

**Western Washington University Associated Students
Board of Directors Meeting**

Thursday, March 14, 2013

VU567

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Ethan Glemaker (President), Victor Celis (VP Academics), Carly C Roberts (VP Activities), Hung Le (VP Bus Ops), Deng de Duot (VP Diversity), Patrick Stickney (VP Governmental Affairs) and Katie Savinski (VP Student Life)

Student Senate Representative: Christian Correa, AS Student Senate Chair

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

Guest(s): Student Senate: Matthew Hilliard, Bill Campbell; Students for Renewable Energy: Neil Baunggard, Hunter Hassig; Students for Sustainable Food: Eddy Ury; ROP: Brandi Ball, Elana Cohen; AS Comm Office: Mario Orallo-Molinario, Jamie Hoover; AS Personnel Office: Sara Richards; AS Elections: Graham Marmion; DREAM Act: Angelica Robinson; Glen Tokola, Polly Woodbury, Alex Bain

MOTIONS

ASB-13-W-32 Approve the minutes of Thursday, February 14, 2013. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-33 Suspend the operation of the Student Senate for the 2013-2014 school year, and hire a Senate Reform Personnel who will lead and prepare all meetings regarding the drafting of a reform recommendation to the Board striking the language “bringing a referendum to the student body”. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-34 Approve the Institutionalization of the AS Communications Office. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-35 Make the AS Public Relations Coordinator a four quarter position this year pending acceptance of that fourth quarter by the hired student. *Failed*

ASB-13-W-36 Concurrence for the 3% proposed increase of the Housing and Dining Rates for 13-14. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-37 Approve as a three year grant the Vagina Memoirs Coordinator position, as a three quarter position [fall-10 hrs/week, winter-15 hrs/week, spring-25 hours total] and approve the allocation of up to \$250 from the ROP Admin Budget [FXXROP] for up to 25 hours of work this spring for the current Memoirs Facilitator, with the stipulation that priority attendance for WWU students be researched and devised. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-38 Approve the language for the Divestment Initiative as stated in Doc. 6. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-39 Approve the language for the Real Food Initiative as stated in Doc. 8. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-40 Approve the language for the Cannabis Initiative. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-41 Reject Student Club Initiative on the grounds that there is no sponsor. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-42 Reject the WEST, Student Senate, Student Voice and Clubs Initiative on the grounds that there is no sponsor. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-43 Reject the WEST and Student Senate Initiative language on the grounds that it is misleading, because it doesn't have a logical connection between the two separate initiatives being combined. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-44 Reject WEST, Senate and Voice Initiative language on the grounds that it is fundamentally misleading to combine subjects in an initiative. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-45 Reject the Student Senate and Student Voice Initiative language on the grounds that this is fundamentally misleading. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-46 Approve the language for the Amending the Initiative Process Initiative. *Failed*

ASB-13-W-47 Table the Amending the Initiative Process Initiative language to the first meeting of April with stipulation that the deadline for filing would be extended to April 12th. *Failed*

ASB-13-W-48 Approve the Western for Environmental and Sustainable Trust Initiative language. *Failed*

ASB-13-W-49 Reject the Western for Environmental and Sustainable Trust Initiative language. *Failed*

ASB-13-W-50 Table the Western for Environmental and Sustainable Trust Initiative language to next meeting and extend the filing period to April 12th. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-51 Reject the Student Senate Modification Initiative language based on the illegality and conflict with the AS Charter under Article 4 Section 1 letter d. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-52 Approve \$450 from the Combined Fund Balance (FXXCOM-ASBACB) for the cost of publicity for the Water Bottle Initiative. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-53 Approve the transfer of \$1,050 from Operational Enhancement (FXXENH) to AS Board Administration (FXXBAD) for additional hours for the AS Board Office Assistants. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-54 Approve the job description in Consent Item A. *Passed*

ASB-13-W-55 Approve Consent Item B. *Passed*

Ethan Glemaker, AS President, called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION ASB-13-W-32 by Stickney

Approve the minutes of Thursday, February 14, 2013.

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

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA- The Board decided to go in the order that guests arrived.

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

IV. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

C. Student Senate Reform Proposal (15 minutes) Stickney Doc.3

Stickney changed nothing from the last meeting; he clarified that the job description will be going to Personnel Committee. Glemaker feels that including sending this as a referendum to the student body might lock the Board into something that might not be necessary. Roberts feels that they need to take some action and should include wording for this. Stickney clarified it still says action must happen by spring 2014. Hilliard would like this to be done through a referendum because there is a chance to increase awareness of the Senate. Celis said that in the motion drafting a reform recommendation is included. Glemaker is hoping for a lot of involvement from the student body in a variety of forms.

MOTION ASB-13-W-33 by Celis

Suspend the operation of the Student Senate for the 2013-2014 school year, and hire a Senate Reform Personnel who will lead and prepare all meetings regarding the drafting of a reform recommendation to the Board striking the language "bringing a referendum to the student body".

