

**Western Washington University Associated Students  
STUDENT SENATE**

Date: January 14, 2019      6:30 P.M.      Room: VU 567

**Attendees:** *Roster Attached*

**MOTIONS**

- ASWWUSS-19-W-1**      *To table the minutes. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-2**      *To add a Discussion Item to discuss protocol for Senators receiving funding for events. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-3**      *To revise the second paragraph, second sentence, of the pay scale proposal to read “pay” rather than “ay”. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-4**      *To pass the Student Senate pay scale change. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-5**      *To make a recommendation to the AS Board of Directors to move to impeach Genaro Meza-Roa. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-6**      *To write a statement consisting of one Senator from each College, and two At-Large Senators to express to the student body the Senate’s concerns with Genaro Meza-Roa’s actions. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-7**      *To have the Election Committee investigate Genaro Meza-Roa in relation to his job obligations. Kolsitka moved to amend this motion for the Election Committee to review Meza-Roa’s conduct and fulfillment of his position, which would go into effect should the ASBOD not pass *MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-5*. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-8**      *To table the rest of the Agenda until the next meeting. **Passed.***

*Levi Eckman, Interim Senate Pro-Tempore, called the meeting to order at 6:35 P.M.*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. Eckman recognized that there were no previous minutes for the body to approve, and he asked if there was a motion to table revisions to minutes.

*MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-1*      *by* Paden Koltiska

*To table the minutes.*

*Second:* Phillip Hensyel

*Vote:* 21 – 0 – 0

*Action:* Passed

**II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA**

*MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-2*      *by* Koltiska

*To add a Discussion Item to discuss protocol for Senators throwing events with constituents and possible sources of funding available to the Senators.*

*Second:* Nicholas Makrakis      *Vote:* 21 – 0 – 0

*Action:* Passed

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

- A. Nate Jo stated that they are the AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees and

would like to commend Senate Pro-Tempore, Levi Eckman, and others who contributed to the formation of the Student Senate for making the historic meeting possible. They added that they wanted to thank the Student Senate Task Force for the work they put in during the summer to start implementing the Student Senate, and to thank Eckman and Juliet Knowles, AS Board Assistant for Academic Shared Governance, for the many hours that went into making the Senate possible. They encouraged Senators to understand that they and others are looking up to the Senators and that they are very thankful for the work the Senators are doing to make WWU a better place. They then reiterated their hope that the Student Senate will be an integral body on campus forever.

- B. Sam Frost, AS Communications Director, stated that she wanted to remind Senators that these meetings are public and that anything said during the meeting is subject to public record and distribution by public entities, such as school news sources. Frost then asked Senators to be cognizant of possibly speaking on behalf of one another, and stressed the importance of being transparent through the sharing of accurate and true information. She then told Senators that being honest was extremely important, and reminded Senators that it is OK to take some time to think about how to respond to questions or comments, especially if there are heavy emotions involved. Frost then encouraged Senators to reach out to her with any questions they may have. Eckman then explained to Senators that the Communications Director generally attends AS Board of Directors (ASBOD) meetings and will do the same with AS Student Senate meetings.

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

#### **V. ACTION ITEMS – Guests\***

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

##### **A. Senators Pay-Scales - \$14.50/Hour**

Eckman discussed the pay increase for Student Senators that was passed by the ASBOD meeting on Friday, January 11, 2019. He then read the [Proposal from the January 11, 2019 meeting](#). Eckman highlighted ramifications for the pay increase based on advising from the WWU Assistant Attorney Generals. The ASBOD had anticipated and hoped that Student Senate positions would be salaried positions because that would make Senator positions more accessible for the student body. However, because the decision was that the pay would be hourly, those students running for Student Senate must be U.S. citizens, which poses a barrier to undocumented students. Eckman then stated that this ramification will need to be considered as the Student Senate moves forward, and mentioned that there will be many conversations with the Assistant Attorney Generals, Kerena Higgins and Melissa Nelson, as well as with Casey Hayden, Assistant Director of Student Activities, and Leti Romo, AS Assistant Director for Student Representation and Governance. Eckman then stated that the ASBOD had an extensive discussion on these ramifications, and encouraged Senators to read the minutes from the January 11, 2019 ASBOD meeting when they become available. Hensyel inquired whether or not the hourly pay would be

