

# Western Washington University Associated Students Board of Directors Meeting

Friday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014

VU567

**AS Board Officers:** *Present:* Annika Wolters (President), Jaleesa Smiley (VP Academics),  
Giselle Alcantar Soto (VP Activities), Chelsea Ghant (VP BusOps), Cristina Rodriguez (VP  
Diversity), Sarah Kohout (VP Governmental Affairs), and Zach Dugovich (VP Student Life)

**Advisors:** Eric Alexander (Advisor)

**Guest(s):** Danny Edgel, Carly Roberts (Student Trustee), Patrick Eckroth (AS Representation and  
Engagement Programs Director), Joe Lambright, Joseph Levy.

## MOTIONS

**ASB-14-F-28** Approve the AS Board minutes from November 5<sup>th</sup> 2014 and November 12<sup>th</sup> 2014.

*Passed.*

**ASB-14-F-29** Approve the Legislative Agenda with correcting the word accessible under Voter Access  
and adding the stipulation that there be additional training for Viking Lobby Day about  
keeping tuition low at WWU. *Did Not Pass.*

**ASB-14-F-30** Approve Committee Appointments. *Passed.*

*Annika Wolters, AS President, called the meeting to order at 5:35p.m.*

Alcantar Soto not here at start of meeting.

## I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ASB-14-F-28 by Kohout

Approval of the AS Board minutes from November 5<sup>th</sup> 2014 and November 12<sup>th</sup> 2014.

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

## II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

Ghant said she would like it if the Information Items- Board A. Ethnic Student Center (ESC)  
Office Assistant Support Hourly Position could be remove until next meeting because Nate  
Panelo, the ESC Coordinator, is not here to support this document and Danielle Smith, the ESC  
Program Coordinator, wasn't ready to speak about this document. Ghant also didn't include a  
proposal along with this document.

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

Edgel came to urge the Board to amend the Legislative Agenda to include support for a tuition  
freeze. The students all lobby for this when they go down to Viking Lobby day. He understands

that the big issue items are the ones that are deliberated and passed in the Legislative Affairs Council (LAC). He was a member of LAC last year, he remembers that process. There are also other support items that are on the agenda that are talking points for each of our students that they were told they should tell legislators that they do support when they go into those meetings with them. He thinks they should add the support for a tuition freeze. Before the tuition freeze, there was a precedence set by the state legislators; is that for over a decade they decreased the funding to higher education and did so every year until the tuition freeze. It was really important, almost more important is that they need to reaffirm a tuition freeze for a minimum standard. They won't think it's important unless they bring it up. They bring a large amount of students to Olympia. They should have a mass of students there saying that it's important to them and if they can get it through this legislative session it would make a really big difference.

Roberts said first off she wanted to say that it's a very beautiful Legislative Agenda with really thought out topics on it and she is proud to say she will be lobbying down in Olympia on this Legislative Agenda regardless of the outcome. She recognizes this is an Action Item for the Legislative Agenda and she knows that it preferable to get input on this earlier in the process but she came to the meeting as a student at large and her schedule no longer centers around the schedules and the timing of the Associated Students. She recognizes that there is an expectation to get this feedback sooner but as a student she wasn't able to keep up on all the meetings. She wanted to give some feedback on the Legislative Agenda explicitly advocating to continue the tuition freeze through more delicate maintenance or increase of funding to Higher Education. She wanted to provide some context behind this issue because it is important. From 1982-2013, tuition was raised every year, there was no year that was steady or decreased in 2009-2013 the legislature cut funding to higher education by 50% which lead to double digit increase in tuition. The freeze was secure by an additional \$12 million in funding being allocated in the 2013 session, which was the most recent budget session. The freeze was brought about mostly by student action, specifically stated by a coalition, the University of Washington put together. It stated that they should increase their own tuition by 3%. Students are the ones who pushed through the tuition increase. Her tuition has increased a total of \$1,994 per year over the five (5) years she has attended Western and that is with two (2) years of tuition freeze. She doesn't take the tuition freeze for granted because she personally felt the hurt when she was here as a student and she saw how much her tuition has increased in the other years without the freeze. But it's easy to forget about because the freeze has been around for two (2) years. She thinks it's a basic student need to have low tuition. She does know that it mentioned in the beginning paragraph of the New and Dedicated Revenue session however she feels it doesn't get the attention and emphasis it deserves. She isn't personally invested in this issue because she won't be paying tuition next year because she is graduating in spring but she knows when students get in front of legislators on Viking Lobby Day, those legislators will be asking them about the tuition freeze and if they aren't set up to talk about that, they will look kind of silly. This is something that legislators have been hearing a lot about and getting good press so it will be something they will want to be talking about.

