

Western Washington University Associated Students
AS BOARD OF DIRECTORS
February 21st 2018 Viking Union 460

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Simrun Chhabra(President), Hunter Eider (VP Academics), Julia Rutledge (VP Activities), Alex LaVallee (VP BusOps), Erick Yanzon (VP Diversity), and Annie Gordon (VP Student Life)

Advisor(s): Eric Alexander (Advisor)

Guests: Cora Cole, Hannah Spencer, Emma Scalzo, Francesca Cruz

MOTIONS

ASB-18-W-12 To approve the LAC Charge and Charter with the stipulation that the graduate student representative be voting. *Pass.*

Erick Yanzon, AS VP for Diversity, called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

Rutledge said that 11a does not have to be discussed.

The Student Technology Fee item was moved to the beginning of the meeting.

After the Student Technology Fee the Board discussed the LAC Charge and Charter

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

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

A. Sustainable Action Fund Referendum Language

Gordon said that the last time the fee was renewed the fee was increased from \$4 to \$7, and the fund wasn't really accessed so it was a ton of reserves. As funds work for more time they get more popular, right now the committee doesn't have the reserves they have had before. Currently the rate is \$0.70 per credit per quarter not to exceed \$7, they want to increase it to \$0.90 per credit per quarter up to \$9. We also changed the language to reflect the kind of human health and justice oriented SAF we want to see in the future. There is a name change on the table that many people are in favor of but a few people have reservations about the implications of the change. The proposed new name is the Sustainability, Equity and Justice fund, which comes from the thought that Sustainability should inherently be equity and justice, and helps broaden the idea of what this money is for. There is some concern that spelling it out like that makes it seem like equity and justice are not a part of sustainability, additionally people who recognize the SAF may not recognize this. Gordon likes the new name change because it makes it so explicit what the money can be used for, and this opens up opportunities to have discussions about why we feel the name should be changed. This document passed the SAF unanimously. Some changes include slightly upping the fee and making the period between updates longer. Rutledge asked how voting to raise the fee would work. Gordon said that it could be at any time, the committee would vote on it then it would go to the Board. LaVallee said they didn't feel concern about rebranding, it has been rebranded twice already and campus has a lot of turnover. New students will come away with the mindset we want this name to convey. LaVallee also said they thought it would be interesting to look at what project proposals got approved to see if equity and justice are already considered, the process for applying for this fund could also be reviewed and be more transparent. Houck said that

two years ago that type of data was brought to the Board by the VP for Student Life. LaVallee said that they meant that they felt every proposal should be seen by a committee as opposed to being vetted by the office. Gordon said that it was voiced in the SAF that they would love an outside perspective on the name change and asked who could come to the SAF. The Board all liked the name change.

B. Election Code

Chhabra said that the Board left off on candidate eligibility last meeting. There were three choices, leave it the way it is, change it slightly, or remove it entirely. Gordon said they thought of a fourth option to add a statement acknowledging what this situation is, just simply stating, we as a Board don't know and it should not be up to the Board to decide who runs. Spencer clarified it would be removing the statement on eligibility and adding a statement detailing what would happen if someone who wasn't eligible to work in the U.S. were to run. Hayden said that that kind of language is not really something to put in the Code itself and is more of a value statement that could go in the candidate packet, removing the statement is also a statement. LaVallee added that then if the University does not want to employ someone they can let that individual know, instead of the AS dealing with it. The Board moved to the section dictating how many signatures candidates needed for a candidate to run. When they left off they would either, adopt proposed change, provide an alternative, or remove the qualifications entirely. LaVallee said that the problem they had with the signatures is that it doesn't actually accomplish its purpose of having candidates interact with students because there is no accountability. Spencer clarified that no one has come to do the alternatives before. Gordon said that they feel that the one hundred signatures requirement advantages some candidates, and they already have to do a lot of other things. Scalzo said that their only interaction with the signatures requirement was when someone came into their classroom and passed around the clipboard in their class. Yanzon asked if not having this requirement would allow a write in candidate. Rutledge said that they didn't see a good reason to change the process this close to starting a new cycle. Spencer said that they thought the signatures were valuable to provide some interface with students as [art of the campaign process beyond just the debates. Rutledge said that they thought it was part of being a public figure to interact with people. Eider said they like keeping it in as a way to make sure people are comfortable speaking in front of people, because they have to do it in the debates anyway. Eider also brought up that a writing component about their platform could be an alternative. Gordon said that those two methods kind of accomplish different purposes and doesn't provide publicity about elections. Chhabra asked why the signatures were by a certain date. Hannah said that it is so the office can check them, a possible alternative would be lowering the number of signatures. Cruz said that the Elections Committee talked about having online signature but raising the number to three-hundred. LaVallee proposed increasing the signature cap but the AS set up class reps or had tables at red square for them to do it, that way there is guaranteed marketing to the student population. LaVallee said that they were coming at this problem with the perspective of someone trying to break the rules, and how to curb that.

LaVallee said that right now the situation can be exploited so that people get into positions of power and receive salaries for one, two years even. Spencer said they had some concerns about that, considering there are already people who talk to classes about elections. Chhabra said that some amount of the platform is formed when candidates interact with students. Rutledge said that they don't think someone should be able to run without ever interacting with a student. The Board suggested a meet the candidate forum, perhaps for anyone who was even slightly interested in running. Gordon raised concerns

about the amount of time being asked of from candidates, and the potential for that space to be intimidating. Chhabra read through the rest of the proposed changes and the Board agreed to discuss at length next week. Chhabra mentioned that Board Members cannot endorse candidates. It was clarified that the only check on the Board endorsing people was the Board itself and that is why this rule is important. Houck brought up that the rules do not currently prevent Board Members from defaming a candidate. Cruz clarified that it was fine to give advice to candidates as long as the Board Member gave advice to anyone that asked. The Board reviewed the section having to do with club meetings and AS events. The Board talked about the section stating that candidates who drop will not be reimbursed for campaign materials. The Board reviewed the section on filing the grievances. Yanzon said that it should be considered that not a lot of people vote and we should try and make these positions as accessible as possible.