amendable later. Eckman responded that it will be amendable after further discussion, but that this Personnel Item would need to be passed for the Student Senators to receive their first paychecks. Eckman then reiterated his belief that the AS needs to stand by its word of lowering the barriers of accessibility, and that by Spring Quarter, he hopes that there will be meaningful results that reconcile the differences between what the state expects and what WWU expects. Kelly Yokuda inquired about the effects on students who were not undocumented, but who were not U.S. citizens. Eckman explained that it would limit the accessibility for any student who does not have the proper documentation to work in the United States, and advised Senators to contact Hayden with further questions, and to also feel free to invite Personnel Directors to the meetings. Eckman then shared that the ASBOD suggested asking the Assistant Attorney Generals to come speak at a Student Senate meeting to answer questions about their ruling. Makrakis asked if the writing on the document could be changed.

*MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-3* by Makrakis

To revise the second paragraph, second sentence, to read “pay” rather than “ay”.

*Second:* Tatum Buss

*Vote:* 21 – 0 – 0

*Action:* Passed

*MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-4* by Nicole Ballard

To pass the Student Senate pay scale change.

*Second:* Adah Barenburg

*Vote:* 21 – 1 – 0

*Action:* Passed

## **VII. ACTION ITEMS – Senate\***

### **VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS – Senate\***

#### **A. DEI Training for Undergraduates & Teaching/Graduate Assistants**

Graduate School Senator, Anna Schorr, introduced herself as a Graduate School Student Senator who also chairs the Graduate School Advisory Council (GSAC), and also introduced Hensyel, Graduate School Student Senator and representative on GSAC. Schorr then shared a conversation had with AS VP for Governmental Affairs, Natasha Hessami, about work that Hessami had been doing during Fall Quarter within the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) along the lines of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) training. Schorr stated that Hessami had organized an email group with a group of CSE students to establish a list of demands for the College, and had been meeting with CSE Dean Johnson. Schorr then said that she was contacted by Hessami in an effort to seek support from Graduate Students because DEI training is beneficial for both graduate and undergraduate students. Schorr claimed that, after taking the proposition of DEI training for graduate and undergraduate students to GSAC, a GSAC member motioned to start a petition requesting DEI mandatory training for GAs and TAs, which was signed by around 20 students and then brought to Dean Pillay of the Graduate School. Since then, Schorr claimed that she and Hensyel, along with others, have met with Dean Johnson, Dean Pillay, and Dean Steve Hollenhorst (Huxley College of the

Environment), to talk about what the training should look like and how it should be organized. Hensyel stated that he and Anna feel passionate about having an environment that does not marginalize anybody in the community, though he highlighted that he and Schorr are not experts in DEI. They recognize a need and want to facilitate a more inclusive practice. They have been reaching out to various people from the Graduate School and the AS to discuss how this can be developed and who it should include, as it is in very early stages. Hensyel asked the body if this might be applicable in other Colleges, and inquired whether or not other Colleges might have interest in a campus-wide online training that would be defining what DEI is. Hensyel reiterated that this is in the very early stages. Koltiska asked the Graduate School Senators in which instances DEI trainings are administered. Schorr responded that she is only aware of a mandatory DEI training within the CSE for TAs and GAs, and that she and Hensyel wish to see if this training is needed in other Colleges, and to assess whether or not the training is effective. Schorr and Hensyel will be meeting with CSE students in the days to come to inquire about the effectiveness of their training. Hensyel added that it is important to consider the scope of the trainings and to assess whether or not the trainings are based on learning or on situational occurrences. Romo stated that the work being done by the Graduate School is new, as there is no existing DEI training of this nature at WWU. Hensyel added that there is a DEI training available through the Equal Opportunity Office (EOO), and Schorr claimed that, although the EOO's DEI training is for campus employees, there is the possibility of applying this training to Graduate Students after someone is hired to administer the training. Hensyel reiterated the Graduate School Senators' intentions to get the student body more involved in the dialogue. Kelly Yokuda shared that she was a part of the document calling for DEI training, and had understood that it was targeting the lack of diversity in undergraduate research positions. She inquired whether or not this DEI training would be focused on this, as was originally discussed. Schorr claimed that this was the original intention, and that Hessami had attended every meeting with Schorr and Hensyel, representing undergraduate students. Schorr shared that she believed that this training was relevant for all students, and that undergraduate research assistants be invited to College-specific training along with the TAs. Yokuda asked whether or not it would be mandatory. Schorr responded that she could not comment on that question. Hensyel shared that he wished to reiterate that the he and Schorr are still in the beginning stages, and they would like to continue determining the direction they want to go. Romo asked if Yokuda was speaking of the undergraduate research assistant seminar, which is another program being implemented this quarter for research students. Yokuda was not aware of the seminar. Romo shared that the training that Schorr and Hensyel had brought up was related to incoming graduate students, though there are three total parts to the DEI training: graduate student training, faculty training, and undergraduate training. Romo then asked if Yokuda may have been speaking of a different program. Hensyel added that the discussion is still ongoing and developing. Yokuda said that she would bring up this discussion