#### **IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests\***

##### **A. Elect Her Targeted Event**

Doc. 1 (15 Minutes) Kohout

Eckroth said this event has been put on before and they are proposing to continue to this event due to its large success over the past few years. Specifically noting its increasing of women in student government over a one year period. One election cycle in the AS from 14% to 57% and

then more noticeably this past year it went to 87% and last year was the biggest “Elect Her” event. He wants to use this as a time for questions the board may have. Dugovich said there is a small number problem with this proposal in that he represents 14% of the current board meaning the number should be changed from 87% to 86%. Ghant said she understands this proposal is for a gender targeted event. There is no fiscally impact as it stands now but will Eckroth be coming back for funding later because of the ASWWU losing some of their grant. Eckroth said yes he got advice to see where he can get that money to fix that budget gap and he will go through Management Council. Wolters said did the number of women in student government positions increase by 14% and by 57%. Eckroth said that these numbers represent women on the AS Board of Directors only, not the AS as a whole. The 14% represents the one woman who was on the Board of Directors then 57% of the AS Board of Directors was women. Ghant asked if he had a ballpark amount that he will be requesting. Eckroth said the grant they provide is normally \$1,200 but they found that they don’t necessarily need that much and he will be requesting \$1,000 with the expectations of using \$800-900. Ghant asked if this is an all-day event. Eckroth said yes. Wolters said there are no further questions and she will see this item again in the future.

Alcantar Soto entered meeting at 5:48pm

## **V. ACTION ITEMS - Guests\***

### **A. ASWWU Legislative Agenda**

Doc. 2 (25 Minutes) Kohout

Kohout said she wanted to talk about the changes she made over the last week. She added in fact about how much revenue the cannabis tax would generate. She has been doing some fact checking and everything seems to look correct. Kohout also added in more information under the Voter Access section, stating creating education and accessible programs for voters to learn more about what and who they are voting for. She added information about Carver and that it would cost each student \$4,882.94 to pay for through a fee. Kohout said under the Student Success section, she added information regarding information about mental health and counseling services. She also added in more information about disability accommodations which were taken from the university’s Student Success package. Kohout did some basic changes to the letter from the Associated Students Board of Directors. She said she is very excited about this document. Smiley said Roberts had mentioned an addition to this document, she thought she would bring that up. Kohout said one of the reasons tuition is not mentioned on this is because two years ago when they got a tuition freeze they actually asked for a tuition decrease. Putting tuition freeze in there would limit them. It is going to be a tough session but she would hate to limit themselves to just a tuition freeze if a tuition decrease is possible. It’s also not a good negotiating tactic, someone should ask for more than they want. When she was doing the Bellair Charter buses she asked for cheaper pricing than she has needed and they gave her something in between. That’s how negotiating works. That’s how the state legislators work. There was a huge discussion about this two years ago as well. Kohout said most of the individuals in the room have been on LAC and she understands this is being brought to the Board a little earlier than in previous years, because she likes to get ahead of things but everyone was aware of the process and if this was something they felt very strongly about they should have come in earlier in the process. She feels like going behind LAC’s back is disrespectful to her and the committee. Smiley said she understands all of Kohout’s reasoning’s but taking into account what Roberts said, she is a student at large

