

Western Washington University Associated Students Board of Directors Meeting

Thursday, June 5, 2014

VU567

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Carly Roberts (President), Josie Ellison (VP Academics), Jarred Tyson (VP Activities), and Robby Eckroth (VP Student Life) Tate: Morgan Burke (VP BusOps), Mayra Guizar (VP Diversity), Kaylee Galloway (VP Governmental Affairs)

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

Guest(s): Taylor Franks, AS Business Director; Alysa Kipersztok; 14-15 Board Elect: Giselle Alcántar Soto, Annika Wolters, Cristina Rodríguez; Jamie Hoover, AS Comm Office Advisor; Mason Luvera, AS Communications Director

MOTIONS

- ASB-14-S- Approve the minutes of May 15, 2014. **Passed**
- ASB-14-S- Approve the minutes of May 22, 2014. **Passed**
- ASB-14-S- Move AS Carry Forwards to Immediate Action. **Passed**
- ASB-14-S- Approve the institutionalization of a permanent carry forward status, to be implemented yearly, for the self-sustaining budget of Fall Info Fair [FXXFIF], **Passed**
- ASB-14-S- Approve carrying forward the Win Win funding in the amount of \$4,158 as is required by the grant in REP Admin [FXXREP]. **Passed**
- ASB-14-S- Move Funding Request USSA Congress to Immediate Action. **Passed**
- ASB-14-S- Approve \$3,000 from AS Discretionary Reserves FXXRES to help fund 8 students to attend the USSA National Student Congress. **Passed**
- ASB-14-S- Approve increased, unanticipated costs for the NCCWSL by NTE \$130 from Operational Enhancement [FXXENH] and NTE \$260 from the Student Development Fund [FXXSBR]. **Passed**

Carly Roberts, AS President, called the meeting to order at 5:36p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION ASB-14-S- by Tyson

Approve the minutes of May 15, 2014.

Second: Eckroth Vote: 4 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

MOTION ASB-14-S- by Ellison

Approve the minutes of May 22, 2014.

Second: Tyson Vote: 4 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

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

Galloway joined the meeting

V. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

A. AS Budget

(10 minutes) Doc. 1 Burke

Roberts said that this has been a very thorough process this year. The Board will see this item at the next meeting so that the VP for Business & Operations can be present for the action.

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

A. AS Carry Forwards

(10 minutes) Doc. 2 Burke

Taylor Franks, AS Business Director said that the Fall Info Fair would like to make their budget a permanent carry forward budget because vendors are charged to fund the fair. These funds should be used in the future for unforeseen expenses. If there continues to be a large amount left each year the amount charged to vendors might be lowered.

MOTION ASB-14-S- by Ellison

Move AS Carry Forwards to Immediate Action.

Second: Tyson

Vote: 5 - 0 - 0

Action: Passed

MOTION ASB-14-S- by Ellison

Approve the institutionalization of a permanent carry forward status, to be implemented yearly, for the self-sustaining budget of Fall Info Fair [FXXFIF],

Second: Eckroth

Vote: 5 - 0 - 0

Action: Passed

The funding for Win Win was granted for specific purposes within the AS Representation & Engagement Programs, it should not be spent on other things and was not all spent this year; that is why they are requesting a carry forward.

MOTION ASB-14-S- by Galloway

Approve carrying forward the Win Win funding in the amount of \$4,158 as is required by the grant in REP Admin [FXXREP],

Second: Ellison

Vote: 5 - 0 - 0

Action: Passed

B. Business Office Work Study JD

(10 minutes) Doc. 3 Burke

Taylor Franks, AS Business Director, said that there needs to be another person in the Business Office because of high demand on the employees. They really need help with the daily processes and processing the ERs. This person would go through all ERs to ensure that they are filled out appropriately and forward them to the correct person. This process currently takes a lot of time for the Business Office employees to follow up with people to get the ERs filled out correctly. This will free up time for the Business Director and Assistant Business Director to be more focused on their jobs and to do bigger projects. They are asking for a work study student because they are unsure how it will work out. There are no financial implications at this time. Roberts said that in general the AS needs to make sure that they are careful about how they think of work studies. They often treat work study status as a stepping stone for positions that then turn into hourly/salaried. She thinks this is to the detriment of students, they need to ensure that these are viable work options for people. She wants to make sure that the AS is looking at work study positions as real jobs with real people associated with them. Franks said that this work study would be gaining actual experience that may help them secure work in the future and it should be a viable job. Roberts asked if this was passed by Personnel Committee. Franks confirmed that it was and would be hired during the summer to begin in the fall.