during a meeting with the Chair of the Chemistry Department this week. Koltiska asked whether or not the DEI training applied to student employees. Schorr responded that she believed that the training was available to any student. Riley Embly asked if other universities have implemented trainings like this. Schorr and Hensyel reported that they have looked into multiple universities that have implemented trainings similar to DEI trainings, but that they have not yet been able to demo any trainings. Eckman asked for any further discussion or comments.

#### **B. College Town Halls**

Luke LeClair shared that they and Laura met with Dean Paredes Méndez of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHSS) about holding Town Halls for students. The first Town Hall for CHSS has been set for January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019, in FR 201 from 5:00 P.M.-7:00 P.M. While the Town Hall is concentrated toward CHSS students, all are encouraged to attend. The first Town Hall is intended to provide introductions and to explain LeClair's and Laura Meerdink's job and expectations for the Town Hall. If there is a smaller turnout, they plan to do smaller groups. With a large turnout, they plan to do an open-microphone for questions. If the first Town Hall goes well, they plan to hold more Town Halls of various sizes. LeClair asked if the body had any questions about the idea or if they wished to hold similar Town Halls. Tatum Buss asked what time the meeting was. LeClair responded that it is January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019, from 5:00 P.M.-7:00 P.M. in FR 201. Hensyel asked if CHSS Senators had macro-questions to lead off with at the Town Hall. LeClair claimed that they planned to focus on marginalized communities within the CHSS—such as those facing sexual assault or harassment - and also Departmentally focused issues. Makrakis claimed that he believed it was a great idea, but asked if Meerdink and LeClair had done any promotion for the Town Hall. Meerdink claimed that they had received support from Dean Paredes Méndez, and that they also planned to create a Facebook page to advertise and put up flyers around campus. LeClair added that they planned to reach out to more specific groups of marginalized students within the College. Frost added that this was a great opportunity for all Senators to know about AS Publications and Communications options for advertising of College/constituency events. Eckman added that each Senator has access to a certain amount of money within discretionary funds that the Senators can use to fund these activities. He recommended approaching each Dean for funding, if possible, and then later resorting to the Senator fund. Makrakis asked Eckman who could be contacted for more information about budgets. Eckman responded that Ally Palmer, AS Business Director, would be helpful to speak with. Makrakis then asked CHSS Senators how often they planned to hold Town Halls. Meerdink claimed that they plan to see how the first Town Hall goes before planning the next one, but that their original idea was to hold them twice per quarter. Koltiska asked Eckman if budgets need to be presented at the end of the year. Eckman claimed that budget proposals will eventually need to be made when the Senate is approached by groups and clubs asking for funding from the Student Senate. Koltiska asked if there were to be a budget coming out of the AS Board budget. Solomon explained how the budgets

work and let Senators know that they should be frugal with the money they spend from the accounts.

