

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

Wednesday, July 29th, 2016 VU462B

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Stephanie Cheng (President), Alex LaVallee (VP Activities), Erick Yanzon (VP Academic Affairs), Mary Moeller (VP for Business and Operations), Bryce Hammer (VP Governmental Affairs), and Wayne Rocque (VP for Student Life).

Guest(s): Sue Guneter Schlisinger, Steven Garfinkle, Emma J. Opsal, Stephen Magnuson, Emily Muth

Advisor: Eric Alexander (Associate Dean of Student Engagement and the Director of the Viking Union Facilities)

MOTIONS

ASB-16-SU-1 Approval of the Board Assistant for Lobby Days Job Description Changes. *Passed.*

Stephanie Cheng, AS President, called the meeting to order at 3:00p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

LaVallee said that his item for the Communications Committee Charge and Charter needs to be tabled until the next meeting.

III. PUBLIC FORUM

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS- GUESTS*

A. Anti-Semitism Taskforce Update

Guenter Schlesinger said thank you all for letting her to give an update. She is on the taskforce as well as Steven Garfinkle who is a history professor and a member of the taskforce. Guenter Schlesinger wanted to give a background on the taskforce and tell them about an upcoming event and they would like to have more connections with the AS for the event. There were three incidents of Anti-Semitism on campus during the spring. Two of those issues were substantiated and that led to have conversations on the university level to ask the question if there is something they should do to address this and start something for the university. Guenter Schlesinger passed out the charter of the taskforce. They know discrimination happens without them knowing about it but when three incidents happen in such a short time period, they knew they needed to do something. A part in the charger states that they are formed to educate the campus communities. With the cases in spring, a couple of them came from students and the students said "I didn't mean for it to be like that, it is a joke". So they are trying to create education and sensitivity around Anti-Semitism and what are the negative impacts of it and how can they make sure future incidents don't occur. They will be developing a set of recommendations for the new president and they hope to implement those recommendations in spring quarter. They will have a variety of education purposes. She will be engaging with Rocque to figure out how the best way to do this with the students. This particular taskforce will be dissolved with it being on going and weaved into the university through a number of different avenues. They had a good recommendation that was that they shouldn't wait till this spring to do something to educate

folks, they should do something sooner because actions speak louder than words. Garfinkle said it is important to give them background and want to talk about what to do in the fall to make sure things are done right. A couple of things that are important to the taskforce is figure out better ways to engage the students on campus particularly the stakeholders. One of the ways that they would like to do leading up to the start of the academic year to meet with groups across campus to talk about how they should go about this and they came to the AS Board to get their feedback and they will be meeting with other student groups. They want to make sure they are talking to those stakeholders and the only way they are going to do that is through student engagement. They are also meeting with community stakeholders. They are trying to figure out what works best for students' schedule like town halls which they are trying to have in the fall. As part of their efforts to take action, they have a speaker coming in fall to talk about Anti-Semitism and talk about the holocaust. This speaker also co-edited a book called "Not Your Father's Anti-Semitism; Anti-Semitism in the 21st Century". They are trying to figure out how to best utilize this speaker such as a big open lecture or does it make more sense to do workshops in smaller groups or work with the AS Board? They need significant student input to make it successful. They have two questions for them. One being, what do they think the taskforce should be doing in its brief existence. Second question is how can they help accomplish those goals. That is what they are looking for from them. This has been going on, on campus for a long time. He has experienced it from other faculty members. This taskforce is for providing opportunities in those learning opportunities but this campus has a long history of Anti-Semitism. Ta Vallee asked how long has it been meeting? Guenter Schlesinger said they have met about five times and they have subcommittees that have met a number of times in between the larger meetings. There are a lot of people on campus who do not know what Anti-Semitism is, prejudice to Jewish people. Part of their goal is to start talking about how to they define Anti-Semitism and so that people can recognize the definition and recognize the pain in the history of Anti-Semitism. Rocque asked if they met with any other folks and come to any conclusions yet? Garfinkle said no they haven't come to any conclusions yet, that means they have all the work ahead of them. They are in the retrieving information phase. They want to get some recommendations by the fall. Guenter-Schlesinger said they will be doing a lot of outreach to make sure they get a lot of different views. In the middle of fall quarter, they will have a writing committee who will produce a document that talks about all these different sides and then list the recommendations. They hope to present it back to the Board by the end of winter quarter. Alexander said they are looking at other universities and how they respond to Anti-Semitism. Guenter-Schlesinger said the charter has three students on it.