whose life doesn't revolve around the AS's schedule and yes it may be going around LAC's back but then again she doesn't have that time commitment. When a student at-large is sitting here, saying that they would like a tuition freeze, Smiley thinks they should take that into account. Kohout said she is really glad they all came to speak their opinions. LAC is made up of all students at large and this is what a group of students, who worked really hard on this agenda. She thinks it's very disrespectful to go behind their back and change things after an item has already been approved by them. They should trust the work of this committee. She understands the thoughts of students at large are very important, but the committee members are also students at large and their opinions are very important as well. They drafted this agenda, it wasn't just her sitting in a room writing this document, it was a group of very well prepared students, who thought very hard about this. Once Roberts had brought this to Kohout's attention beforehand she asked members of LAC and they were against putting that on the agenda because it's very limiting. When they got a tuition freeze, they asked for lower tuition. It already says in the document that low tuition is the most important thing. Washington Student Association is fighting for a tuition freeze so the legislators will know that students want lower tuition. If they put it on their agenda it would be redundant. And they should fight for other things and not things that would limit us in the future because if they ask for a tuition freeze legislators will never consider a tuition decrease if they don't ask for it. Eckroth said last year he was assisting last year's AS Vice President for Governmental Affairs, Kaylee Galloway. When talking to legislators they actually gave them the advice to ask for a tuition decrease. If they ask for a tuition freeze it is showing that they are okay with how it stands now. Over the past 30 years it shows that asking for a tuition decrease doesn't really work and they need to show their strong opposition for the state's divestment. He doesn't know how many of them are aware of the situation that is going on in California right now, but they don't want that happening. He is inclined to say they should trust what the subcommittee said they wanted because they have the specialized knowledge in these areas. Lambright asked if the request for tuition decrease in the legislative agenda. He guess it's not. Is there a limit on the amount they can go down and lobby for? Perhaps this was an oversight? And if so, he doesn't see how it would be disrespectful to add something in. it seems redundant to decrease their scope of reference when they go into lobbying. And that comes from someone who doesn't know much about what they are talking about right now. Kohout said it wasn't an oversight. It was a really intentional thing not to include it. The university is not talking about tuition and it is something they want to stay away from it. They would have different opinions from the university as well because they want more funding. It's not in the university's agenda either. They don't talk about tuition a lot especially on paper because they will vary on different things. The committee thought very long and hard about what they put on the agenda and this wasn't an oversight. Thank you for being here though. Lambright said she wanted to just clarify that Kohout plans to ask for a tuition decrease but it's just not on the talking points. Kohout said it's not on the talking points but it does say to keep tuition low. What Eckroth has been mentioning is that it's about having state investment into higher education. It's not about tuition in a sense, but it's more about having the legislators realize that higher education is really important and it's a human right and they should be funding it. They shouldn't be paying more. The way they will be getting more services on campus is through investment. The state needs to reinvest in them, and they need to start funding higher education. That's why it talks more about state funding than tuition. The reason why they are getting higher tuition is because the state isn't funding it. Lambright said that investing doesn't

rule out the chances of getting a tuition increase though correct? As a student at large he feels that at least mentioning the tuition freeze and it's at least on the table. Kohout said she thinks it's a valid point. But once again she thinks it's very unlikely that they get both. They aren't going to do it at the expense of the students. They won't invest more and expect us to pay more. She doesn't see it happening. Dugovich said as to adding a tuition freeze onto this agenda would be completely redundant. He doesn't understand the point of it. Not good bargaining at all and it goes below what they really want and he doesn't support it. Roberts said she wanted to clarify what tuition setting authority means. Basically the legislative have had tuition setting authority in the past and in 2011 they transferred the tuition setting authority to institution. Funding from the legislators and tuition levels have been decoupled. That's why the WS A advocates for the legislators to have tuition setting authority because they think it is their responsibility to set it. That argument would be correct, they wouldn't increase funding and increase tuition. Institution is fighting to keep tuition setting authority because they need a way to make up the difference if the legislators falls sort. That's why they've seen increases. The freeze is brokered between the university and the legislators and the legislators basically said that they will give them the money but they have to promise not to increase your tuition. If they are shooting for tuition decrease instead of a tuition freeze than that's great, but as a student she would like tuition to be on the document a little more explicitly and she thinks tucking it into a sentence when they are talking about revenue is going to miss a lot of the audience because anti new and dedicated revenue legislators aren't going to read that anyways. If they wanted to make it a bullet point within that section then she thinks it would be great. The reason they don't talk to the university about tuition is because it's an awkward conversation and it's because of that tuition setting authority. It's a subject that has the potential for disagreement so they avoid it so they can focus on coalition building within the universities. The AS Board may do whatever they feel is necessary, she isn't here to strong arm anyone but she saw it as a student and she wanted to provide this information and her thoughts. She thinks it's a huge missed opportunity because if they aren't talking about tuition who is going to talk about it? They are the only ones to do it. She can also expand on anything she said if they have questions because she wants to be as clear and helpful. She isn't going to pay this tuition as she is graduating but she would like to see western students prepared to talk about this and her younger siblings will have to pay this tuition. She thinks that either frozen or decreased tuition to happen. Kohout said she wanted to give some context on why they included New Revenue and this may be the first time they included New Revenue in the Tegislative Agenda. The reason why it was included because a lot of the dedicated revenue may go to McCleary and so that even living off that option for new revenue is there. Although it is scary they should still read it. It very explicitly says there low tuition there. They've never talked about tuition very deeply. She talked to the past VP for Governmental Affairs Galloway what her thought were on it and Galloway said it had never crossed her mind to include tuition. It is implied explicitly stating that low tuition, fully funded state financial aid, and providing funding to state institutions of higher education is a priority to students. It covers and encompasses why they want low tuition. Joseph said that if tuition setting authority is within the institution right now and the legislative agenda is meant to lobby legislators what would the purpose be to lobby for tuition then? It sounds like they should be lobbying the administration for tuition not the legislators. Roberts said she mentioned tuition setting authority because it has context in this situation because if universities don't get funding they will have to raise tuition, they won't have a choice. That's why it's important to

