

**Western Washington University Associated Students**  
**AS BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Date: December 13th, 2017 6:00 PM Room: VU 567

**AS Board Officers:** *Present:* Simrun Chhabra (AS President), Hunter Eider (ASVP for Academics), Julia Rutledge (ASVP for Activities), Alex LaVallee (ASVP for Business and Operations), Erick Yanzon (ASVP Diversity), Annie Gordon (ASVP Student Life) and Ana Ramirez (ASVP Governmental Affairs)

**Advisor(s):** Eric Alexander (Advisor)

**Guest(s):**

**MOTIONS**

**ASB-17-F- 36** Approval of the Lobby Day agenda final language, with the exception that under the Support for Undocumented Immigrants the language will be changed to the updated language provided by Victoria Matey. *Passed.*

**ASB-17-F- 37** Approval of the Legislative Agenda for Civic Participation, Sexual Education, Student Unionization, Survivors of Sexual Assault Support, Undocumented Student Support, Voting Accessibility, and Revenue. *Passed.*

**ASB-17-F- 38** Approval of the AS Communications Committee Charge and Charter, with the changes to the Publicity Center Account Executive to Publicity Center Project Manager, as well as, the ROP advisor to Coordinator of Equity and Identity Resource Centers. *Passed.*

*Simrun Chhabra, AS President, called the meeting to order at 6:13 PM.*

**I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA**

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

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

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

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

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

**A. ASWWU Legislative Agenda**

Yanzon asked how many students had signed up for Lobby Day and what Ramirez would like the Board to do to help. Ramirez said the numbers were low, about 15 people, and the committee was planning to extend the deadline to 5 days before Lobby Day, January 9<sup>th</sup>. Casey Hayden mentioned that every student had received an email about signing up for Lobby Day that day. Annie Gordon asked what the committee had done in previous years that could be different from what had been done this year. Ramirez said the previous year they had received a lot of attendees because of the presidential election results. Hayden mentioned that Victoria

Matey had changed the last bullet point for the Support for Undocumented Students final language, which had been passed through the Legislative Affairs Council. The language change was from “Revoke the Northwest Detention Center’s business license and release all the undocumented immigrants due to health and safety violations for this for-profit private mega prison” to “Close the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma by revoking its business license due to the severe health and safety violations that have occurred there, under the ownership of the GEO Group. Poor conditions and profit motivation at GEO Group facilities have led to hunger strikes and even many deaths.” Yanzon asked what GEO was. Hayden said it was the business that owned and ran the detention center. He mentioned Matey had felt it was important to include the group name so legislators knew who to target. LaVallee asked if the Legislative Affairs Council had already voted to approve the new final language. Ramirez said Matey had made the changes after she had sent the documents. Chhabra asked what Ramirez thought of the change. Ramirez stated they liked the change, but Matey should have made the changes before. Rutledge noted that the new wording was stronger.

**MOTION: ASB-17-F-36** by Gordon

Approval of the Lobby Day agenda final language, with the exception that under the Support for Undocumented Immigrants the language will be changed to the updated language provided by Victoria Matey.

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

Hayden said the Board should probably approve of the full proposals as well.

**MOTION: ASB-17-F-37** by Yanzon

Approval of the Legislative Agenda for Civic Participation, Sexual Education, Student Unionization, Survivors of Sexual Assault Support, Undocumented Student Support, Voting Accessibility, and Revenue.

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

**B. Communications Committee Charge and Charter**

Julia Rutledge stated the charge and charter changes had already been looked over by the Communications Committee. She recapped that the committee had added new positions to the charge and charter because positions had been added to the AS. This way each office had someone, a publicity coordinator, sitting on the committee. Chhabra mentioned the Publicity Center Account Executive title had changed to Publicity Center Project Manager and the new updates should reflect that. Erick Yanzon also mentioned the title for the ROP advisor had changed as well to Coordinator of Equity and Identity Resource Centers.

**MOTION: ASB-17-F-38** by LaVallee

Approval of the AS Communications Committee Charge and Charter, with the changes to the Publicity Center Account Executive to Publicity Center Project Manager, as well as, the ROP advisor to Coordinator of Equity and Identity Resource Centers.