C. Divestment Resolution

(15 minutes) Doc. 4 Guizar

Roberts said that resolution was brought forward by Alysa Kipersztok who is a student at-large. This is different than the discussions they have been having about divesting from fossil fuel companies. Kipersztok said she brought this to help define what would happen if students were looking to divest from foreign countries or boycott. This isn't to stifle any student pursuits or voices, but it is a framework to talk about these issues and how decisions will play out, in a way that is best representative of ASWWU. Her personal reason is that many universities are experiencing various boycott and divestment issues, in particular ones that involve divesting from the country of Israel. She feels that it is important to have a resolution in place to help guide this type of process. Her hope is that this resolution will protect student groups from discrimination and preserves their ability to recognize themselves by their respective culture. Roberts said this is structured as a bill to update the Bylaws, but this would need to be changed to fall in line with the policies and procedures of the AS. Ellison clarified that Bylaw changes have to happen via a vote. Roberts said that they could make this a resolution that says that the AS will not take stances on issues regarding foreign nations or the resolution could establish a set of measures for when it would be appropriate for the AS to get involved in these issues. Roberts feels that this is a proactive resolution and that is a great thing. The University of Washington Student Senate has been

embroiled in a lengthy discussion on divestment this year. She thinks this resolution is good because it is more generalized and the discussion will not involve a decision based on a specific situation. Galloway asked for an example of where this would be used. Eckroth dittoed. Roberts said that if students asked to divest from a nation because of the things that their government are doing. For example suggesting Western stop buying things from there, sending exchange students, etc. They could re-work this resolution to say that the AS doesn't take a stance on matters of foreign relations. The reason that this is important is that there could be a population of students from that nation attending Western and this could create a hostile campus environment for those students. This has happened on campuses where movements have taken place. Many students don't feel comfortable identifying with the group targeted by that particular movement. This resolution would be a way to ensure that all students on this campus feel safe and welcome. Roberts feels that it is not really the place of student government to get involved in international conflict. She feels it is a misuse of time and doesn't allow for addressing things that are of immediate concern to the student body and promoting the general welfare of the student body, which is the primary purpose of the Associated Students. Roberts thinks this could be helpful to future boards. Galloway doesn't know that this is clear in the resolution. Galloway is concerned that there may not be enough time to review this, do more research, and be careful with the wording. She felt that it may be better to have this be an item that the next Board should spend due diligence reviewing. Roberts would like to work on this because the student will be studying abroad next fall. She would like to work hard to have a good document by Tuesday. Majkut said that in the "Be It Resolved" it says that if there will be legislation involving divestment from any country, then they must look at any country that has similar or worse human rights conditions. One of the areas the Future of the World Report looks at is the ten worst offenders in terms of political rights. So for example if they were to divest from number five they would need to look at 1-4 as well. This is to help limit targeting of specific area. He thinks this is an interesting idea, to look at larger issues than to just look at one area. For instance if they are looking at Thailand in terms of child sex slavery then they need to look at other areas where this occurs. Roberts said that there would need to be reformatting. Eckroth felt that the goal of the resolution wasn't clear but agreed with the direction that it was going. Galloway said that if there were significant revisions to this document then she would be willing to look at it. Ellison thanked Kipersztok for her work on this. Roberts said that the Future of the World Report has a good reputation, but she doesn't think that it is advisable to move forward with an outside organization being referenced. Galloway thinks that there are a lot of questions, she doesn't know what authority the AS has in this situation. Is this divestment involving the Foundation, or purchasing through the AS. She is concerned about making a decision in a shorter than usual timeframe when they are not totally familiar with the situation. Roberts said one example is that some colleges have boycotted Hummus from Israel on their campuses. For her this is making a decision that is not in the realm of expertise of student representatives. As far as the AS Board authority, because they operate under shared governance, if students want to take a position the administration would typically look to the AS Board be the body to take that stance. She feels it is important for the AS to know how to handle this situation. Majkut said that the AS Board can make decisions about AS purchases within the state purchasing regulations. For example the AS decided not to purchase bottled water before it became banned on campus. Kipersztok said that these types of boycotts could develop into pressure to refrain from collaborating on research with academic institutions in other countries. The resolution isn't necessarily cutting off people's voices in expressing, boycotting or divesting it is mostly a framework to have a dialogue about if it is an immediate concern, falls within AS values, etc. Roberts clarified that if there is an issue with a company and their practices, this is different than a nation of peoples and would not be applicable to this resolution. Roberts supports this because it protects the rights and the safety of students in the future. Eckroth dittoed. She thinks that philosophically academic institutions should keep a degree of separation from international conflicts because academia has a way of bringing people together and keeping positive foreign relation ties alive even when other things may be disturbing that. She