mention it because although Institutions have the authority legislators still feel the brunt of it. They will be the ones who will hear about it when tuition increases. That's the connection between the two. Joseph asked so legislators can give money with the stipulation that tuition can't go up. Roberts said essentially yes. And there was a lot of drama around it because Eastern Washington University tried to do that over the summer. Kohout said she has a context question. If the board decided to add this tonight she doesn't feel comfortable passing it tonight. She worked really hard to work within the time frame but she would like to bring it back to TAC and if they don't approve it she doesn't know where it goes from there. Alexander said so that is up to the AS Board to make that decision and they are the one who set the final approval. Kohout asked what if TAC doesn't approve it. Wolters said that if TAC doesn't approve it they will see it as is. Alexander said as of right now, all they have in front of them is the original document and there has been no motion to add anything. Eckroth said he wanted to touch on what Roberts had mentioned about the tuition setting authority. What she explained makes him opposed to putting tuition on the legislative agenda because they would be pushing the blame and frustration onto the body who has nothing to do with the tuition. He doesn't think it's a healthy way to lobby because once they've start getting negative how they've acted in the past and they may have nothing to do with it, it doesn't seem like a very strategic way to lobby. When they push for New and Dedicated revenue, the students are helping the university keep its tuition low. Roberts said she has a response about process wise is in the AS Boards power to add things to the agenda significantly and substantially at the board level after its gone through TAC. Tegislators have caused tuition issue, because they are the ones who gave universities the power so when tuition did increase the legislators didn't have to take the blame for it. It is her interpretation of it but it's so that they aren't directly to blame for it, indirectly they are because they determine how much funding institutions get. It was essentially who wants to be the bad guy in this? In closing thought she wants to say do what they want with this. She thinks that it's really important to include something about tuition and just because it hasn't been done before doesn't mean it shouldn't be done. It's a really dire situation with McClearly and now with the decreased class sizes they are going to be squeezed in multiple direction. Tuition is the tangible way of talking about cost of college with legislators and if they aren't talking about it with them who else will? And stating low tuition is important is different than advocating for lowering tuition. If they just say low tuition some people may say "\$10,000 a year, that's totally doable!" What they have now, in her definition would not be low tuition. She wanted reiterate that it is a very good document and she is sorry her feedback couldn't come sooner in the process of this. It is not her intentions to be disrespectful, she only wants to be helpful and she has intentionally been staying away and she is only coming as a student, the casual student at large although she has some weird context and backgrounds. She wanted to let them know that is all that she is trying to speak as right now. She said thank you for listening to her and she knows they will make good decisions as they are wise individuals and she appreciates their service. Kohout said she wants to reiterate what Eckroth had said earlier and that she understands the state legislators fault that the universities have the tuition setting authority but they aren't the ones that they should be going to this about. Although they provide the funding they don't directly increase tuition. So why talk to legislators about it when they should be talking to the university. Kohout apologies if this is at all disrespectful to Roberts but she wanted to bring up the fact that Roberts is the Student Trustee as well. She wanted to make sure and very clear that she is here as a student at large and she wants it to be very clear. There have been some talk in the past