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

**C. Communications Office Equipment Proposal**

LaVallee recapped for the Board the proposal was for replacing some equipment and purchase of new equipment to make live streaming more accessible on campus. The second proposal was for a new surface pro so the student employees did not have to use their own personal computers. Chhabra said the proposal was for \$2,000 and asked if it was an actual need and how much would this actually help the office. Yanzon asked how much money was in FXXGRR. Hayden said there was \$50,000 left. Annie Gordon asked for more context on what the budget was and what its purpose was. LaVallee said the GRR was the same budget the

Board had used earlier that year to purchase new laptops for the Resource Outreach Programs. When there was new equipment needed to be purchased the money came out of FXXGRR, there was a separate budget for replacing equipment. Hayden clarified that the FXXGRR had \$50,000, minus what the Board approved for ROP laptops, left in the budget. LaVallee said GRR was a reserve budget, meaning the money the Associated Students didn't spend in a year pooled up into many reserve funds and the GRR was one of those funds. Chhabra asked if the Board had a choice about which laptop to approve. LaVallee said he was unsure. Chhabra said she was uncomfortable making the choice about the laptop for the Communications Office. Rutledge asked if the "AS Video Office Equipment Request" was asking the Board to approve both the proposed motion and the second motion. LaVallee said the two motions were to separate two different proposals. The Proposed Motion was for video equipment and the Second Motion was for the laptop, potentially from a different vendor. He explained that the office equipment request was one full motion. Rutledge clarified that the request was for \$1700 plus either \$2,200 or \$1,100. LaVallee said that was correct and noted the bottom of the request had included a rationale by Jacob Carver, the Video Coordinator, on why the more expensive laptop would be better in the long run. He said he felt it was better to buy the more advanced technology. LaVallee read the statement from Jacob Carver stating "The Surface Pro is a great machine period. In what we are hoping to use it for, mainly mobile live broadcasting, the more power we can get out of it, the better. The difference in processing power from the cheaper option to the more expensive option is literally double, from 8 GB (gigabytes) of RAM to 16 GB. For us, this will be the difference between a mediocre quality broadcast to a high quality broadcast. The more expensive Surface will also guarantee the ability to run the broadcasting program that we have chosen. In my professional opinion, the Surface Pro with 16 GB of RAM will end up benefitting our video program now and in years to come." Yanzon said part of the background and context stated "Last year we were able to broadcast with high-quality because the Peter the former Kivik coordinator owned the equipment's himself" and asked if the videographers in the future would be required to know how to use the Surface Pro equipment. LaVallee said he believed the new videographers would go through training during the internship period. Chhabra asked how often people in the Associated Students used live stream for their events. LaVallee said there were not many, but the previous year quite a few people would tune into the AS Board debates. Chhabra asked if the associated students could check out this equipment or if the videographers would be expected to be at the events with the equipment. LaVallee said his hope was the equipment would start up staying with in the AS offices, but in the future there would be the opportunity to hire hourly employees to take up that responsibility. He also mentioned if the live stream option was not used frequently, the AS could move the laptop to a different office in need of a laptop. LaVallee said they felt there was still a lot of questions and wondered if the proposal should be brought back next quarter. Hayden asked if Jeff Bates had looked at this proposal and said the equipment should be vetted through him. LaVallee said he would check in with Mohammad about the specific equipment requested. Yanzon said moving forward there should be rationale for each item requested and an explanation about what the equipment would be used for. Rutledge said she would like clarification on the proposed and second motions. Chhabra also asked that the Communications Office if the equipment could only be used with videographers present or could people check it out. LaVallee said they would find out more data on the live streaming from the previous year and the fall quarter.

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

### **A. Student Free Speech Discussion**

Chhabra mentioned the Board had been sent an email saying someone at the Johnathan Zimmerman event had received a notice that they had violated the student conduct. The student was disappointed in how the university handled first amendment rights in that space. The student released a statement and asked that the Board call the Assistant Dean