thinks that it is really great, for example the United States currently has scientists working with Israel to develop healthcare technology that is benefiting people all over the world. She feels that there is no such thing as a cut and dry situation in foreign relations. She believes that student governments do a disservice when they spend time trying to take action on one small part of something. Conflict is so complex, if the international leaders can't resolve it, then that use of time and energy could have detrimental effects without bringing a lot of positives. Especially in looking at what has happened on other campuses this year. Majkut thinks that things that don't demonize people on campus and allow for dialogue are excellent. He has particular concerns about the last "whereas" statement. He thinks that it could for example limit speakers being brought to campus. He thinks the language is a little indistinct in terms of what is trying to be accomplished, but he thinks the idea is good. Ellison likes the idea of looking at more countries than just one in terms of divesting. Annika Wolters, AS President elect, likes the ideas of looking at the same or worse violators of human rights, she sees it as a possibility for students to be more educated on international affairs. It may be a good way to make a statement for global equality. She would like there to be an opportunity to take a stance. Roberts thinks that they should take a really good look at the measures that they would be using in that case. Some measures take into account voting, education level of girls, workers conditions, etc. She feels if they are going to be saying that they boycott all who are equal or worse offenders, then they need to ensure that they are confident in the measure being used. Countries' places on this list change dramatically based on what is included in the measured indicators. She thinks that they may need to take more time to write this resolution if they add the equal or worse clause, but thinks that they should go in that direction if people feel that is a good idea. Roberts thinks that because of the volatile nature of the lists, it would be better to not rely on a third party body to supply rankings. She thinks a resolution that doesn't include this would be more clear and straight forward. She thinks that expanding education is good, but she is concerned about how the implementation would work. Galloway thinks they may be overcomplicating things and she suggested a "be it resolved" statement of "the AS should not take stances on ...these issues... to ensure that safety of all identities and that all students are feeling safe and included on campus. Eckroth doesn't think they should be taking stances against countries at all. Galloway dittoed. The Resolution would be a binding document and not just urging future Boards. Kipersztok thinks that the points made were important things that are important to include in the resolution.

D. AS Branding Guide

(25 minutes) Doc. 5Burke

Mason Luvera, AS Communications Director, said creating this document has been a two year process. Originally it was designed to describe visual perimeters for the organization. It has been expanded to be a comprehensive document on how to execute and abide by our organization's representation. Simply, it is the book on how to be the AS. They had many discussions and did some informal research to look at what factors come into play with the AS. The factors for the AS are the: awareness on campus, presence on campus and attitude of the AS. Branding is about the using language, tone, and appearance to shape the representation of the AS on campus. The theme they developed was "This is our brand and also our story." This is not just about how to advertise, it is about presenting the AS in a way that helps accomplish their goals. It is about telling the story of where they started, how they came to this point, and where they are going. Each connection with the organization will define how students think about every other presence they have on campus. The goal of branding is connecting, unifying, and enforcing so that it continues, because if there is not a consistent presence on campus students will not be able to feel ownership of or connect with the AS. Luvera pulled some information about the organization out of their guiding document and found key phrases like: empowering, supportive, educational, dynamic, and relevant. Voice is how they convey these phrases to the students. How they should communicate and use their language: constructively, compassionately, and unbiasedly. Key quotes: "all AS communications must be respectful, non-inflammatory, and equally weighted. We must never communicate with hostility, marginality or personal bias." and "Messaging should be done in a