about conflict of interest such as being WS A President. She wants to be very clear that Roberts not there as a Student Trustee. As her position as a Student Trustee Roberts is serving kind of like the administration kind of a little bit, Kohout doesn't know if Roberts feels like she is or not, it's okay if Roberts doesn't, most people wouldn't. Roberts said she is above the administration on an organizational chart. Kohout said she just wants to make sure that it's very clear because she thinks that could be a conflict of interest. Roberts said she didn't clear this appearance by the chair of the board of trustees. Everything else she clears with the board but she may not be supposed to be there. The authority of the trustee does not derive from the individual trustee but as the group acting as a whole. She as an individual does not have any authority and she is not speaking on behalf of the administration. She just thought it was important enough to risk it and mention it. She hopes that she makes it clear that she is just a student at large. Dugovich said in closing, when someone wants a raise and they go to their boss and ask for a \$10,000 raise, they don't add a disclaimer at the bottom saying that if they don't get the raise it'll be okay too. It's not smart lobbying if they add a tuition freeze. They are advocating for lower tuition and they should stand by that. Ghant said she really appreciate the document. And Kohout worked so hard on this. She does want to take into consideration the students at large that stepped forth. If they added a bullet saying they advocate for lowering tuition, what would be the major problems with that? They already mentioned it here and if it was one bullet point to take into consideration who they represent. She thinks it's crucial and everyone wants lower tuition. Students want to attend college at a rate they can afford. Students won't be reading this document right off the paper when they go down to lobby. Kohout said she wants to re-clarify that this was drafted by student at large. Kohout is very sad that they couldn't make it to the meeting tonight but this isn't a document she wrote. It was a document that was written by students at large and she thinks it's very important to consider that. She thinks that having it as a bullet is redundant, once again they are asking something from someone that does not have the authority to provide that. It would make them look silly and she doesn't think it would be effective. She doesn't know what their experience is with lobbying but students may go in there and be really nervous and read off the agenda. Smiley said this conversation that they are having should be had at TAC. With that being said, she respects the students opinion and clearly not all the students perspectives were represented in the creation of this document if they have people here to talk about other issues. Smiley thinks they should send this document back to TAC for another conversation. That is the most inclusive way to go about this. Alcantar Soto said no legislators aren't in charge of tuition directly, and it's clear it's redundant to include a tuition freeze. It's not what they are looking for here. She thinks to include something about lowering or decreasing tuition does affect them because they are in charge of 'funding. She doesn't have any experience lobbying but she could see legislators asking students what they think about tuition. If it is nowhere in this document but that little first sentence it won't go well and she thinks it should be a bullet point. Kohout she spent a lot of time crafting and figuring out the schedule for this. She delayed this a couple ways because she wanted the committee to think about it. Not that it should effects anyone's decisions it's just why she is upset. Also this is one perspective out of over 14,000 students. If she knew there was going to be an army of student to reject this document she would have made sure people from TAC were here at this meeting. They expecting this document to be respected by the board. That's why they aren't here. That's why she is upset because she spent a lot of time on the scheduling. She wanted to clarify why she is upset. Tambright said they do have a direct effect, they set the budget as it is a budget setting