Second: Roberts Vote: 6 - 0 - 1 Action: Passed

A. Communications Office Institutionalization (15 minutes) Roberts Doc. 1

Roberts split the proposed motion into two parts as indicated on the Agenda. Orallo-Molinaro said that process-wise he is asking them to go against the Personnel Committee recommendation to not make this position four quarters during this hiring. He apologizes for not getting this in early and he does want to honor the process so he came up with some alternatives. Orallo-Molinaro wanted to show the need for this position. The AS Communications Director (CD) handles Summerstart. There was AS Communications Office (CO) presence at every single event and there are a lot of dates all summer long. He feels that the goals for the academic year were put aside because of the huge amount of work over the summer. Having the PR person there over the summer will allow for communication expectations to be set and communicated to incoming AS employees during training. He feels that this is an unhealthy workload. Stickney asked how many hours he worked during the summer. Orallo-Molinaro feels that he worked about 40 hours a week during much of the summer and is only paid for 19 hours. Glemaker said that the AS really values self-care, he asked if Orallo-Molinaro had considered his outside commitments. Orallo-Molinaro said that his summer classes ended when Summerstart began. Hoover said that the CD would still be at the events that Orallo-Molinaro was performing in, so that time commitment would be the same. Duot asked about health because he felt that the Board used to handle these events and he did not hear any complaints. Orallo-Molinaro said that he feels the summer is mostly for

positions to get used to their jobs, but the CO starts working right away. Roberts feels that if this is to be the schedule for the future, then the workload during Summerstart warrants a second person. It makes sense for the PR Coordinator to handle these items and it would also be good to have a solid plan for handling PR when AS Employees arrive in the fall. Le feels that planning this late is an extra burden on the Personnel Office and is unfair to people who have started applying for this position but might not be able to work during the summer. He also feels that it is not a good idea to set up employees to fail. He sees two options: if it is approved as a four quarter position then they would hire as a three quarter position and if the student was available during the summer, they would work. Otherwise during the first summer they could hire an hourly person to handle these duties. Roberts thinks that this compromise that will respect Personnel Committee and meet the need for a summer person. Majkut said the job description says coordinating attendance at Summerstart, not necessarily being at every event. He feels that attending all of them is unreasonable, there are other people who the CD could coordinate to attend events. He realizes that both CD's have been attending everything. There is also a question about the early event being a good use of AS employee time. Majkut said that the AS tends to use a broad brush, and adding an entire position to handle a problem is not always the only answer. He thinks Orallo-Molinaro is correct in that the office won't get the movement in this office without the PR position. Majkut thinks that budget wise the AS is not in a situation where a lot of extra resources are available. He feels that if they pass this funding then something else has to come off the table. If they choose to allocate this money then something else will be impacted. Orallo-Molinaro feels the Board is setting the CO up to be the mouth of the organization, to speak with reporters, etc. He agrees that it is common for people to say, when in doubt hire someone. He feels that the CO needs to be well versed and to maintain health for the CD. He is unsure if they should add work to other directors. If something does happen at the event, he thinks that it is good that the office that plans the event is in attendance. Stickney would like the Board to come up with a procedure or support system so that if the PR coordinator isn't hired the AS CD isn't working 40 hours. Duot said they could make a good argument that all positions should be four quarters. He is concerned about funding availability. Richards said that as someone who served on the Board last year, it was a culture shock going from the Board to a director position because directors do a lot more work. Richards feels that offering to a student who applies to work over the summer is not equal opportunity because there are people who might have applied if they could have worked during the summer. She thinks that they should hire an hourly position. Roberts clarified that the CO could resubmit a proposal next year.

MOTION ASB-13-W-34 by Celis

Approve the Institutionalization of the AS Communications Office.

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

MOTION ASB-13- W-35 by Roberts

Make the AS Public Relations Coordinator a four quarter position this year pending acceptance of that fourth quarter by the hired student.

Second: Celis Vote: 1 - 5 - 1 Action: Failed

B. Housing & Dining Rates (15 minutes) Savinski Doc.2

Kurt Willis said that he will clarify items they spoke about last week before the documents go to the Board of Trustees. The Residence Hall Association is taking a proxy vote currently, but it looks like it will pass. There was some concern about the capital plan funding because it is a significant amount of money. Things that they are doing are really important, but students don't necessarily get jazzed up about sprinklers.

MOTION ASB-13-W-36 by Stickney

Concurrence for the 3% proposed increase of the Housing and Dining Rates for 13-14.