“bright” and “energetic” tone, always consecutive and never unwelcoming.” The visual section has the colors used in the welcome banners. There is a lot to be said about the AS logo and how it embodies to the AS. It has the overlapping circles which are designed show the supporting students and bringing people together theme. They have not established a set parameter for color for individual areas. But advertising the AS as a whole such as door boards, business cards, banners, etc. would follow the color scheme in the document. Students cannot identify AS advertising, this is an issue that was identified in focus groups. Tuvera said that it should be easy for staff to understand and will be mostly implemented by the Publicity Center. The internal branding rules will help to connect all staff, such as the email signature which will be the same throughout the organization. New AS business cards can include departmental logos but must also have the AS logo. Offices can also chose to use the Western Business Cards because the Western Branding Guide supersedes this guide. Best practices was the longest part of this process and describes how to commonly address issues, scenarios, examples, media issues, etc. Tuvera said this is the culmination of a couple of different issues ensuring that the visual identity is clear and consistent as well as addressing the lack of a real presence for the AS on campus. They have a student population where people are busy and getting a lot of information, they need to be contacted right away and be consistent from year to year, despite staff turnover. These are parameters unheard of in other organizations of similar sizes. It would cost about \$27,000 in billable hours to have someone else do a branding guide like this, Tuvera is proud of this office. Roberts thanked him for doing this. She oversaw the office for a year and a half, this is far more beautiful than what they had envisioned originally. Unanimous dittoed. Eckroth read it line by line and really enjoyed it. He asked if the Communications Office (CO) will have more training sessions to guide responses to social media. He likes that they are directing this and talking about how to handle responses. Tuvera said that their curriculum with the CO has been moving away from the media side of things as their focus and empowering other employees to handle this. Social Media needs to be as removed as possible from the staff, people should identify the office first and the people who work there secondly because they change yearly. The CO has asked that all AS offices get a graphic, logo, and a design for the cover photo from the Publicity Center. They also will train people on how to post content that generates connection between the work they do, the office identity, the AS identity, and the students they are reaching. Tyson asked if there is the means to ask students about their perception of the AS. Tuvera said that he likes to use social media because people tend to be pretty uninhibited on social media. They will look at hashtags that have the connections to things currently happening in the AS. They do see people tweeting but not making connections with it being an AS event. They also had meetings and conversation that students they didn’t know at Summerstart and Transitions. It was mostly informal because he feels that if it is formal people get more inhibited.

E. AS Program Standards Revisions (25 minutes) Doc. 6 Burke

Matt Smith came to speak for Management Council (MC). The revisions to the Targeted Programming areas were to help give more definition to what semi-targeted events are. This would mostly be if the cast is targeted, but the event attendance was not. The original purpose of targeted events were for the whole event to be targeted. These new clarifications should help future Board’s understand the difference and the kinds of questions they should be asking. Smith feels that the targeted events were put into the Program Standards in order to recognize the need for a safe space for marginalized identity events. Smith felt that if there was an event that was partially targeted it came to the Board, but this was mostly because staff knew this was necessary. With turnover it will be very helpful to have the process written down. Ellison thinks this is important and will make the process easier. Majkut asked if this language was taken to the Equal Opportunity Office. He thinks that the EOO can review this after it is passed and changes could be made if necessary. Ellison will run this by EOO. Roberts thinks this lays out clear parameters and some of the concerns the Board has dealt with in the past as far as the legal parameters. Roberts said that some questions had to be asked, but were not expected and therefore were sometimes seen invasive by

presenters. Roberts asked if the VP for BusOps was the appropriate person to submit requests to because they used to oversee all of the offices, but this is not true anymore. Smith knows that they did discuss and this at MC was kept that way intentionally. Roberts can see it being good to say the appropriate Board member because having more than one person as an option is confusing. She would like to strike the VP for BusOps. 2 dittos. Majkut thinks that it might be good to list the Vice President's and their respective areas because this would give more clarity. Ellison thinks that it could allow for someone who doesn't feel comfortable approaching the Board member providing oversight. Roberts thinks that there will be contentious relationships throughout people's work experiences and they need to learn to work with the appropriate person.