year. By saying tuition is too high at least it will be on their mind. Maybe it doesn't need to go directly into this document but maybe in the Viking Lobby Day training so at least students know a few things to say. Dugovich said the individual that sit on LAC are highly skilled lobbyist who worked there butts off on this document and for them to sit here and criticize it like they know better than them is ridiculous. None of them said anything about this last week. He is guessing it is from Roberts and Lambright sitting there. This is the document the LAC drafted with everything in mind and for the Board to say LAC should just add something is not okay. He is baffled that they are still having this conversation. Joseph said as an ex LAC member he doesn't know how much good it would be to send it back. In LAC They spent a lot of time and they aren't going to want to change it. The only way it will most likely get changed is at the board level but he thinks that wouldn't respecting LAC's authority over it. LAC has been known to make mistakes before as well. Ghant said they do respect what they've done. They aren't disrespected there document they are just taking into the consideration of other students as well. She appreciates Lambright's point, saying that when they are doing the Viking Lobby Day training they put emphasis on lower tuition so they have those talking points. So they are passionate about this issue. If Kohout could do that instead of adding the bullet point. She would feel more comfortable that way. Kohout said really likes that idea. She thinks it would be said anyways. She thinks hopes that they will have time to go over the legislative agenda at Viking Lobby Day. She thinks it's a great idea. Rodriguez said everything that people are talking about that there is a committee full of students at large. She is viewing this in light of what Roberts has said and that Roberts doesn't revolve around the AS. Maybe this was the first time she got access to these documents. Rodriguez never had a chance to go to LAC. Although there are highly skilled LAC members there isn't communication throughout the whole process with student who aren't in that space and those who are affected by it. Someone who knows about this stuff and speaks about it once they get access to it, Rodriguez really respects that. Wolters said this document has been online now for a week since the last meeting and accessible for to everyone. Kohout said it's been on LAC's website as well for about a month. Kohout knows Roberts has been distancing herself from the AS now but to come and talk about it when it's an action item and to add substantive changes to it is a little iffy. Roberts said she knows she said she was done speaking on behalf of the issue and she is. But Roberts wanted to say as a student at large here she realizes there is more context with her background and her current position. She really appreciate what Rodriguez said and she is feeling like her input is not being welcome as a student at large. If there is disagreements that's alright and completely okay but if a student wants to talk about something that's an action item, why have it on the agenda if they aren't open to hearing what others have to say about it. She just wanted to point that out. She understands that herself as a particular student at large may have been expected to be more involved earlier but she has a life she has stuff going on. She didn't realize it was an action item when she was volunteering her time to be on a panel for Viking Lobby Day. She wasn't just trying to wait for the action item. In the future when students come to speak about an item she hopes they don't shame them with the process because that's what it feels like, although that may not be the intentions that how it felt like regardless. Kohout said she isn't opposed to things being brought as items during action items. Kohout said Roberts was aware of the process though and it feels like she is being stabbed in the back by the way it was brought forward. She feels like her own opinion isn't as welcome as well. She wants to apologies to everyone there if they felt like that because that isn't how they wanted everyone to feel. She just feels like it was brought up to undermine



her and that's why she is upset. Smiley said she knows they have ditto cards but she wanted to re-iterate that no one is knocking how much work Kohout has put into this document. Wolters said she will entertain a motion. Kohout asked if they can take a recess before making the motion so she can write out what she wants to say.

Wolters said yes, they will have a five (5) minute recess starting at 6:31pm.

Wolters called the meeting back to order at 6:36pm

MOTION: ASB-14-F-29 By Kohout

Approve the Legislative Agenda with correcting the word accessible under Voter Access and adding the stipulation that there be additional training for Viking Lobby Day about keeping tuition low at WWU.

Second: Dugovich Vote: 3-0-4 Action: Did Not Pass

Wolters asked that if a motion dies what happens. Alexander said that it has to go back through the same process and reintroduced through information item then action item.

**Kohout left the room at 6:39pm.**

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

#### **VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board\***

#### **VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board\***

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

##### A. Committee Appointments

##### Budget Committee...

Irina Siliverstova	Manufacturing and Supply Chain Management	Junior
--------------------	---	--------

##### Grad Council

Ezra Citron	Environmental Science	Grad
-------------	-----------------------	------

##### Services & Activities Fee Committee...

John Petrinovich-Bartich	History	Senior
--------------------------	---------	--------

##### Election Code Review...

Griffin Crisp	Anthropology and Political Science	Freshman
---------------	------------------------------------	----------

MOTION ASB-14-F-30 by Alcantar Soto

Approve Committee Appointments.

Second: Smiley

Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

## **X. BOARD REPORTS**

**Kohout entered the room at 6:46pm**

### **President**

Wolters stated that she went to the Students for Renewable Energy meetings yesterday and she wanted to ask them for ideas about what to do with the climate friendly fund. There is a \$20,000 endowment that will have a 4.5% profit which is \$900. Students get to decide where that \$900 goes and she isn't comfortable putting that into a scholarships and ask students to donate to that cause. Before they could talk about the cause of the climate friendly fund and the donations to that cause, the Students for Renewable Energy were concerned it was only one climate friendly fund. This is the only climate friendly fund they can give money too. So if anyone wanted to give money to the Huxley College there isn't a climate friendly fund set up. Whatever cause they come up with, it's the only one they can give money to. So before they support that one climate friendly fund, they would like to have more discussion. She met Eric Hippie today. Its international men's day.

