking about making a new budget for these areas to make the budget clearer. Duot said that there is an increase to the Child Development Center. Tsui said the AS contribution counts for a small amount of their budget. They requested an increase in one area and a decrease in one area which created a 0% increase overall.

The budget for fall staff development in general is the first item Tsui would like to discuss in detail. BC originally recommended \$17,255 to fund the current program with the retreat at Fort Warden. There are other options for decreasing the costs by changing the location for the retreat to a less expensive facility or an on campus retreat. Tsui said that she received a lot of feedback about this budget, mostly critical and feels the Board is the best group to make a decision. Brockman said that people were upset because some budgets were cut and this was an increase to the retreat, but much of this has been addressed. Brockman asked to change the budget to Fall Staff Development because it is not only for the retreat. Brockman doesn't think that it would be a good idea to cancel the retreat. There were concerns at BC about whether this is a good use of student funds. Richards definitely sees the value in attending an outside retreat. She is not in favor of option c. Maute-Gibson thinks that it is important to focus on recommendations from the Communication Office which included canceling Camp AS and focusing on a grassroots organizing training. Arvizu is leaning towards option b. The ESC has used Camp Casey for their conference and it has worked out. She would also like more information from the Personnel Office about what the exact benefits are of an offsite retreat. Brockman is concerned that option b doesn't allow funds for departmental training. He said if they chose this, then they should increase it to the current level of \$15,000. The second discussion item is the Federal Toby Trip. BC is currently recommending funding at \$0 because they recommend using the Legislative Action Fund (TAF). If the Board finds this is not an appropriate use of the fee, then they recommend decreasing the student representatives traveling to two. Maute-Gibson said that TAF is funded by a decision of the Legislative Affairs Council. She doesn't feel that the Board can bind them to make this decision. Also traveling on the trip is currently in at least two job descriptions, which makes it operational. She also doesn't feel it fits the purpose of TAT. She agrees that option b is reasonable, but it is still not enough for two people to travel. Her proposal is to increase to \$3,700 for two people. Maute-Gibson feels that in trying to narrow the attendees to two, the President has not always been versed in the governmental areas and in representing the students this would be necessary. The Legislative Liaison is the most versed in lobbying and would be valuable to attend the trip. Arvizu asked if it is normal for universities to send students to DC. Maute-Gibson said that they have been traveling with administrators and this has been very powerful. Central sends about 10 students to DC by themselves. Tsui's recommendations for any surplus funds is to have \$5,000 for administrative adjustments such as fringe benefits miscalculations, etc. The recommendation for any funds above this is to split up the funds 50% Activities Council, 25% ESC Club Programming, 25% Supplemental Funds.

Y. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

- A. AS Bookstore Distribution Policy (10 minutes) Peters Doc.4
Peters said nothing has changed from last week.

MOTION ASB-12-S-48 by Maute-Gibson

Approve the revised Bookstore Improvements Reserve section of the AS Reserve Policy, B, 1, as proposed.

Second: Peters

Vote: 6 - 0 - 0

Action: Passed

MOTION ASB-12-S-49 by Maute-Gibson

Approve the proposed “Policy for AS Bookstore Net Revenue Distribution” as submitted. This policy will be in effect from approval until June 30, 2014.

Second: Peters Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

The Board took a short break and reconvened at 7:40p.m. Brockman was called away shortly so the Board discussed Item Cfirst.

C. AS Program Standards (20 minutes) Peters Doc. 6

Peters said that there have been minimal changes. There was discussion last week about changing the sentence flow of program Mission Statements. As he was doing this people asked if this was really ok to do without the office being involved. He feels that they should just make a recommendation to look at the flow next year and involve the offices. Brockman would like to make sure that the list in section 2.2 of equal opportunity match the Employment Policy. Section 4.1.d.l&2 speaks to targeted programming. It outlines that requests come through any Board member instead of just the VP for Business & Operations.

MOTION ASB-12-S-50 by Arvizu

Approve the AS Program Standards as stated in Doc. 6 with the addition of “genetic information, gender identity/expression” in Section 2.2.