The Board took a break and reconvened at 7:13 p.m. Morgan Burke & Mayra Guizar joined the meeting via conference phone.

F. Funding Request USSA Congress (25 minutes) Doc. 7 Galloway

Sarah Kohout, VP for Gov Elect, said that this is a request from the Operational Enhancement Budget to send 5 more students to the United States Student Association (USSA) Congress. They are currently funding 3 students out of the Legislative Action Fund budget. They would stay in the dorms which includes meals and gives more of a sense of community. They would be able to drive down to the conference, which is cheaper than flying. Galloway said that Congress is one of the two major annual conferences that the USSA puts on, this year it will be at the University California Urbine campus. Sending 8 students would send a huge statement and allow for students to get civically engaged, trained in multiple areas as well as playing a key role in the forward momentum of USSA. A lot of decision-making happens at Congress and it is important that they have representation. They are requesting these funds from the Board because the current status of the LAF and the restructure is unknown. If the restructure passes this will be a very different story. There was a pool of very qualified students who applied and 8 were selected by the Legislative Affairs Council (LAC) to attend. She feels that this would be a good use of funds and an investment in students. Monday, June 9th is the early registration deadline, due to the tight timeframe, she would like to see this as action. Burke asked if this would come out of next year's budget. Galloway said that it would be funded out of this year's budget. There is a breakdown of expenses for this year from Operating Enhancement and there would still be funding for the flights being requested later in the meeting in consent. Tyson spoke to some students about the opportunities that they have had on campus. It has been brought up that certain conferences have not been very accessible to other students. He feels that this goes along with the idea of the AS being a little club and not offering opportunities to all students. Galloway said there were 14 applications and 8 students selected. They have discussed how to make students more aware of these types of opportunities. Galloway feels that their involvement has increased. Last year there wasn't a selection process and the VP for Gov just chose who attended. This year as they saw a greater benefit to the students and wanted to open up conference attendance, the LAC decided to create a conference policy and an application process. The LAC hasn't really done this before. Applications are required to be available for several days before review and be reviewed by the committee. The building of infrastructure happened this year and this first process may not be as open as they would like, but it was a step. There is an opportunity to continue to outreach to students. Ultimately LAC's goal is to have equal opportunity selection processes based on the benefits that the students would bring to the conference and what they would bring back after the conference. Tyson asked if they will be going with more bang for their buck in terms of having qualified and involved students, or outreaching to students who aren't as involved. Galloway said that they aren't revealing the delegation right now, but the students are qualified and were selected through comprehensive deliberation of 3 hours. The criteria did allow for involvement not just in the AS, but also on campus. Tyson wanted the process in public record and that is why he asked about it. Kohout said that this is the first step and they were working on a tight timeline, she feels the process will only improve. Ellison said that they were keeping the names confidential so that decisions were not perceived to be made based on the people who might be attending. The LAF will be supporting sending the top three candidates. Roberts has some concerns about this request.