### **VP for Academic Affairs**

Smiley stated that the Student Technology Fee Committee had their meeting and they are looking for two (2) more student representatives. She had a meeting with the Integrity Task Force which is now in the Provost Office. It's different then the Academic Honesty policy and they are trying to separate itself from that. It is trying to change the culture around integrity and around plagiarism and make Western a more support environment, supports failure, not encourages it but to have that supportive aspect around. ACC the two (2) absence policy was amended by the board, and so they will be looking more into that policy. Scholar's Week is meeting Friday and they are looking for students to be involved with the logo design.

### **VP for Activities**

Alcantar Soto stated that the Activities Council recognized one new club called the Art Club. KUGS had their 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration this weekend and that went well. Student Publication Council was today they need to hire two editors in chiefs one for the Western Front and one for the Klipsun Magazine. She went to the Guardians of the Galaxy movie event, it was great, they didn't have enough seats, and it was completely full. Rodriguez and her have been working with Nick Courtney for Fridays Teach-In. it went really well. They did not have the attendance they were hoping for but they had a good number of faculty show up. They had really good conversation.

### **VP for Diversity**

Rodriguez stated that the Resources and Outreach Programs (ROP) had two (2) new hires. Today the TIC is having a rental clinic. QRC is having the Trans day of remembrance event from 6-7:30. VOC kayak trip is happening. Hard Talk is happening with the sexual awareness center. The ESC tomorrow 11:50am there will be the ( ) NAPA Action. Standing in Solidarity with

Student Activist in Mexico. There will be a reenactments tomorrow in Red Square. She went to the Oregon Student of Color conference. It went great, she chose to go to workshops she would get a lot out of like the Queer and Trans justice and how to included straight folks in the movement. She will apply that here with everything that she learned. It was helpful to be in a space where she could learn that stuff. There was a hiccup the day before the conference, the hotel gave her the wrong quota for the rooms but Wolters helped her by pulling it out of the discretionary Fund. They will all see that proposal soon to fix that out of the Operation and Enhancement fund.

### **VP for Business and Operations**

Ghant stated that for the Business Office, the Business Director has resigned. The position was offered to the assistant business director and they declined the position. So now that position is open. Management Council spoke about rehiring salaried employees. For example if the Business Director wanted to come back they could do it instead of having to reapplying. There was great discussion about it, they talked about a letter of intent that they were interested in coming back. They will continue that conversation. Management council also passed \$350 towards the Involvement Calendar. They also elected Josie Ellison to be the vice chair of management council in her absence. Brian Bates will be the Personnel Committee representative. She had the SPAC committee on Monday and that went well. The VU gallery spoke to the committee, then they took a tour up to the VU Gallery for the new members. She went to the Publicity Center staff meeting and it was great. Jeff Bates wasn't there but everyone else was. She talked to them about what they would like to see. They are staffed well now with about 20 people. They are having trouble evaluating what students experience has been with the Publicity Center. She was giving some suggestions on how they could do that like with the tablets to get that student voice.

### **VP for Governmental Affairs**

Kohout stated that Heather Hefflemire the Tegislative Tiaison is working on Western Takes Olympia. This is an event to prepare students for lobbying in Olympia and break the barriers on that. That occurs tomorrow at 4:30-6pm. There is an update on Inspections. Kendra Thomas the Focal Tiaison was at the work session and although it hasn't been passed, the work session was on getting mandatory inspections. This is a huge step forward in the process. Hopefully there will still be the educational component so that tenants will get general information on their rights as renters. She has been meeting with lots of groups to get lobby days going. She met with Charles Sylvester a professor in the Physical Education, Health and Recreation (PEHR) department and they discussed Carver and got into classrooms, and seeing carver from the inside is really moving. He suggested cancelling class for a day and sending them down to Olympia to Toby on it and then seeing if they can fund that. They can also provide training for those students. That also work with the alumni association. She is also working on getting a Social Issues Toby Day. Viking Toby Day's registration is open now. Priority is for the first 110 students. They hiring the Board Assistant for Viking Toby day and she started this week.