of Students, Michael Sledge, and President Sabah Randhawa, in support of the statement. She said herself and Gordon had met with Michael Sledge in order to understand how the student conduct procedure happened. They found out that Sledge was not the person that conducted the meetings. Instead Jessica conducted those meetings. Sledge only got involved if there was an appeal process. Yanzon asked if the sender was informed that the statement would be an information item. Chhabra said yes. Yanzon said they would like to hear from the student about what else they need from the Board beyond the letter. Eider said they had talked to some of the students and they said they were fine, but they would like more support if something else were to happen. Gordon said the conduct process had different sanctions and if a student went through the process of filling a complaint then the student conduct office would email the student asking they come into a meeting. The meeting was designed to be educational, focused on thinking about the impact of one's actions. Depending on how the meeting went, the student's actions would be assessed to see if they were at risk to themselves or others. The student might receive anything from a warning to a sanction (ADCAS, restricting attendance at locations, expulsion, etc). Ramirez asked if the student had their meeting yet. Gordon said they had not yet gone to the conduct meeting. She said there were two different issues to talk about: supporting the individual students going through the problem at the time and also the Board responding to the fact that a student peacefully spoke and in response could be potentially disciplined. She felt supporting the individual students would be a bandage to the bigger issue. Yanzon said they were thinking how could the Board continue to keep the AS accountable when bringing speakers to campus that might not align with the campus values and how does the Board keep the university accountable in regards to how they define student safety. Rutledge said they were having a meeting, in relation to WAC, the next day and felt this was something that could be brought up. Western wrote those policies not legislators, so they could change the disciplines. Hayden said the actions of the Student Conduct Office was based on the student code of conduct, which was also Washington Administrative Code because it must be publically known. The student code of conduct was not at the time under review. Gordon said it was not going to give them the desired results if the WAC stayed as it was. The Board could not expect the administration to support their actions if the code stayed the same instead they should focus on how to be involved in the process. Hayden said there was a student conduct appeal committee, if a student wanted to appeal a sanction they could go to the student run committee. The committee could either overturn, go stronger or less strong or keep the sanction the same. He said they were at an important time where they need more awareness on campus about how to do free expression on campus within the guidelines. He asked if they should hold a free expression forum to educate the students. Gordon said she would feel more comfortable about holding an event like that if the Board made a statement first. She wanted to let people know that hate speech and free speech are two separate things. It would be powerful for the Board to make a statement on this topic of hate speech versus free speech. Rutledge said in their discussion with the student, having a policy or program standards on what the AS sponsors and supports. Chhabra stated maybe it should be more difficult for a speaker to come to campus, including more checks and balances in the process. TaVallee asked if anyone attended the event. Eider said he went for a short time and then left. LaVallee said he would like the Board to define what they think free speech means on campus. Rutledge said without doing actual policy changes the Board could not change the rulings on the student actions. LaVallee wanted to know how they defined safety because students felt the Johnathan Zimmerman event was unsafe. How they make statements about this event could set president for future events. Yanzon agreed with LaVallee in regards to defining free speech and safety on campus. They felt policy changes might not be what the students needed. Gordon said the documented statement by the students was tricky because they state "policies like this one continue to narrow the first amendment rights of students" and

on that note they were asking for a more narrowed definition of first amendment rights. She said the Board should talk a lot more before they decide to make a statement. Chhabra brought up that in conduct situations someone has to file a complaint of a violation before it becomes a violation. She also wanted the Board to think about the value the institution has in regards to free speech. Hayden clarified that an administrator could file a complaint as well and said that the process did not always follow the complaint process. Rutledge found that when talking about restricting actions, it was important to think about who was being restricted and how could it harm those that they were trying to protect. The Board decided to continue this conversation at a later meeting.

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

#### **X. BOARD REPORTS**

**Simrun Chhabra, AS President**, reported that they would be attending the Board of Trustees meeting and the Foundation meeting the following day.

**Alex LaVallee, AS VP for Business and Operations**, reported that himself and Hunter Eider had attended a Student Technology Fee renewal committee meeting talking about getting new wireless access points, bettering the printing quota and they would in the future be seeing proposals for the ITS areas on campus. The Board would receive a list of the proposals to prioritize based on what they felt the students wanted/needed.

**Julia Rutledge, AS VP for Activities**, reported that she had a Student Publications Council meeting, where they voted to end Western Weekend because no one picks it up and they were making no advertising money.

**Ana Ramirez, AS VP for Governmental Affairs**, reported that there was a Washington Student Association (WSA) Board of Directors call and they asked what other campuses were doing in response to Betsy DeVos statement. She found the only university to change anything was University of Washington Seattle, who changed their conduct code, but that was in motion before the statement. She also mentioned it looked like they might be able to get tuition and S&A fees decoupled this year, but it would not be a permanent change. The change would be decoupling the S&A fees when tuition was decreasing or frozen and limiting the increase of S&A fees when tuition is increasing. The legislators were not a fan of permanently decoupling because they felt it was hard for students to increase the S&A fees for lower income students.

**Annie Gordon, AS VP for Student Life**, reported that herself and Rutledge were working on finding funding within the Associated Students for the on campus food pantry. She asked Chhabra to mention the food pantry to the Foundation to potentially get funding from them.

**Erick Yanzon, AS VP for Diversity**, reported that the Undocumented Student Support Working Group meeting talked about moving forward for the next couple quarters and how they would address AS employment policies and AS election code. The hope was that these changes would inspire other departments in the university to make similar changes.

**Hunter Eider, AS VP for Academic Affairs**, reported that he was hoping to have a financial aid literacy event the following quarter and was still working on logistics. He said the timeline for the Student Technology Fee was the committee had to have a proposal submitted to Sabrina Houck by February 22<sup>nd</sup> 2018. The committee would be meeting weekly to review old proposals and create the proposal for the AS ballot.

***XL OTHER BUSINESS***

***XII. EXECUTIVE SESSION***

***Simrun Chhabra adjourned the meeting at 7:29 PM.***

DRAFT