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

D. Vagina Memoirs Facilitator (15 minutes) Duot Doc.4

Brandi Ball is uncomfortable with the wording that was added on; she feels that the stipulation about student attendance doesn't describe what would happen if they were unable to meet this goal. She thinks that it would be better for the motion to read "an effort will be put into researching priority attendance at the event". Ball said that of people who filled out evaluations only 4 out of 77 evaluations were community members. Cohen doesn't feel the passing of the position should be tied with the stipulation. Celis said that basically three things are being asked for: one for the position in general, two is funding for spring quarter hours and three is a stipend for volunteer facilitators. Glemaker said that the last motion is optional and only included if someone is very passionate about it. Duot said that the stipend should be decided by the Women's Center. He also thinks that the stipulation doesn't need to be included because they will be doing this under the Board's advisement. Richards clarified that family and friends of cast members that are there for support should also have priority over community members. Cohen said that there were a few different events put on by the Women's Center that did not work out because of issues. Richards said that she is not sure that this event is something that Western will be ready for every year. She encourages having it be continued for three years and then be reviewed. Richards think they should create a group to review improvements to the program. She doesn't think they should continue with the position because it was created due to the negative relationships with the Women's Center. She believes they could move this back into the Women's Center Assistant Coordinator position and 2 volunteer facilitators. She doesn't think the volunteers should be paid. She thinks they could also look at moving the Labyrinth printing back because sometimes the memoirs inspire art that could be included in the publication. Richards said that this year's facilitator helped to create a good situation; versus the negativity she saw as a cast member. She thinks that if they can develop a more positive relationship between the Women's Center and the volunteer facilitators, then it can be successful without hiring this extra position. She thinks that there are large budgetary implications and four staff members in one office; she would think it was wonderful if there was a lot of funding available. Cohen thinks that implementation is the biggest concern for her; she feels the way it is worded now might exclude people the cast members need there for support. Ball said that if they ticket the events and still make it free there would be \$1,500 in extra expenses for ticket fees. Ball said even card swipes would take a significant amount of time and require people to wait longer in line for seats that they might not need. Le said according to the AS Program Standards the focus of all events is first to Western students. He thinks that saying it is difficult to implement is not a good enough reason not to do it. His proposed solution is to institutionalize the program for three years using the newly created grant program. Le agrees with Richards that they need to review every year. He would like to change the stipulation to be priority attendance for student and supporting members of the cast. Majkut had concerns about an assessment not being completed on the safety concerns, but feels comfortable that this will happen. He thinks that the coordinating function worked better than it had in the past but broad strokes of creating positions instead of narrowly tailoring resources to meet are a concern to him. Roberts said that their place at this level is not to micromanage. Duot and Stickney dittoed. Roberts said that Le's new wording is a good step. Roberts clarified that she doesn't feel that anything is a value judgment on the content of the Vagina Memoirs; it is just the reality of institutionalizing programming. She thinks that realistically they need to have a clear discussion on the workload for the Women's Center and budgetary implications. Ball said that the ROP budget was decreased by \$500. And this is only \$754 more than the decrease they have already submitted. Ball said that having the WC planning this event was very draining for the whole office. Glemaker values what Le said and he feels that there is a lot of assessment that could be happening in the WC, he suggests funding this out of Grant funding for two years and have the Assessment Coordinator look at this office as a whole. Le said that the WC was assessed last year. Cohen said that this winter there was no chance for her to work on any event but the Memoirs and she was spread very thin even though she had support of the other WC staff. She

doesn't think they can add this back in the WC. She thinks that the position is unique and someone might be a great assistant coordinator but not be the right person for the Memoirs. Cohen said this is one of Western's most highly attended events. Facilitating is not just putting on the event but also hosting the meetings and supporting the cast. Duot said they should make it three years. He feels that this program is all about empowering and that is important. Stickney dittoed. Savinski said that institutionalizing the position through the grant process is a good idea so that they can continue to evaluate if this is something that is still appropriate for the changing campus community. This program comes to the Board every year as a gender targeted program and having it a grant is more in line with that process. Savinski would like to see the stipulation language softened to researching. Stickney and Duot dittoed. She thinks there are creative and intelligent people in the AS and they can work out the kinks. Richards said the facilitator has a hard job and ends up holding all of the cast member's truth. She doesn't feel they should be a facilitator and an AS employee. Roberts said that there were over 2,000 attendees, so the cost per student served it is around \$1.60 which is a good cost ratio. She thinks that there needs to be a dedicated position for this, she doesn't think the total number of staff is relevant to this conversation. There needs to be a dedicated person if they are going to have this event, and feels that a rolling basis is good for a while because it gives security to the job while honoring the need to respond to cultural needs. Richards said that the UW has changed from the Vagina Monologues to Memoirs because of the AS program. Glemaker said that the Memoirs is an impactful event that effects not only our community but the broader community in the state of Washington. Duot suggested moving from two years as suggested by Te to 3 years then it would go through the assessment process on the normal schedule. Celis dittoed.

The Board took a break and reconvened at 6:58 p.m.

MOTION ASB-13-W-37 by Le

Approve as a three year grant the Vagina Memoirs Coordinator position, as a three quarter position [fall-10 hrs/week, winter-15 hrs/week, spring-25 hours total] and approve the allocation of up to \$250 from the ROP Admin Budget [FXXROP] for up to 25 hours of work this spring for the current Memoirs Facilitator, with the stipulation that priority attendance for WWU students be researched and devised.

Second: Celis

Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

E. DREAM Act Resolution from Senate (10 minutes) Celis Doc. 5

Celis said that the AS has a stance already and he would like to see action come from that stance instead of just taking action for the sake of taking action. Duot said that the House just passed the DREAM Act, the Board responded enthusiastically. Glemaker thinks that they can target the Senate at this point. Celis & Stickney dittoed. Stickney said that today as part of the rally students called Senators to ask them to vote for the DREAM Act. Robinson would like to help with a letter to legislators. Duot thinks that the job is not done and they need to continue. Savinski thinks that it is really important that the Board flex their representation muscles on this item and speak out as student representatives. Stickney and Glemaker dittoed. Glemaker said if there isn't a motion then they will not take action on this. Roberts thanked the Senate for taking initiative and action on this item.

F. Divestment Initiative (10 minutes) Glemaker Doc. 6

Glemaker said that the Board had their work session to discuss initiatives and came up with new wording. Baungard was happy with the new wording. Roberts thinks they had a really good work session on this and the language is clear while respecting the intention of the students who brought the initiative. Glemaker clarified that the Board can approve the wording, amend it if they feel it is misleading or illegal, reject the wording because it is misleading or illegal or table until the first meeting in spring quarter. Glemaker thanked all of the students involved with the initiatives for their hard work.

MOTION ASB-13- W-38 by Roberts

Approve the language for the Divestment Initiative as stated in Doc. 6.