**C. Concerns and Discussion of AS VP for Business and Operations**

At-Large Senator, Nicole Ballard, shared that she felt it was important to check the transparency of the AS, and should bring up this concern to the body due to the checks and balances of the Board of Directors and the Student Senate that need to be holding the members of each body accountable. Nina-Tuyen Tran also brought up that this issue was of great concern to the CSE Senators because this person is not doing their job, as was highlighted in the AS Review article. Tran also added that it is important to do as Ballard mentioned, and to check the work of the Board of Directors. McMillan shared that they felt this is something that the Student Senate should be discussing because of the power invested within the body. McMillan also received an email from a student about an interaction they had with the AS VP for Business and Operations, Genaro Meza-Roa. McMillan shared that the student said that they were forced to get a no contact order from Meza-Roa last year through the university because they felt unsafe by his persistence to contact the student. Recently, the student encountered Meza-Roa in public, and the student then moved back to their home state due to the interaction in which they were made extremely uncomfortable. When the student asked administration for support, they were met with few responses because the university felt there was not adequate evidence. Embly asked if McMillan could elaborate on the nature of the interaction between the student and Meza-Roa. McMillan responded that the student did not share that information with them. Nicole Wood asked Eckman about what the process of checks and balances looks like for the Student Senate and the Board of Directors. Eckman shared that, as the Legislative Branch of the AS, the Student Senate has the following rights per the by-laws of the AS Student Senate:

“Any Student Senator may choose to bring an item to the Student Senate in regard to any member of the ASBOD or ASWWU Student Senator directly defying or disobeying the AS Elections Code.

1. Such an item will require the immediate attention of the ASWWU Student Senate, who will then create a subcommittee of the Student Senate with the guidance of the Senate Pro-Tempore to conduct an official investigation in coordination with the AS Personnel Office.

a. If found guilty of the aforementioned actions by the sub-committee, the accused member of the ASBOD will be subject to consequences at the discretion of the entirety of the ASWWU Student Senate.

b. These consequences are subject, but not limited to:

i. Issuing a formal apology against actors involved, to be approved by the Student Senate with a 51% vote.

ii. A public address to the student body of WWU with a speech, to be approved by a 51% vote of the Student Senate.

iii. Loss of certain position privileges, to be determined in coordination with the Assistant Director for Student Representation and Governance and confirmed by a 51% vote of the Student Senate.

iv. Formal removal of the aforementioned party, to be enforced by the Assistant Director for Student Representation and Governance and the ASBOD and confirmed with a 3/4\* Student Senate vote” ([ASWWU Student Senate By-Laws](#), Article VIII).

In regard to voting, Eckman shared that the voting powers of the Student Senate are as follows:

“In order for an action item or resolution to pass, it must obtain a quorum of the eligible votes cast. An abstention by a Student Senator will not count as a vote cast in favor or against the action item or resolution being voted upon.

1. Voting may be done via electronic device, but only with prior approval of the Senate Pro-Tempore and Vice-Chair, and only under irregular or extreme circumstances.

2. Voting may not be done by proxy vote, and a student senator is the only one who may cast their vote for official ASWWU Student Senate business” (ASWWU Student Senate By-Laws, Article VI).

Eckman then added that the Board of Directors is guided by the [By-Laws of the Associated Students](#) Article VI, Section 5:

“Any member of the ASWWU Board of Directors may be recalled by a majority vote in a special election. Recall is initiated by a petition containing the verified signatures of no less than forty percent (40%) of the membership of the ASWWU voting in the last general election or by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of the ASWWU Board of Directors currently holding office. A special election for the purpose of recall shall be held not less than fourteen (14) or more than twenty-one (21) days after the recall petition or resolution is presented to the Vice President for Business & Operations.”

Eckman then recommended that each Student Senator again revise the Election Code of the AS. Wood responded that this information provided context. Romo added that another option is to do nothing, and another option would be to implement a judicial review by the elections committee to review the concern. Embly asked what a potential outcome of a judicial review might be. Romo said that it would get more voices involved. Embly thanked the Colleges that brought these issues to light in this meeting. He urged the body to make a motion to look further into this matter in order to ensure an inclusive campus community both among students and faculty. Yokuda shared that she saw an anonymous Facebook post regarding a claim of sexual assault by a Spring 2018 election candidate, and she shared that she wished to make elections processes more sensitive to these issues that are brought up by students. Eckman thanked Yokuda for her comment and noted that the body could not speculate off of an anonymous post, but then urged Senators to reach out to Alec Willis and Nora Harren of the Representation and Student Engagement Office for more information on the processes followed for elections. Courtney Yoshiyama asked what an investigation would look like if the Senate were to vote in favor of a committee to investigate the issue. Eckman responded saying that the Student Senate has the power to create sub-committees according to the by-laws. Romo added that another option would be an investigation through the AS Elections Grievance Committee, and Eckman reminded the body that it would need to be

