

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

April 6<sup>th</sup> 2018

Room VU567

*Minutes neverformally approved.*

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

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

**Guests:** Kurt Willis and Lenard Jones

**MOTIONS**

**ASB-18-S-1** To move the University Housing and Dining Rate Proposal from an information item to action item. *Passed.*

**ASB-18-S-2** To approve the Western Washington University Housing and Dining System Proposed Rates. *Passed.*

**ASB-18-S-3** To appoint Julia Rutledge, VP of Activities, as the AS Board Member on the Student Trustee Selection Committee. *Passed.*

*Simrun Chhabra, AS President, called the meeting to order at 4:18p.m.*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Chhabra added Wall Street Journal Business and Structural Review Committee to Other Business.

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

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

**A. University Housing and Dining Rate Presentation**

Gordon noted the document needed to be moved to the Board of Trustees by the following week and wanted the Board to keep in mind that she had been updating the Board on this topic for the past few weeks. Willis, Associate Director of Housing, at the time they were the Chief Financial Officer of housing system and also overseeing the Residence Life system. Jones was the Director of University Residences. Willis said the housing and dining system consisted of three components: on campus living, dining hall contract with Aramark, and facilities components of the Viking Union. He noted they work closely with Eric Alexander and the Viking Union staff. The document explained what the housing system did in order to run its business as well as the proposed changes. The bottom line they were taking to the Board of Trustees was a rate increase of 4.5% for residence halls and Bimam Wood community. The reasons for this change was inflation and the capital enhancement component of the housing dining system. They continue to work toward safety and security in the residence halls. They were working on renovating Buchanan Towers, with the roll out of electronic access for internal and external doors. They were working with the Food Systems Working Group to have 25% real food by 2020. Compared to other universities they had a lower weighted cost than all, except Washington State University. They said roughly speaking for the average student, double room and 125 meal plan, it would be a \$55 per month increase. Jones added that they were engaged in the housing master plan, in talks of building another residence hall on campus. University Housing was weighing concerns of location, dining and accessibility to find the best options. They were trying to decide whether it was better to renovate an older building or to knock it down and build something new. Chhabra

asked what areas the university had looked at in regards to building. Jones said they were hesitant to add a new building on North Campus because of the high traffic in the dining hall. So they were looking at the Ridge and South Campus as viable options. He noted that the Ridge was not accessible and they would have to creatively think about where to put the new residence hall. Jones said they were in preliminary stages of the process, and were currently reaching out to other universities for comparable information. Gordon noted that at an upcoming University Housing Representation and Advocacy Committee, Linda Beckman and Melynda Huskey would be there to present on the master plan to provide more people to hear this information. Willis said they were studying admissions data to see what demographics of students were staying on campus and evaluating housing demand. Hayden asked if NXNW and The Gather had effected the on campus housing market. Jones said those alternatives didn't have restrictions for the renters to be students and they had 12 month leases. Willis said they were cautious but they had not seen much impact yet. Yanzon asked about the Capital Plan and how students could provide input. Gordon said a lot of that would be discussed at the UHRAC meeting. Willis and Jones said that the plan was not complete and student input could still be taken into consideration. Chhabra asked if the 4.5% increase was necessary to maintain current operations or if it was to help with the 10 year plan. Willis said the increase did both maintain the operations, but also current maintenance and renovations. A small amount would be moved to the capital plan.

*MOTIONASB-18-S-1* by: Gordon

To move the University Housing and Dining Rate Proposal from an information item to action item.

Second: LaVallee                      Vote: 6 - 0 - 0                      Action: Pass

*MOTIONASB-18-S-2* by: Gordon

To approve the Western Washington University Housing and Dining System Proposed Rates.

Second: Rutledge                      Vote: 5 - 0 - 1                      Action: Pass

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

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

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

##### **A. AS Personnel Policy**

Yanzon stated there were a few updates to the document. There had been discussion about advisors voting in hiring committees. At the time, three students were put into hiring committee with a full-time staff member and all three had voting rights. Hayden said in the previous policy it had stated there would be three voting members and a non-voting advisor. He said the edit would take out the mandate for a non-voting advisor. Gordon asked to review what the final decision was. Hayden said the decision was to have three voting members, but changed the wording to say that a staff advisor "may" serve on the committee as a voting member. That means the search committees would not be required to find a non-voting advisor. Yanzon also noted the change to the staff development attendance and how they did not agree with the wording at the time. Gordon thought they had discussed allowing the employee 5 days to come forward with an explanation of why they missed the meeting. Hayden provided context stating this scenario was when an employee missed a staff development without prior approval or a reasonable explanation. The performance contract was in place for the employee to know the