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

H. Real Food Initiative

(10 minutes) Glemaker Doc. 8

Stickney feels that the language is good and reflects what the AS can do if the student body votes to approve the initiative.

MOTION ASB-13-W-39 by Stickney

Approve the language for the Real Food Initiative as stated in Doc. 8.

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

G. Cannabis Initiative

(10 minutes) Glemaker Doc. 7

Hilliard feels good about this language. Majkut said that in the other two initiatives the explanation was edited. He clarified that they are approving the language of the initiative and the explanation.

MOTION ASB-13-W-40 by Stickney

Approve the language for the Cannabis Initiative.

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

I. Combination Initiatives

(50minutes) Glemaker Doc. 9

Initiative a. Student Club Initiative

Campbell has decided that he doesn't want to sponsor the Club Initiative Language. Duot said that it becomes the property of the Board once it is submitted and he is unsure if they can just reject it. Majkut said they could reject the initiative because they don't have a sponsor. Baungard asked if they could approve the language and if it isn't submitted it wouldn't be on the ballot. Majkut feels that if an initiative doesn't have a sponsor it doesn't fit within the code requirements. Graham Marmion said that the person who submits is the sponsor. If they remove themselves, then it no longer fits within requirements of the code.

MOTION ASB-13-W-41 by Savinski

Reject Student Club Initiative on the grounds that there is no sponsor.

Second: Le Vote: 6 - 0 - 1 Action: Passed

Initiative g. WEST, Student Senate, Student Voice and Clubs Initiative

Given that they rejected the language for clubs they reject the combined initiative.

MOTION ASB-13-W-42 by Stickney

Reject the WEST, Student Senate, Student Voice and Clubs Initiative on the grounds that there is no sponsor.

Second: Celis Vote: 6 - 0 - 1 Action: Passed

Initiative e. WEST and Student Senate

MOTION ASB-13- W-43 by Roberts

Reject the WEST and Student Senate Initiative language on the grounds that it is misleading, because it doesn't have a logical connection between the two separate initiatives being combined.

Second: Stickney Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action:

Initiative f. WEST, Senate and Voice Initiative

Stickney thinks combined initiatives are fundamentally misleading because a student might want to support one part but not another. Therefore it is hard to assess what the students are really trying to tell the Board. Campbell feels that the amendments to the bylaws are different

than a standard initiative and they have been combined in the past. Glemaker said that this is changing so many pieces of the bylaws that it is confusing. Savinski dittoed.

MOTION ASB-13-W-44 by Stickney

Reject WEST, Senate and Voice Initiative language on the grounds that it is fundamentally misleading to combine subjects in an initiative.

Second: Celis Vote: 6 - 0 - 1 Action:

Initiative h. Student Senate and Student Voice

Campbell thinks that these subjects are connected. Stickney said that one is creating a legislative body and the other modifies how the student body votes. Also there is not a process because some senators can be elected and some can be appointed. Glemaker agrees that student representation is tied but the ways in which it is modifying representation is very different. Stickney thinks that the effect is the same if they pass the language separately they can find out specifically what the students want and be able to interpret clearly. Stickney feels that students might have two different decisions because they are two separate things. Savinski thinks that striking this language benefits students because it makes it the most understandable. Campbell is curious about what definition of misleading the Board is using. He thinks that it is clear. Duot thinks they are voting because it is not understandable and that is why it is misleading. Stickney said that if there is the ability to vote on these initiatives separately, then this is a clearer statement. Campbell said that there is a conception that a referendum is different than an initiative, but he feels that the voters can decide what to vote for and if it is misleading they can vote no. Savinski doesn't feel that they should ground themselves in what has happened; she honestly believes that it will be most clear to see them as separate issues. 4 dittoes.

MOTION ASB-13-W-45 by Stickney

Reject the Student Senate and Student Voice Initiative language on the grounds that this is fundamentally misleading.

Second: Savinski Vote: 6 - 0 - 1 Action: Passed

Initiative b. Amending the Initiative Process

Changing the title from Student Voice Initiative was the substantial change as well as including adding the article and section number that would be changed. Celis had concerns that this was in conflict with the section of the AS Charter that talks about granting the Board authority in creating and overseeing the campus activities. Glemaker feels that the initiative process is a student activity and this initiative takes away from the authority of the Board to oversee this. Duot feels that the Election Code Committee can make this change without it having to be included in the Bylaws. Campbell said the Charter doesn't clarify that only the Board can oversee, it just says allows. Campbell said that if this initiative passed then it would be up to the university to decide if it was in competition with the charter. Stickney dittoed. Stickney thinks that this initiative is clear enough and within the ability to change in the bylaws. He thinks that it should be available to go to the student body at least for signatures. Majkut made this comment when this change was proposed to the Election Code. He feels that saying "instruct the Board" creates a conflict with responsibility of the Board vis-a-vis the bylaws in article 3 where the Board is given the authority to handle the business of the organization. Campbell said that this is not to create a conflict with the way the Board manages the organization, it is to create an avenue for students. Campbell feels that there would already be a conflict between the Board of Directors and meetings of the membership because he feels that the Board and a meeting of the students can accomplish the same thing. Glemaker said that instructing the board, takes away from the Board's responsibility for running business of the organization. Celis said that it is also in conflict with article 5 section 1. Glemaker believes when the Election Code allow rejection of initiative language based on "legality," it really means rejecting because it is in conflict with the policies and guiding documents of the AS and University. Hilliard understands