B. AS Assessment Process

Opsal said they have been the Assessment Coordinator last year and she will be this year. Assessment has been going on since 2009. Previously it was under Moellers position and it got to much so they created the Assessment Coordinators position. In 2014-2015 year, she was the AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees which worked on SPAC. She presented the Mission Statement for the Assessment Office. They are not having a good time with assessment because it has been declining in quality for the last three years. For that reason, SPAC itself is broken, not assessment. That committee doesn't work for assessment. One of the things they use is a SCOT analysis for every program and service. Every office goes through SPAC very four years. During the summer her position starts working on SPAC and the process goes through until about March. They have two to three meetings with the office before creating the final recommendations. After that, the recommendations to improve the office go to the AS Board for final approval. It's a long commitment to be in this process also if her position needed to leave for a personal reason, there wouldn't be anyone to take it over. Also it goes to the Board in winter

quarter when everyone who worked on the recommendations are getting geared up for AS Hiring. With the recommendations they found that sometimes they don't need anything at that time, the office is doing fine and then at other times they find that offices need to be looked at but it is not their SPAC rotation turn. This year, the Business Office worked alright and it didn't need to go through SPAC. Between the SPAC meetings, there was a huge time commitment for everyone on the committee. A lot of her job is just teaching students about different offices. Most of the end of Fall quarter is teaching the committee what the office does. It is beneficial for that learning process, it is not the best use of her time. She showed them how to look up previous SPAC documents. Internally helpful thing is that she is coming back to the process that she understands but in many cases people don't get that opportunity. The process also relies on the coordinators in the office to care about creating these documents when sometimes it doesn't happen. She wants to propose to suspend SPAC. First would be a meeting between her and the coordinator of the offices, the Director of the office and they will sit down and talk and do a SCOT analysis which is what she is doing with everyone at Fall Staff Development. It is beneficial to have a Board member present for this as well. They will talk about what needs are met and what needs need to be met. Then they will take all of this to Management Council because it should be seen by others before coming to the AS Board. Management Council will have knowledge of most of the offices already. Then she will bring it to the AS Board. This would shorten the time frame for the process. She would like the Board to give some direction of where assessment should be focused. She also has a slow point in her position where about a month in Fall quarter she doesn't have much to do. They should also be supporting the offices they over see that are going through assessment. TaVallee, Rocque, Moeller and Cervantes all have office that will be going through assessment. Opsal requested they don't pass SPAC Charge and Charter because that would suspend the committee from meeting for the year. Part of the four-year cycle is that it shuts out people. People tend to think more highly of those recommendations that go through the SPAC process opposed to a well thought out proposal coming from an office, outside the SPAC process. A lot of times people who are not undergoing the SPAC process, they aren't getting her help to do assessment. There would be something called SPAC-lite where smaller proposals and assessment can take place. Hammer asked if the assessment of assessment process will be done in fall, or if assessment of the offices will be done in late fall? Opsal said there will still be groups, but by groups, fall quarter group and winter quarter groups. This way there is a consistent level of work throughout the quarter and then they are done instead of large lag times between the due date of documents. Alexander said as a Board, they should think about the current process doesn't allow for much nimbleness for the process. Previously if you weren't in the SPAC process, how would you bring things out within a four year process? These mini processes are a good way to alleviate that. Timing of SPAC and the budgeting process is always a challenge. Usually SPAC has a recommendation with more or less budget and it doesn't work during the timeline of budgeting. Opsal said the Fall quarter group will be made up of offices that think they may have a budget impact so that group is done sooner. Alexander said another piece is the role of advisors and where they fall into that. SPAC spends a lot of time looking at the trees and not the forest. They are looking at the individual office and not looking at how it works within the bigger organization. They have the AS Structural Review to look at the macro level. They may want to do a formal suspension of the SPAC. Moeller said do they want to the committee to be back up and running? Opsal said they want this to be a trial year and if it fails, the next person in her position would do SPAC while trying to figure out a better solution. TaVallee said this would be all offices that opt in? Opsal said eventually she would like to move away from the quadrennial cycle but this year they will be requiring the seven offices to do it for fairness sake and transparency sake. Everyone has gone through SPAC twice except those seven groups. SPAC started out for programming offices and then other offices said they wanted to be in it but the documents created didn't align with programming offices such as Communications office assessing their usage of service

compared to the club hub. Hammer said does Opsal think that people would opt out of doing assessment in the future? Opsal said they will be looking at what works best. Yanzon said could they hire another person? Opsal said she doesn't think that's viable. LaVallee would like to see it more documentation on how offices will be opting in on assessment.