### **VP for Student Life**

Dugovich stated that the AS Transportation Advisory Committee met on Monday to review transportation advisory master plan. The master plan that was completed last year and they are doing some edits to it. The purpose of this committee is to give recommendations to the university about infrastructures improvements and the transportation. What they discussed at the meeting was

lighting in and around campus, improving the sidewalks on South College Way which is getting overrun by the arboretum as it creeps towards campus. Also pedestrian facilities at the Lincoln Creek Park and Ride, Finding better areas to load and unloading pedestrians around campus and more. The next meeting will be in dead week. Green Energy Fee Committee (GEF) met on Tuesday, they talked about changes the rules and regulations. So now Pilot projects moved the head of the pack than other projects to keep being innovated and fresh. They will be meeting again in during dead week. The deadline for small grant projects is November 26<sup>th</sup> and large grant proposals are due by November 29<sup>th</sup> and those are soft deadlines. The Movember events Eric Hippie is coming tonight to talk. The Walk of Hope Event is tomorrow 7pm. Environmental and Sustainability Programs had their club opener this week which went well.

### **XIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

Eckroth asked about the decision on the Legislative Agenda. Kohout said that the motion died. Wolters said the vote count was 3 yes, 0 No, and 4 abstentions. Eckroth said he is disappointed in this body. One for the inability to make decisive action tentative positions like this is not good for organization and the fact that there were four (4) abstentions is not good use of voting. He is also disappointed that they took a very weighted view from Roberts instead of a body of 12 or so. It shows a lot of Influence from prior years that shouldn't be there. Wolters said thank you Eckroth. Kohout said she doesn't know about the process now, in if there is a way instead of making it die, they can table it and bring it back after LAC see's the changes. Procedurally she doesn't want it to fail because she doesn't know how to reconsider things. Alexander said in the case of a motion that fails particularly with cases including abstentions, they have the option to renew the question in the next board meeting. Two reasons they could do that is that if the question is substantially changed, so if LAC meets and she decides on some new options or to call the question based on the way the vote was abstained. So she can do that. Kohout said she was just making sure procedurally it was okay because they need a legislative agenda. She will bring this and all the concerns to LAC tomorrow and they will discuss it then. She hopes that they have faith in her to bring it back to LAC in a very unbiased way and just so they are all aware. Smiley asked what time is LAC tomorrow. Kohout said 6-8pm tomorrow in VU 567. They do action items first it will be the first thing they talk about. Alexander said wanted to offer some new business and process and he wanted appreciate the amount of passion and emotion to this conversation, it was rich though difficult. It can be hard to separate process from personal. He wanted to be sure that everyone is trying to keep in mind as elected folks that the personal piece could hurt more than process part. It's not to say they can't be emotional, they can be as emotional as they want, it's great, but it's hard to do that, and he wanted to recognize that face. He wanted to acknowledge that is his work is to remind them of the multiple opportunities that they have to move this meeting forward. He is still weighing how much weight he should be putting into this meeting and offer suggestions or not. If they all have some insights, feeling or thoughts on how much or little he engages in making contextual statements or process comments that may be around more other options please let him know because his role is to be there when they need him. Please at all times feel free to ask him things. Alcantar Soto said in light in that decision she would suggest that they reinstate the meeting on Wednesday to not hold this item back. The reason she abstained from voting is because there

was a lot of new information presented today and she did not feel comfortable making the decision today. If they give it one more week, she doesn't want to delay the process until December 3<sup>rd</sup> but give them more time to think things through. Ghant said she agrees with Alcantar Soto. Her decision wasn't personal against Kohout. She thinks LAC and her did a wonderful job she feels Kohouts emotion. She was tom with voting and with Eckroth said she takes it as constructive criticism but she doesn't think she has the inability to make decisions but with new information coming and they are voting, it was difficult. If the motion was brought back with some adjustments she would feel more comfortable. When does this agenda need to be done by. Kohout said she likes to get things done earlier than needed. She wants to leave room for it to be designed properly because she isn't a design person. She would prefer it to be done sooner than later. She wanted it to be passed before dead week to get the design work done by the end of dead week so they can print everything out and to give students the chance to read it before break. She really respects everyone here. She isn't taking it personally. Alcantar Soto said how many board members does it take to call a board meeting? Does it have to be on Wednesday? Wolters said the decision is made by her and enough VPs are there they could possible do it. It does not have to be on a Wednesday it just has to be 24 hours in advance. Another option is to get started on the design process beforehand. Although Kohout said she isn't a design person, Wolters is and she would like to help.

***The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 7:13p.m.***