having reservations about accepting this language, but since the initiative can change the bylaws themselves he doesn't understand why this is an issue. Marmion suggested altering another section of the Bylaws. Campbell feels the charter allows the board to have the authority but doesn't say that they are the only people who have the authority. The authority is given to the Board on behalf of the students, but if the students themselves want to change things then this should be allowed. If it is in contention with Western Washington University policies, it would be reviewed after the initiative passed. Glemaker doesn't want to talk about intention in the documents because he doesn't feel they have the authority to do that; it is up to the Board to interpret the documents. Celis feels that under item J in the Charter is conflicting and there haven't been changes to make sure that wasn't conflicting. Stickney thinks they need to separate their opinions on the value of the initiative. Stickney thinks that if the students want to make sloppy Bylaw then that is their choice. He feels if there are levels, then the proposed change is on the same level as the current Bylaws. It would then be the Board's job to interpret the Bylaws even if they are conflicting. Roberts suggested tabling to the first week of spring. Glemaker said it is their job as the Board, as the interpreters of these documents, to ensure that they are clear and not in conflict. He feels it is their job to reject initiatives if it causes the document to say two different things in the same document. Duot would like more time. Campbell doesn't feel that an amendment to the Bylaws can be rejected just because it conflicts with the Bylaws. Le said that one of the rules of the Board is that documents need to be prepared before they come to the meeting; the Board had a work session to attempt to sort out since the last meeting. He feels it is unfortunate that the next time they meet is right before the deadline and would give a short timeline for collecting signatures.

MOTION ASB-13-W-46 by Stickney

Approve the language for the Amending the Initiative Process Initiative.

Second: Duot

Vote: 2 - 4 - 1

Action: Failed

Roberts wants to make a motion to table this but recognizes that might be a filibuster, because that pushes signature collection back so close to the deadline. She feels the goal is to approve the language so people have the opportunity to put it on the ballot, but she doesn't want to approve it if there are still questions. Roberts thinks that the question is legality. Majkut said section 2 of the Election Code says, once the initiative is added to the agenda, the Board must approve, approve with amendments, or reject the language at the next three meetings, the responsibility is to take one of those actions. If they don't take an action on it, it is unclear what will happen. Campbell thinks that they can add something to change the part of the Bylaws that is in conflict. Roberts is concerned that the language itself might be in conflict, but also the resulting measures that could be taken via an initiative could be illegal. For instance, if the students decided to put initiatives up to disband an office that is deciding how services & activity fee money is spent, her understanding is this would be in conflict with the law. Le doesn't think they can make a sound decision if they amend the initiative now. He thinks that they would need to think about change because they need to have the full information to make a decision. He thinks they should table. Marmion feels they were getting more within the content and that there is the challenge procedure in place. Marmion doesn't see any legal issue with passing the initiative now. Campbell doesn't see the conflicts, when it comes to future initiatives, they would go through the same process of Board review. Campbell thinks the Board has the authority to extend the filing period for this initiative. Stickney thinks they can add language to this initiative to take away the conflict.

The Board took a break to take care of a business emergency and reconvened at 8:10 p.m.

Glemaker said that Majkut's concerns about the conflicts were stated last week. Glemaker tried to contact Campbell throughout the week. Glemaker said that while there is a final deadline for submitting initiatives and they could have received them far ahead of time. All of these initiatives came as a surprise to Board, so there was not a lot of time to work with Campbell to

make them clear. The Board has also spent a lot of time on this and so he would like to be respectful of everyone's time in this process. Le doesn't believe that they have enough information; the Board has faithfully and objectively upheld the initiative process. Due to the lack of transparency and objective collaboration, ultimately it left this group uneasy with these initiatives and he doesn't think this is how the initiatives should be handled collaboratively. He wants to be clear that this did not affect their objective decision making. Le feels that they were unable to pull from this information about exactly what the initiatives are asking for. Campbell said that this initiative is a direct response to a decision that the Board made this year. He thinks that they should make this clear but would like to have more time to get signatures. Majkut said that the Election Code is very precise and applies specific responsibilities and limitations in section 15 b. says the Election Code may not be revised between the filing period and the close of elections. This was intentional so that things would not be changed midstream. Majkut said that if they decide to extend the deadline then the Board is saying that section 15b. doesn't cover the dates. If they make a decision to change any part of the code then they exempt this section of the code from 15b. Celis is hesitant to change the dates and has a concern because there are requirements for the candidate meeting on the 11th so if the date was the 12th that is after the new deadline. Makjut said that the Election Coordinator interprets the Code. He thinks that the date part of it might be more flexible than the language of the code. Campbell said that the initiatives could have been presented early; part of the new process in the code was the date for deadline. Campbell thought that he had 3 meetings and he made a mistake by not knowing the deadline. He suggests that they move the deadline earlier next year. Glemaker feels that these conversations have unearthed a number of things that need to be looked at in the Code.

MOTION ASB-13-W-47 by Le

Table the Amending the Initiative Process Initiative language to the first meeting of April with stipulation that the deadline for filing would be extended to April 12th.