C. Outdoor Center Trip Leader Training Grant Proposal

Magnuson said Tanner and Charlee are doing internships for their Outdoor Recreation Program. They also have their Excursions Coordinator, Emily Muth here. Another person who has worked on this is Fred Collins the Assistant Director for Outdoor Recreation. Magnuson said Muth started as in a WOOT participant and eventually made her way up to the Excursions Coordinator. Magnuson said currently where they are at, is in 2014 when he got hired, there was immediately identified. WOOT was designed thoughtfully with the desired outcomes and the mission. With the orientation programs which is true on other campus there is a lot of outcomes related to retention in the program and academic success. That program was designed with those outcomes in the forefront. What they need is a lot of training for the trip leaders prior to the WOOT trips in order to get those outcomes. When he came in, he saw the trip leaders needed to do a set of trainings before ever stepping foot in front a student group. On the other hand, they have their excursions trip leaders. In the excursion trips were brought in for their technical ability and those who had contact with the excursions and got preferential selection on the types of excursions so on one side they had a very structured training program and on the other side relied on those technical skills coming in without guided training for the trip leaders. The first thing wanted was the desire to provide opportunities for those who wouldn't otherwise get into outdoor recreation because outdoor recreation is very cost prohibited as well as looking at the demographics it has been a very normative white male heterosexual to be the leaders in the fields. It's not only true for the trip leaders they provide and the industry as a whole, they see that. They are trying to break down that barrier. Second part is a risk management perspective. The WOOT trip leaders were getting about 80 hours of training and then excursion was just based on your prerequisites you were coming in with. They were setting the bar very differently on how they hire trip leaders. A lot of times people are attracted to this area because of the outdoor recreation available. It is a big draw for people with those technical abilities to come to WWU. They are fortunate that they haven't needed to do much searching for people with those backgrounds but it's also a limiting factor because they haven't offered those trainings and so they are excluding a lot of people from getting those trainings to learn those skills. What they have done is they have done a restructure on hiring for the trip leaders. Previously the excursion trip leaders were hired when they needed them and now they are all hired at the same time. The demographics for those 10 people they hired was eight women and two men with a variety of skills. Immediately they saw people they were trying to target applying once they opened it up. It was a really interesting thing because they saw they were attracting people who don't have the skills but have the desire to learn and lead those activities. So this was the first year to have solely trip leaders, instead of WOOT trip leaders or excursions trip leaders, they are now Outdoor Center Trip leaders. They are providing a base training which all trip leaders will go through. It will be focused on outdoor recreation methodology and applying it to everyone they train. They can take it wherever they wish to focus on. In the proposal they are asking for about \$40,000 annually to support all the trainings to get their staff where they need for industry standards. Right now they are not circular focused so it was up to the trip leaders on what they wanted to teach. Now they are providing training on how to teach. There are two different things in this area, one is having the necessary skills and the second is training people on those skills. Those are very different and it takes a lot of time and efforts to learn how to teach those activities. As they move forward in their process and when he talks about the risk management, it is very important to train and assess their trip

leaders at the same level. Right now they are not meeting the industry standards. They would have a tool to train and assess their trip leaders and the program and allow access for people to train and learn those skills to lead in outdoor recreation. In addition to this process, they are in the formation stage in the accreditation process for Association for Experiential Education. There is about 300 varying standards in those six different areas. So with the grant they are proposing for higher level training and going through the accreditation process it will allow their program to develop their curriculum to be carried on year to year and support their mission. LaVallee said there is no difference between WOOT and excursions and they will have about 40 people? Stephen said yes, and 40 is around the number they will need. That number should be pretty consistent. The roster in the past is huge and then other years it is pretty slim. It will provide a cohesive community within their employment as well. Every year they are looking to hire another 10-12 trip leaders who will work through the process and steps. Hammer said is this one time grant and operationalizing it or a onetime grant? Magnuson said it will have to be operationalized and it will be assessed through the accreditation process. The training program is a three-year program. Freshman come in looking for a job and then they would get another three years. If they got the grant they would see a full waive of the process and then they could look at whether they were meeting their outcomes of the three-year process. Rocque said is there a plan for inconsistencies if people leave and don't make it through the process? Magnuson said they are putting a lot of money for each student into the program and the amount he gave was the high end. There is a risk that a student comes in for a year and they decide it wasn't for them and they invested money into it. In their first year they go through their base line training which is required, they are paying that out. Is there potential loss by doing that? Yes, but did the student get provided an educational opportunity and experience in the time they were engaged? Absolutely. It's a cost benefit analysis and he looks at what the students were gaining during the time they were there. They will be providing co-curricular to the institution. LaVallee asked if the job description that was provided was hired for this year or next year? Magnuson said this past year and they've begun the training process for this year. LaVallee said in the past the pay was for the trips they lead. Does the rate the pay for the trainings vary? Magnuson said the pay scale is something that they are developing with their standards between the different levels. The pay does change based on the trainings students take part in, how many trips have they led. They haven't set the different levels yet. They have contacted different universities on how they pay their students and they are trying to make sure they are being fair and equitable. They are trying to see in their area, what are people are paying. It varied differently, some were solely volunteer based and some was being paid for everything. LaVallee said does the amount of people who want to participate in certain trainings would they still have the trainings? Magnuson said they won't have the training if no one wants the training. This is the maximum they are proposing but it may come under that amount. They don't want any surprises. Moeller said they are looking for three year grant and then it to be operationalized? Magnuson said yes. Moeller said why wasn't it passed last year? LaVallee said usually something this large went through the SPAC process. They submitted a decision package that went through Budget Committee who didn't pass it and the Board was surprised that such a huge amount was being asked of without a proposal like what they are seeing today. Alexander said there has been no set way for people to move through their process and ask for money outside out of SPAC. The Board had seen a proposal come through from Casey Hayden who provided material to the Board and he provided what he thought the Board would want to see because he had that knowledge previously. Magnuson did a decision package instead of the proposal. It was a process question, because they weren't engage previously beforehand. Rocque said he likes this. He feels there are two inconsistencies. The issues around diversity that the Outdoor Center has was mentioned but not clearly explained what the issues are and how this will mitigate those issues. The second one is back to if students chose to leave, how will this be reinvested in the community? Student said he run nine trips a year with around