situation was serious and state that they would not do it again. Yanzon felt they needed to add more of the context that Hayden had provided. A guest asked if it would be a case by case basis to determine if an excuse constituted a valid reason to miss staff development or if it would be based on the contract. Hayden said at the time it was case by case and the Personnel Director acted as a filter of whether the excuse was Personnel Committee, performance contract or a valid excuse. The guest asked if prior approval was more acceptable. LaVallee said it was more appropriate to warn the Personnel Office ahead of time. Chhabra clarified the language change to allowing an excused absence three to five business days after the missed training. If the excuse is valid, they will not be placed on performance contract, but if the excuse is not accepted or they do not meet the deadline, the employee will be placed on a performance contract. LaVallee asked if the following statement was accurate “student government positions which are not subject to a maximum hours requirement,” not just the AS President. Hayden state that it was true, they were exempt from the minimum wage act. Rutledge felt the language might take away protection for compensation for the positions. Hayden agreed, and thought those expectations should be placed in the job description. Yanzon thought the policy should include language about using the job description as guidance. Houck said there may have been intention in taking out line about the job description because a job has extra expectations with it. She guided the Board to discuss the topic more with Hayden. The Board decided to move the voting of this item to the following week.

## VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board\*

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

#### A. Committee Appointments

##### Student Trustee Selection Committee

AS Board Member

*MOTIONASB-18-S-3* by: *La Vallee*

To appoint Julia Rutledge, VP of Activities, as the AS Board Member on the Student Trustee Selection Committee.

Second: Chhabra

Vote: 5 - 0 - 1

Action:Pass

## X. BOARD REPORTS

**Simrun Chhabra, President**, reported the Board of Trustees met the following week and would be presenting AS updates. WSA proposals were due the next week and general assembly was coming up. They stated if people had suggestion about legislative agenda items to submit them to the Legislative Affairs Council. The Student Trustee application was due the next week.

**Hunter Eider, VP for Academic Affairs**, reported Faculty Senate Exec was trying to brainstorm topics to discuss for the quarter. One faculty member brought up what Tenure Faculty was allowed to do. They talked about the idea of creating a collaborative meeting with Faculty Senate and the Board. They had met with the West Coast University member at the New York Times to discuss Western’s contract with them. He was trying to decrease the cost of the physical newspapers for the students.

**Julia Rutledge VP for Activities**, reported that they met with Johnathan Riopelle, with the SAF, and Jonathan Dymond, with the Alumni Association, to set up a Viking Funder and a grant through the Sustainable Action Fund for the food pantry. She also noted that they would be presenting at Western Welcome with Jenn Cook.

**Alex LaVallee, VP for Business and Operations,** reported the S&A Fee Committee had met and got preliminary budgets and estimated total ask of around \$360,000. He noted that down in Olympia the budget was passed so they could raise the S&A Fee by 4%. Business Committee went over budgets. They had been requested by the CDC to review their AS website page.

**Erick Yanzon, VP for Diversity,** reported the interview assessment action item would be on the agenda the following week. The ESC retreat was happening that weekend. They were talking about what it would like to when they move into the Multicultural Center. The Equity I Social Justice Committee was working on looking at what barriers there are to classes and outreach in faculty recruitment. The Multicultural Center groundbreaking ceremony would be coming up soon.

**Annie Gordon, VP for Student Life,** she noted that the S AF Sub-Committee would be meeting that week to start looking at the system and structure of the grant writing program. She stated there was a Tocking Committee that had been created to address how to place locks in university classrooms in the case of an active shooter on campus. She said Tenard Jones had sent out an updated list of demands that she would be publically sharing soon. They were looking at increasing the student transportation fee.

## **XII. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Wall Street Journal Business**

Eider stated that they got an email from the Wall Street Journal University Collaboration program and they were interested in meeting with the Board in the future. The program highlights included, all user would have full access to the WSJ on mobile tablet desktops, faculty and staff would get complementary digital subscriptions, it was very affordable and more.

### **B. Structural Review Committee**

Chhabra had met with Eric Alexander in March to discuss SRC. They discussed what they wanted out of the committee and found three main things that could be worked on outside the committee: constitution restructure, updating position descriptions and fall special election timeline. Yanzon noted these changes would need to come to the following years Board. The plan of action should be focused on making recommendations for the next Board. Chhabra asked who would take on what tasks. Gordon said she would work on the fall special election. Yanzon stated they would work to put together a proposal for the following week.

### **C. DC Trip**

Chhabra thought that Federal lobbying was very beneficial and that more than three Board members should be lobbying. She asked if it was possible to bring the whole Board. Houck said they could use their reserves, the trip funds and the TAC budget if they wanted to get the funds. Chhabra asked that people work to find extra funding to get them all to Washington DC. Yanzon felt that they deserved to go, but how were they making sure they were providing access for other students to have this opportunity. Yanzon asked that everyone think about what they want to lobby on and then who it made sense to send to lobby for those issues.

## **XIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

### **A. VP Governmental Affairs Position**

The board went into executive session (RCW 42.30.110 Section 1 Subsection G) at 6:10pm to end at 6:40pm

*Simrun Chhabra adjourned at 6:40p.m.*