Second: Roberts Vote: 5 - 2 - 0 Action: Passed

Initiative c. Western for Environmental and Sustainable Trust

Glemaker still feels that this is misleading because they do have a position that handles these duties, just under a different name. Le dittoed. He also tried to work with Campbell on the language several times and received no response. Stickney moved to approve the language. Celis feels that it is misleading because the Board already has essentially this position. Stickney dittoed. Campbell is concerned about the Board's opinion of what is misleading. He feels this is something that the students can vote on, it is to add another position to the Board and they can decide what the position does later. Stickney dittoed. Le asked for clarification and it never came to help them make their decision. Savinski dittoed. Stickney said that Bylaws don't say anything about the job descriptions of the Board, just the titles. If the student body passes this they can modify what each position does to fit the title. Stickney thinks that the Board is masking content by saying that it is misleading. He doesn't like the change, but in their role of saying that it is misleading or illegal; he doesn't feel that is what they are doing right now. If they don't like it, they should campaign against it. Duot dittoed. Stickney thinks it's a breach of process and their responsibilities. He doesn't think they always need to have control over everything. Savinski asked to clarify the intent of what Campbell wanted to accomplish; she feels she needs that in order to make a decision. Campbell apologized for not getting this information to her. Glemaker has consistently said this was his concern, and didn't know that Stickney disagreed with this until right now. Stickney didn't know others on the Board thought it was misleading. Le respects Stickney's opinion but asks that Stickney respect others opinion on what is misleading. Duot doesn't think it is misleading. Glemaker feels this is misleading because the language implies that the Board doesn't have this position. But the Board does have this position under the VP for Student Life. Le and Savinski dittoed. Duot thinks they are arguing the content and the language is clear. Stickney said this initiative creates a position with

a title that would be elected; it doesn't even have to deal with environmental issues. If they included the job descriptions in the bylaws, then every time they change the job descriptions it would go to a vote of the student body. Campbell doesn't believe it is misleading in adding a position with a title. Savinski disagrees that is what this is saying. If they are asking a student to vote, it doesn't allow for the change to be restructuring the VP for Student Life, if it specifically says that there is a new position of an 8th Board member. Majkut said that the language is clear about creating an 8th position. The details are not in question, but one would expect that the duties have something to do with the title. Glemaker said that because this isn't just to create a new position, it leads students to deal with environmental issues and this is already handled by a position on the Board.

MOTION ASB-13-W48 by Stickney

Approve the Western for Environmental and Sustainable Trust language.

Second: Roberts

Vote: 3 - 3 - 1 Action: Failed

Stickney feels that a trust is being broken with the students. Te thinks that the Board's role is to protect the assets and the organization as a whole to the best interest of the student body. The language without more content and context is misleading. Duot thinks that the Board should let people exercise their freedom. Glemaker wanted to remind people what Campbell said during his campaign when he was concerned after a poll Campbell conducted that students couldn't name the titles of the Board members. If they can't name the positions, how can they name the responsibilities to know that Student Fife already handles this? They have bolstered and expanded the student Fife position to include a lot more time for sustainability. Roberts thinks that they are talking about misleading in terms of the content and misleading in terms of illegal. What this would do is not misleading, but the implications are misleading. Fe said there is the English language and then there are the connotations of what certain words mean. Stickney said that the Board's job in the initiative process is to make sure that there is no bias. Content wise he would campaign against this, but he thinks that students have the right to make this decision. Duot dittoed. Campbell asked what an initiative that would be added to the Board would look like. He also thinks that an initiative can come with an explanatory statement and that is where additional information could go. Stickney dittoed. Fe said that without more context, the language is not understandable. Glemaker dittoed. Fe asked for more clarification but they did not get that. Savinski really feels that for students to make a sound decision they need to know what the position would entail. Students also don't know the budgetary implications and issues with where the position would be housed. Duot said students can make their decision. Duot is going to campaign against this, but doesn't feel they should reject the language. Roberts said that the implications of this initiative are misleading and it is a bad choice for students, but she doesn't see any logical reason that she is going to be able to find to vote it misleading or illegal. She is disappointed that this is the conclusion she has come to because it would be great to exercise the authority that students entrusted to her to protect them from things like this. She hopes that they can pass this language and it will meet the end that it deserves. Glemaker said that campaigning against it is irrelevant. Glemaker gave Robert's comment a lot of kudos. Correa thinks that pragmatics is a part of communication. Glemaker dittoed. Campbell said that the Code states that the Board is not supposed to take a position on an initiative. Campbell said that nothing says that this position will be paid. He feels that this fits what needs to happen to add a position. Even if there is a position that is already there, the students still have a right to add in another position. Students have the right to add a position and to amend bylaws. Duot has a right to say anything in a meeting. Fe thought about if there is more content that could help this language be clearer. He recommends tabling this to come up with more information and clarification. Glemaker struggled with this a lot, because changing the language would change the content of the initiative. He doesn't feel it is in their authority to alter the content as the Board; he reached out to Campbell to seek approval for changing the language and didn't receive a response. Glemaker said if the initiative just asked

the students if they wanted to add a position to the Board, it would not be misleading. Roberts said that endorsement isn't allowed by the Code, but endorsement is a positive position on the initiative. Glemaker is uncomfortable extending time on more than one initiative. Duot said that they need to realize how hard they are making this on the student who submitted this initiative.

MOTION ASB-13-W-49 by Stickney

Reject the Western for Environmental and Sustainable Trust Initiative language.

Second: Roberts Vote: 2 - 3 - 2 Action: Failed

MOTION ASB-13-W-50 By Le

Table the Western for Environmental and Sustainable Trust Initiative language to next meeting and extend the filing period to April 12th.

Second: Glemaker Vote: 4 - 3 - 0 Action: Passed

The Board took a break and reconvened at 9:38 p.m.