100 students a year. He was around before Magnuson and they were struggling to even get one female trip leader to join them. Since Magnuson has come in they have seen a more inclusive atmosphere in the Outdoor Center. He went on a trip with three female trip leaders and last year they went on a trip with someone who's sexual orientation was non-binary. If they create a training system in place would allow the access for people who are interested. When there is more diversity in their staff, more diverse populations feel they can participate too. Rocque said what specifically will the trainings provide to help that though? Magnuson said it has to do with the hiring process. Before it was do they know the excursions coordinator? Then they get in. Now it is a formalized process where they can focus on the interpersonal and desire to serve instead of the technical and now that opens the door for people who didn't have access before. The Student said that it is understated here but to be a trip leader is very expensive. The Wilderness First Responder course is \$600, this will be cutting that cost for people. Hammer said where would the funding be coming out of? Moeller said reserves. Alexander said it would be a grant which would have its own line item in the AS Reserves. This model has been tried in other places and succeeded. If the Board has any questions, comments, suggestions for Magnuson, please provide it to him before it comes back into the meeting. Rocque said he would like to see how it is benefiting other parts of the university.

IV. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

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

A. Board Assistant for Lobby Days

Hammer said they all have Board Assistants that help support their positions. Part of her position is to support the many lobby days the AS has. This position was originally creating for Viking Lobby days with a small time period. Last year's Vice President for Governmental Affairs thought it this position should extend for all the Lobby Days. It is paid out of the Legislative Action Fund which every student pays \$1 into. Legislative Affairs Council has control of Legislative Action Fund and they approved the additional costs. LaVallee asked how many lobby days there are? Hammer said it changes from year to year. There is Viking Lobby day, ESC lobby day, Environmental Lobby day, there has been a Carver Lobby Day and possibly a ROP lobby day. Moeller said how does this intersect with Personnel Committee? Hammer said Personnel Committee approved it last year but it was done so late that it couldn't go to the Board in time.

MOTION: ASB-16-SU-1 by LaVallee

Approval of the Board Assistant for Lobby Days Job Description Changes.

Second: Moeller Vote: 6-0-0 Action: Passed.

VI. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

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

IX. BOARD REPORTS

Stephanie Cheng, AS President did not give a report.

Eric Yanzon, YP for Academic Affairs reported that he has been working on a committee that would be a trail student senate that they are proposing. He is working on the charge and charter for that.

Bryce Hammer, VP for Governmental Affairs reported that recently she has been dealing with the United States Students Association and they are a member of it and they are dealing with some road bumps. They will be bringing a document soon about it.

Mary Moeller, VP for Business and Operations did not give a report.

Aleyda Cervantes, VP for Diversity did not give a report.

Alex LaVallee VP for Activities did not give a report.

Wayne Rocque VP for Student Life did not give a report.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

LaVallee said he is thinking about Sue Guenter Schlesinger said they need to plan an event for them. He was also thinking about the shooting events that have happened. He was thinking about a mourning and thinking about a public art thing that people could contribute to and it can be illustrated in a way. He wants to give people a way to express themselves but be a weary of those who may not be as informed on the issue. He wanted to open it up to the Board. Hammer said the Gallery Director is looking for a show for Fall quarter if he wanted to reach out to them. Rocque said he wants to make sure to open the door as open as possible and not closing anyone out. Hammer said for the Anti-Semitism taskforce, is there a way to get more students involved? Rocque said the conversation tends to be centered around faculty and hard to contribute to as a student but he would love to get more students involved. Alexander said when the guests come they should ask that because they are asking great critical questions.

Stephanie Cheng, AS President, adjourned the meeting at 4:58p.m.