She is concerned about having a deliberation on 8 people when the funding was not secured. The Operating Enhancement (OE) policy is that they cannot hear items as an immediate action. Roberts doesn't think is appropriate to take out of this fund. She suggests making it Discretionary Reserves because any leftover funds in OE would roll into DR at the end of the year. Galloway said that their intention was to fund the whole 8 students, on Wednesday she found out that the LAF Restructure was less certain. After this she discussed with LAC the uncertainty and so the committee funded 3 people, and selected 8 with a core of 3. She brought this as soon as she saw an issue. Galloway does respect the policy. But they have taken immediate action on items from Operating Enhancement and funded items for the Board. Ellison said there is precedence for funding a conference. She feels that it is the first year that they have opened applications and it will be more widely advertised in the future. Ellison thinks this does meet Operational Enhancement requirements. Majkut clarified that Galloway is asking for the money to be fronted and if the LAF passes, then they may fund attendance from that account. Burke feels funding needs to follow info/action if that is what is stated in the policy. Galloway said USSA hasn't released that information but it could be between \$400 and \$800 in additional funds if they miss early registration, but she did not know for sure. Ellison feels this is significant enough to look at this tonight. Roberts said that if they want to move this to action item tonight, they should take it from Discretionary Reserve. Roberts wanted to clarify a few things because she thinks that in the business world a lot of what they are talking about and some of the arguments that are being made would not fly. She thinks that regardless of the LAF process, even if things went forward verbatim from the referendum, the Board of Trustees would not have approved that restructure before June 13th. She thinks that there is some decision making being made in an order that would not fly in the "real world". She understands the need to get things done within the time frames that they are working on, but thinks that the decision was still made in an order that does not make sense fiscally or policy wise. She is not trying to make an argument she just needed to point this out for the sake of everyone in the room that this would not be an appropriate thing to do. Galloway is frustrated because she feels she is being painted as an irresponsible person. Roberts said that she did not say anything about Galloway personally and asked to move on.

Roberts said that emotions are high. She called for a *five minute recess*.

Galloway is concerned because this will not affect her, because she will be graduating, but it does affect Kohout and the students who requested to attend. Kohout said that this would be at the end of the summer quarter so they want to allow for time to prepare to leave and discuss with professors. Kohout said that they did not notify anyone that they could attend and will not until the total funding amount is known and secured. Roberts restated that if the decision is made to fund this from Discretionary Reserves, then the remaining balance from OE would eventually be funneled into the reserves at the end of the year anyway.

MOTION ASB-14-S- by Ellison

Move Funding Request USSA Congress to Immediate Action.

Second: Eckroth Vote: 5 - 1 - 1 Action: Passed

MOTION ASB-14-S- by Ellison

Approve \$3,000 from AS Discretionary Reserves FXXRES to help fund 8 students to attend the USSA National Student Congress.

Second: Galloway Vote: 5 - 1 - 1 Action: Passed

G. Legislative Action Fund Restructure

(20 minutes) Doc. 8 Galloway

Galloway said that the Legislative Action Fund is a project she has been working on all year. It has been through many journeys. In conversations with the university VP for Enrollment and Student Services, Dr. Eileen Coughlin, the restructure that was passed in the student referendum which is called opt-out or mandatory refundable fee was an option that was not administratively implementable or a structure that they have on campus. In light of the 2011 changes to student fee

RCWs, President Shepard has said that he would be comfortable with administering a mandatory fee upon approval of the Board of Trustees. This is a different fee structure than what was passed in the student referendum. She is bringing this to the Board to request the opportunity to make this a mandatory fee. This would be similar to other mandatory fees and there would be no option to have it waived or refunded. Eckroth feels uncomfortable making this mandatory without student consent. He hates to put this on hold but feels it needs to go to a vote next year. He feels that the students who voted thought that it would be optional opt out. He doesn't think it would be good to change this without asking the students. Roberts respects all of the hard work that has gone into the fee. She recognizes the importance of this fee and all of the benefits of this fee. On the principle that students have been allowed to vote on fees in the past, they owe it to students to have a campus-wide vote on this because it is different than what they just voted on. The board technically has the authority to recommend mandatory fees, but there has been a strongly upheld value of including all students when introducing new fees. She thinks that that there could be a referendum really early next year and that it could be successful. Kohout thinks that it is irresponsible to have a referendum outside of normal spring elections in terms of the impact on the AS Elections Coordinator who does not have time in their budget for an extra election. Kohout saw the strain on the coordinator this year when an extra election was required and wouldn't want to do this again. Guizar feels that it would be a lot more hours than is allocated for the position. Eckroth feels that this would need to come in spring as a referendum again. Roberts thinks that they could adjust hours or add support to make a referendum successful, but she doesn't think that they can represent a student vote where there wasn't one. She isn't comfortable advocating for a mandatory student fee that students haven't had a chance to have a voice in as a whole campus. Kohout doesn't think this should wait until spring, but students did vote for more student representation. But the word opt-out was never defined, she doesn't know that changing the wording would change what the students wanted. Galloway agrees that it is important to have student input. If she knew that having a mandatory fee was a feasible option she would have run the referendum that way to start with. She just found out on Tuesday that Central who thought that they had an opt-out actually had a mandatory fee. She also found out yesterday that President Shepard was comfortable with administering a mandatory fee. She said that a dollar is a small contribution in comparison to other fee increases that have happened. The value behind these increases is to enhance the student experience on campus. Galloway feels that this one dollar provides a lot of benefits to students.