Initiative d. Student Senate Modification Initiative

Celis feels that this is a very clear violation of the AS Charter and shared governance model in having the Deans choose the process of elections or appointments. This is in conflict with the current model of students appointing students. Glemaker Dittoed. Campbell doesn't see this having anything to do with the Senate because it references university committees. Celis said that if the Dean didn't want to appoint a student they could set up any kind of election. He thinks this takes away from the shared governance model within the university. Celis would like this to be consistent across the colleges. Campbell could amend this section, but is concerned about the resources it could take. Duot said not many students actually know or have connections with the Dean of their colleges. He thinks that they can continue to work on the process of appointment for the Senate, but they can do this within the AS organization. Roberts feels it does violate this section of the Charter because they are giving the Deans the power to appoint a student to a student run committee. She also shares Duot's concern about equal access, because not many students know the Deans. Glemaker referenced Article 3 section 1 which gives the Senate legislative power. He feels this is in conflict with many sections of the Bylaws which give the Board legislative authority. Campbell said that it is students interacting with their college and the Deans lead that college. He believes this is a redistribution of how the shared governance works at the university. He feels that the legislative sections are addressed specifically and do not conflict. Duot recognized Campbell's opinion, but still feels that only people who know the Deans would be appointed. Stickney thinks that they can amend it to strike "appointed by the respective Dean" and make it the Elections Coordinator. He also feels that he is hearing more discussion of the content and that is not relevant. He believes the language is violating current policy. Le doesn't feel comfortable amending the language without the Elections Coordinator. Campbell would be comfortable with an amendment and doesn't feel it is that big of a change. Stickney doesn't feel that it is illegal except for this one section that he feels they can amend. Savinski feels that the wording of the language of the initiative allows for them to look at the content because the articles are part of the initiative. Campbell feels that if the body rejects this language even though an amendment is being offered, it is saying something different from what the intention of the Board is during the process. Glemaker said that he has concerns with many other areas of the initiative and their conflicts with other guiding documents. Roberts agrees that it conflicts with the Bylaws but since it is an amendment to the Bylaws this shouldn't be an issue. Majkut said the precise language in the Election Code "The Board of Directors may only reject the proposed measure if its language is deemed misleading, or if there is reasonable concern about the legality of the proposed measure. The Board of Directors may only amend the language of the measure in a way that does not affect its substantive content. Students are advised to submit the language of the measure for review as early as is feasible." Roberts said since it is one of the sentences in the question and changes a large portion of what this is proposing, they need to decide if this is substantive. Glemaker doesn't think that they can edit things that change the content. He feels that they gave ample time to change the language before the

meeting and he feels this is a substantive change. Campbell said that the Board didn't make changes, but allowed the students who submitted to change the language. He feels that is what is happening here. Glemaker said that he has been wrestling with this. He feels that there are many problems that have surfaced with the Election Code. His interpretation of the Code is that substantive changes can't be made by the Board, and can only be made by the sponsor in the interim between meetings. He feels there has been ample time to change this and that the Board has been clear about their concerns. Glemaker said that trying to make these changes at 10 p.m. when the meeting should have ended over an hour and a half ago is not a good process for making a thorough decision. Stickney doesn't think it matters when the change happens. He feels that people are trying to find every avenue to say no to this. Duot said that if they pass it there will be one statement for and one against, he thinks that Campbell has accepted the change. Le feels that they can't come to a consensus so they should just vote.

MOTION ASB-13-W-51 By Celis

Reject the Student Senate Modification Initiative language based on the illegality and conflict with the AS Charter under Article 4 Section 1 letter d.

Second: Roberts Vote: 4 - 3 - 0 Action: Passed

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

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

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

A. Student Tech Fee Referendum language *(15 minutes)* Celis Doc. 10

Celis said the Student Tech Fee Renewal Committee submitted this language, after a lot of discussion and gathering student input. Currently the fee is \$25 for students taking 6 or more credits. Students taking between 1-5 credits pay \$12.50. Of that \$15 goes towards computer renewal and replacement which is 60% of the fee, \$3 goes to the Student Tech Center which is 12% of Fee, \$1 goes towards wireless network renewal and replacement, \$6 goes to the proposal fund which is 24% of the fee. Celis said that the increase in the fee adds Microsoft Student Advantage which offers students the ability to download Microsoft office, when they graduate they will be able to keep this. It also adds in a Virtual Labs and U: Drive Upgrades And a Print Quota with 50 prints. The numbers for the other areas are adjusted as referenced in the document. Roberts got to follow the process as it happened and thinks this is good for students. While they are raising the amount of the fee, the benefits that students will get back from it are going to greatly enhance their experience here at Western, as well as continue to help integrate technology into education. Stickney was on the committee and he thinks that everyone did a good job in updating this fee.

VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

A. Water Bottle Initiative Publicity Funding Request *(10 minutes)* SavinskiDoc.il

Savinski said that nothing has changed since last week, she hasn't heard any concerns and feels the process has been transparent. There are members of the faculty and staff that are looking forward to having the signage. Duot thinks this is important

MOTION ASB-13-W-52 by Celis

Approve \$450 from the Combined Fund Balance (FXXCOM-ASBACB) for the cost of publicity for the Water Bottle Initiative.

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

B. Assistant Hours *(5 minutes)* Le Doc. 12

Le said there have been no changes. Duot said that the Board Assistants work tirelessly for the students and he wants to give them some love. Le clarified that while the assistants are appreciated, this is not a reward for good work, the hours are necessary for additional work assigned.