C. Resource and Outreach Programs Restructure Proposal

Yanzon said that they had been talking with Leti Romo and they want to change the name to Student Advocacy and Identity Resource Center. The other change would be moving the assistant coordinators to coordinators, a budget increase of \$4,000 dollars. The SIRC would be moved into other offices and a new director position for representation and outreach to handle some of that work. Chhabra asked what events would be handled by which office. The Board discussed event over-saturation and the responsibilities of potential new positions. Yanzon said that there is an issue with the fact that they want this posted for spring hiring but it has budgetary implications which is not approved till June. Hayden suggested approving it with the condition that the budget committee approve it.

Y. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

VI. PERSONNEL ITEMS (subject to immediate action)

VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

A. Legislative Affairs Council Charge and Charter

Chhabra said that they changes suggested last week were implementing. Chhabra moved to approve the LAC Charge and Charter updates.

MOTIONASB-18-W-12by: Chhabra

To approve the LAC Charge and Charter with the stipulation that the graduate student representative be voting.

Second: Rutledge

Vote: 5 - 0 - 1

Action: Pass

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

A. Student Technology Fee Renewal Proposal

Eider said that for the last four years the STF Committee designated the fee of \$35 a quarter that students pay to upkeep technology on campus. The money from the fee is split up into six different categories and this year the committee decided to change how the money was allocated, but not how much the fee is. Some of the changes include more money to the Student Tech Center to accommodate for the rising minimum wage and increasing the

amount utilized for maintaining wireless networks on campus. Yanzon asked why they weren't doing the virtual labs. Eider said that usage was very low and there are other programs that do the same thing. Chhabra and LaVallee entered at 6:20. Hayden recommended that it was clarified in the language that no new fee was being added. Yanzon asked if the student body needed to vote on it considering that no new fee was being added. Eider said they thought it had to go by the students no matter what. LaVallee brought up that this way students could give input on if they like the changes especially because a new program is being added. Eider said that next week they will be bringing an item about computer labs and how some of them aren't open to all students so the committee is going to reevaluate which labs are receiving funds from the student tech fee. Yanzon asked why those labs were on the fee in the first place. Eider said that when they were taking funding away from computer labs that aren't open to all students the funds will primarily go to the STF proposals so we can fund more one-time tech proposals.

B. Ethnic Studies Referendum Language

Yanzon said that this referendum is not a fee, it is just a survey of how Western feels about the issue. The referendum proposes the revitalization of the College of Ethnic Studies and the addition of Ethnic Studies to the GUR's. Even if the referendum passes there will not magically be a College of Ethnic Studies, that still goes through the Board of Trustees. To put this in context the Board already passed a resolution earlier this year urging the Board of Trustees and Faculty Senate to consider restoring the College. Rutledge said that if this goes on the ballot it should be clearer what is being voted on. Rutledge continued that this confusion would probably be on the use of the word support, make it explicit that this does not start the college just voices support for it. The Board discussed whether using this terminology "the Associated Students of WWU" or "the Students of WWU" would be better given that everyone is part of the Associated Students. Houck clarified that there can be additional information provided for voters beside the actual text of the resolution.

C. Undocumented Students Support Referendum

Gordon said that before this was voted on they needed to do research on if you can transfer a fee over to financial aid. Yanzon said that the Board should ask why the student body should be the one paying for undocumented students, why is that burden on the students. Gordon said it could be changed to a request for funding from the institution. LaVallee said there was a possibility of already having funding available that is untapped. The Board clarified when these items need to be finalized and voted on.

D. Smoke Free Campus Referendum Language

Gordon said that this is a referendum to gauge support for a smoke-free campus.

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

X. BOARD REPORTS

Simrui Chhabra, President, reported that they went to lobby day. They have been attending LAC and chalking the meetings and they have been talking about involving grad students on campus and in committees. The Board should also meet with the grad students to talk about representation. WS A was Sunday and general assembly is coming up and they think Western should bring students-at-large. They are also going to the REP office meetings. They are meeting with Sabah at 1 lam tomorrow and the Board can give them things to talk about or attend the meeting.

Alex LaVallee, VP for Business and Operations, reported that they began budget committee and are going over budgets. Business committee is today. There was not a structure review committee meeting last week, will be one this week. They will be bringing sections from the personnel and employment policy from personnel committee to management council. S&A fee did not meet last week.

Julia Rutledge VP for Activities, reported that they have a few meetings about the VU gallery coming up and will be reporting back. This week they have SPC hiring new editors for Western magazines.

Erick Yanzon, VP for Diversity, reported that ESC lobby day was this weekend and it went great. Yanzon said the Board might be seeing an ESC restructure proposal.

Hunter Eider, VP for Governmental Affairs, reported that they recently met with Mary Nichols and they are having a financial literacy month in April.

Annie Gordon, VP for Student Life, reported that tomorrow Men's Resiliency is having an event, Ending Rape at seven in the PAC. They gave a friendly reminder that the Academic Advising Center has drop in advising hours. The Suicide Prevention committee is having an art show called Transcendence and submissions are due March 2nd, the show is March 6th-15th. We also have suicide prevention training every Tuesday for the next couple weeks.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:37p.m.