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

VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

- A. University Operating Budget *(15 minutes)* Doc. 9 Ellison
- Josie Ellison, AS VP for Academic Affairs, said that not much has changed since last week. They reached out to graduate students and all of the responses were in pretty strongly in opposition to the increase. They mostly cited an increase the previous year and the feeling that Graduate students are being asked to subsidize undergraduate education on campus. The Board needs to decide if they will use hard, soft, or in between language to address the increase proposals. The proposed wording Ellison created were not in the documents because if the Board chose a soft stance, Ellison didn't want hard language to appear online. Roberts had a conversation with President Shepard today and informed him that the AS opposed a tuition increase and that a more comprehensive statement would be assembled before the Board of Trustees meeting. Roberts thinks that this is important because this is not the administration being irresponsible with their budget. It is the university making the necessary provisions to have a working budget because the state legislature has so divested from higher education. Ellison said that the larger blame is on the state legislature, not the administration. Roberts feels that they should always oppose tuition increases even if they are still comparable with other state tuitions, even if out of state students are being compensated with grants and tuition waivers. They should still oppose

because tuition is so high.

Ellison left the meeting at 7:59p.m.

A soft opposition would sound like: ASWWU acknowledges the need for a tuition increase to continue providing high level service for students, but expresses disappointment in both the state legislature and the administration for increasing the already high burden on students.

A hard opposition would sound like: AS WWU opposes the increases in tuition proposed in the operational Budget. The legislature and administration have already increased the burden on students too much in recent years and higher education is already inaccessible.

Roberts said that they could delegate this to her as President, if they wish, to read to the Board of Trustees. Eckroth is in favor of the soft response. Galloway said that representing students they should use the hard language. But she sees the benefits now and moving forward of preserving a quality relationship with the administration and making sure that they are working together, which can mean compromising. She thinks they should moving forward with the soft language. Roberts would rather squarely place blame with the legislature because the administration is funding things that students have asked to be funded including more advising and fair pay for teaching assistants. The administration is funding this the best way they can without more investment from the state. She asked the Board's permission to work the wording in that way. It was granted.

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

- A. Executive Session to discuss items involving Personnel (15 minutes) Doc. 11 Burke
Tabled until the meeting on Tuesday.

IX. CONSENT ITEMS (subject to immediate action)

- A. NCCWSL Conference Airfare (10 minutes) Doc. 10 Burke
There was increased unexpected expenses for airfare for this event. There was one person approved from operating enhancement and this increase was for the flight. The Student Development Fund is typically administered by Personnel Committee, but the attendees are on that committee so the Board will be making decisions on covering the increase of airfare for the two attendees out of this fund. This is in consent because it is an adjustment to a motion previously made.

MOTION ASB-14-S- by Eckroth

Approve increased, unanticipated costs for the NCCWSL by NTE \$130 from Operational Enhancement [FXXENH] and NTE \$260 from the Student Development Fund [FXXSBR],

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

X. BOARD REPORTS- were not given due to the length of the meeting.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. The next AS Board Meeting is Tuesday, June 10 at 3 p.m. in VU 567. Documents due noon Monday.
- B. Big Blue Bonus Book Raffle \$50 AS Bookstore Gift Certificate recipient is: Cayfie Mash. Aiternate is: Vanessa Sariego.
- C. The Board signed a card to send to the Board of Directors at Seattle Pacific University to show support after the shooting that occurred earlier in the day killing one students and injuring others.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:16p.m.