MOTION ASB-13-W-53 by Savinski

Approve the transfer of \$1,050 from Operational Enhancement (FXXENH) to AS Board Administration (FXXBAD) for additional hours for the AS Board Office Assistants.

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

IX. CONSENT ITEMS *(subject to immediate action)*A. Personnel Job Descriptions (2 minutes) Le Doc. 13

The Board decided to postpone voting on the Club Coordinator job description until the next meeting and not add it to the Consent Items.

MOTION ASB-13-W-54 by Celis

Approve the job description in Consent Item A.

Second: Stickney Vote: 6 - 0 - 1 Action: Passed

B. Committee Appointments

Parking Appeals Board

Tristan de Rochefort Political Science Freshman (SPAC, Judicial Appeals)

Student Senate

Glen Tokola English Literature Senior (Carl H. Simpson)
w/ creative & technical supplements, Minor in Philosophy

University Judicial Appeals Board

Glen Tokola English Literature Senior (Carl H. Simpson)
w/ creative & technical supplements, Minor in Philosophy

MOTION ASB-13-W-55 by Stickney

Approve Consent Item B.

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

X. STUDENT SENATE REPORT

Christian Correa, AS Student Senate Chair reported that they did not meet this week.

XI. BOARD REPORTS

Glemaker asked the Board to submit emailed reports by Wednesday at 3 p.m.

President

Ethan Glemaker reported on the first meeting with the strategic planning subcommittee of the President's Taskforce on Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity. It was an incredibly energizing meeting and the subcommittee developed some wonderful directions for the larger committee in terms of defining diversity and how it should be pervasive within the institution. Glemaker met with Duot, Le, and Vicki Hamblin from International Programs and Exchanges today about a partnership between IPE, University Residence, the Enrollment Fee, and the AS regarding a new International Students and Scholars Services Office. The AS has been asked to commit about \$10,000 annually to help fund this program. Glemaker also received a letter from a concerned faculty member regarding the proposed fee increases for the Child Development Center and the letter was seen at UPRC this week. Glemaker has concerns about the increased cost for students to be employed at the CDC and has heard from a student regarding her inability to work there any longer due to the increased rigidity in terms of certifications and such, which are costly. Friday, March 15th will be the final day of candidate visits for the Dean of Fairhaven search, the committee will decide on a recommendation next week, and then the Provost should make her decision soon thereafter.

VP for Academic Affairs

Victor Celis reported that he and Sara Richards had the opportunity to meet with representatives from the Government Accountability Office to share student perspectives on the Higher One issues from last year and their experience on the Refunding Task Force. The University Planning and Resource Council have been discussing various budget proposals from each division within the University. They will be looking at the Child Development Center's funding situation at a future meeting of UPRC and discussing if this is something the University should take on rather than raising the rates of the CDC. Other committees are winding down for the quarter and will start up after Spring Break.

VP for Activities

Carly C Roberts reported that the last Activities Council meeting of the quarter went well. Operation Smile (student chapter of Operation smile, a charity that works to provide operations for children born with cleft lip and/or palate), WWU Teague of Vikings (A club for organizing WWU students to play the online game Teague of Tegends), and Middle Women of WWU (a women's empowerment organization started by WWU student Rebecca Rivero) were all recognized as AS clubs. Funding was allocated for students from the National Society of Collegiate Scholars to attend the Teadership Summit in Houston Texas June 21st-23rd. Funding was also approved for Students for Sensible Drug Policy to put on "Drugs: Perception vs Reality" an art show to be held in the VU from April 18th-20th. The Departmental Related Activities Committee is zooming along, though there wasn't a meeting this week, departmental budgets continue to roll in. Roberts met with administrators from Western Teadership Advantage to discuss student involvement in the development of the co-curricular and extra-curricular activities associated with the program. She is excited to get the AS and student voice involved in these processes and will be meeting with Dr. Joe Garcia hopefully in the beginning of next quarter to discuss student involvement on committees.

VP for Business & Operations

Hung Te reported that Facilities and Services approved of the Rafts for the Outdoor Center. Management Council met and approved new language for AS Program Standards, and adopted a common set of demographics for assessment. He has been working on reading budget proposals. They almost all needed more details. Budget Committee has been going well, they received the Board Priorities and are excited with this new granted responsibility. In the Spring, he wants to revise the Reserve policy to reduce the base amount of dollars required in reserves. This can likely be done by reducing the requirement in Targe Event Toan from 100k to 50k (just an idea for now). Te is looking into co-funding of a program to increase of international exchange students.

VP for Student Life

Katie Savinski reported that campus will be busy this weekend as Western will be hosting both the men's and women's NCAA Division II Regional basketball tournaments. There will be 16 teams from the west coast competing this weekend. The Alternative Transportation Fee (ATF) Committee made a recommendation that the ATF be increased by 5% for the next fiscal year. The current fee charged to students is \$25 per quarter and this increase would bring the charge to \$26.25 per quarter. This will recommendation will be coming to the Board in the spring.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Duot thinks that they should leave what they said in this meeting and go in peace, respecting people's opinions as everyone continues to learn. Te said that there were some value statements in this meeting about other people's opinions, but he wants to reiterate that each person was elected to voice their diverse opinions. Celis said that this group has been able to communicate when there are issues and this makes them a strong board.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 10:22 P.M.