Second: Maute-Gibson Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

B. AS Employment Policy T2-T3 (30 minutes) Peters Doc. 5

The parts that are highlighted reflect the changes Brockman made from last week. Majkut asked to add a section at the beginning of 8.04 that states “Supervisors must maintain communication with their directors and staff managers with their staff director on issues of employee performance. Prior to any significant action beginning, including establishing a performance contract or recommending discipline/suspension/termination the supervisor should meet with their director.” Majkut is proposing this because of a situation this year where the supervisor was following the policy, but left the director out of the loop. He would like to make this consistent with messages they try to tell staff. Communication is important in issues where students might be disciplined. He thinks this puts the Personnel Director more in a direct relationship with the supervisor and the employee. But he thinks they should add the director because they are part of the supervisory line. 6.01 This addresses the position holder not serving on the hiring committee but being encouraged to educate the search committee on responsibilities. Majkut said under vii there is the possibility of putting a resource person as a non-voting member. Brockman said last week that the position holder could serve as a non-voting member. Majkut doesn’t think this is a good interpretation of that policy. He thinks that most AS committees don’t go to a vote and that then this person would become part of the process. He thinks that strengthening the language about having the position holder meet with the search committee. Brockman asked if he would like to add “This person cannot be the current position holder to 6.01 vii.” Arvizu is not in favor of having the position holder be on the committee because the discussions are really what lead to choosing the candidate. Arvizu doesn’t understand why they need an additional person. Brockman explained that some of the more technical committees have an expert, such positions that are joint AS and office of sustainability. Duot asked what about if a comment influences people on the committee. Ellermeier said that they would be there to help inform the decision with in technical matters. Ben Crowther said in part x because of the assessment process there are sometimes changes to job descriptions. He thinks this would be useful even if the person was reapplying. Brockman understands, but he feels it is still a risk to have them meet with the committee. There is an appearance of fairness issue to other applicants who may become aware of this. But he also agrees with what Crowther said about the position holder occasionally being the only person with specific knowledge that is needed. He suggests adding “unless approved by the personnel office.” He feels this includes a third party person and helps with the fairness of the process. Arvizu suggested talking to the director or coordinator instead. Crowther said that even though

people work closely together the supervisor doesn't always know all of the details of why changes may have been proposed. 8.03 Legacy Document Crowther appreciates it is no longer required that the document be re-written every quarter but 8.08iib still requires that ten topics be covered. He thinks they should be recommended and not required. He used the structure as a guide, but didn't need each of the sections. Maute-Gibson agrees that they might not want to leave it exactly the same, and these questions should be answered but additional things could be added. Brockman said that with this amendment there is nothing required in the document. He thinks if they are going to pass this then they should require a word limit of 500-1,000. Peters does agree that at this point they have nothing required. Peters fails to see how the points are restricting. Duot thinks that it should be with good faith and not require this. He feels that they should use discretion and the question "what did not work well." Richards feels like Crowther probably spoke about all of these topics, but maybe not in the same format. Peters doesn't believe it has to be in this format, as long as they are answered. Brockman said that these topics were approved by Management Council. Ellermeier said that personnel issues do not need to be included in the document. Arvizu is fine with these topics, she feels they are the basics and this is a good direction for the legacy documents. The amendment to change the wording in 8.01iib to "topics should cover but are not limited to". Failed: 0-5-1. Maute-Gibson read the other policy that is referenced about being students first, she understands why it is important to match this. However, she thinks that making a contract to students and having this in it, but having no consequences for skipping classes seems odd. Brockman said that there are not really consequences listed out for each violation. He thinks that it should be a rule not to exploit students; he thinks this should be in the policy because it is a university policy. Ellermeier suggested "may not be required to work" which makes it clear that their supervisors can't require students to work during class. Brockman disagrees with this and thinks that the first priority is education. Peters asked if he knew how the university handles this situation. Brockman said that when he spoke to the student employment office, he understood that according to federal work study, it is against the law for a student to work on campus when they are supposed to be in class. Brockman is not sure that there is a specific consequence. Duot thinks that telling employees they are students first is important. If a student chooses not to go to class then it is an individual thing. Majkut thinks that this is an important issue and one that will continue on into next year. They have been discussing academic performance contracts if someone's academic standards start going down. He thinks it is a good thing to say in the policy and complies with the university standard, but he thinks they need to have more conversations about this. Maute-Gibson said that academics is outside of the job descriptions and legacy is inside, salaried employees are different than the hourly employees. She thinks that this is a strong value statement to make about something that people in the organization see as a joke. She thinks it is just as strong of a statement to say the AS "will not make you work during class time." She thinks this says that the organization will go out of their way as an organization to ensure that employees are not scheduled to work over classes. Brockman thinks salaried, hourly or work study should be treated with the same level of respect for their academics. Brockman is trying to put the university policy into this document; he does agree that this needs more work. He feels this is an important issue. Arvizu thinks that they have already expressed the importance of academic success because of the grade point and credit requirement.

MOTION ASB-12-S-51 by Richards

Approve the 2012-13 AS Employment Policy with the addition of the new wording for 8.04 "Supervisors must maintain communication with their directors and staff managers with their staff director on issues of employee performance. Prior to any significant action beginning, including establishing a performance contract or recommending discipline/suspension/termination the

supervisor should meet with their director.”; add to 6.0lvii add a sentence at the end “This additional member may not however be the current position holder”; and add to section 6.0lx after “except those reapplying for their jobs” “unless approved by the Personnel Office”.

Second: Peters Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

VI. PERSONNEL ITEMS (*subject to immediate action*)

VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

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

A. Committee Appointments

Diversity Achievement Award Committee:

Brandi Ball Communication Sciences and Disorders Junior

MOTION ASB-12-S-52 by Richards

Approve Consent Item A.

Second: Peters Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

X. STUDENT SENATE REPORT

XI. BOARD REPORTS- There were no reports due to the length of the meeting.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 8:30 P.M.