brought as an Agenda Item for the next committee meeting. Romo then noted that a resolution process would take  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the members for quorum. Solomon responded to Yokuda's previous comment and stated that the anonymous Facebook claim of sexual assault was influenced by the individual seeing the candidate's posters around campus during the Spring 2018 Elections, but that Meza-Roa did not put up any posters. Schorr brought up that she had seen these discussions occurring within the Board of Directors and asked Board Members to share what kind of information had been brought up among the Board. Solomon and Romo briefly discussed what information Solomon could share with the body. Frost added that an Executive Session in the next Student Senate meeting might be helpful for further discussion and Eckman explained to the body what an Executive Session is. McMillan then clarified that, for the Student Senate to move forward with a resolution, it would need to appear as on the Agenda for the next Student Senate meeting. Solomon then shared information on the interactions between the Board Members, and that some issues in the past had been his lack of presence in Office Hours, his lack of attendance to Fall and Winter Quarter trainings. Ama Monkah, AS VP for Activities, added that she does not feel comfortable working with Meza Roa, that the Board Members have had personal experiences that the Senators were not aware of, and that it didn't seem to make sense that other Board Members have established a good working relationship with one another while working relationships with Meza-Roa are not good. Solomon also claimed that Meza-Roa's actions of leaving an ASBOD meeting to drink wine in the next room over is unprofessional and that it has been difficult to motivate Meza-Roa to work on projects while other Board Members are working more hours than they should to work on their projects. Frost asked Solomon if she could expand on conversations she has had with Meza-Roa. Solomon responded that, though she has had conversations to try to motivate him to work on particular projects, she has not seen work that she believes is acceptable for the student body and the Board of Directors. Eckman added that he had misspoken earlier, and that Information Items are subject to resolution by the body. Romo added that the Agenda for AS Student Senate meetings is public knowledge and is available for anyone to see. Ballard claimed that the article, though informative of the actions of Meza-Roa, does not fully share a lot of concerns about his behavior—both from students and from the BOD--as she is familiar with other instances of students complaining about Meza-Roa's actions. Ballard then expressed concern for a lack of transparency about the situation and actions by Meza-Roa, and asked if the information discussed within the BOD Executive Session on November 16, 2018. Makrakis stated that he sees this as a large issue and that there are points of contention, though it is hard to fully understand everything in 30 minutes of discussion. Makrakis asked Solomon if she could elaborate on the procedure with Meza-Roa, and if Meza-Roa is aware of the fact that he could be facing disciplinary actions. Solomon claimed that Meza-Roa is aware, and that she has provided much feedback to his actions. Eckman added that, for the sake of transparency, he invited Meza-Roa to this meeting. LeClair stated that it is obvious that more investigating needs to be done, whether it be by the Senate, a Senate sub-



committee, or by the AS Elections Grievance Committee. Romo added that it is important to remind the body that there, if the Elections Board were to review the issue, it would only examine the work portion of Meza-Roa's job, rather than the other concerns presented within the AS Review article. Eckman stated that this would be an examination of whether or not Meza-Roa has the ability to fulfill his job. LeClair then motioned for the formation of a committee to investigate the concern through interviewing BOD members, Meza-Roa himself, and other students who have concerns. Hudson Fox seconded (*ASWWUSS-19-W-5*). Jona Akelipa wanted to urge the body to act swiftly with this action in order to protect those who are most affected by the behavior of Meza-Roa. Akelipa offered the example that, had the Senate voted on investigation into the actions during Fall Quarter 2018 by Shane Merwin, he would likely not be advocating for further investigation, though his intention was not to conflate these issues. With this, Akelipa urged the Senate to remember that every moment that no action is taken to investigate, Meza-Roa is occupying a position of power and making WWU students uncomfortable. Embly asked Akelipa to provide more context on Shane Merwin. Akelipa then responded that Shane Merwin was a student on campus who wrote racist graffiti who was allowed on campus in classes for some time until students, who worked on their own time and without compensation, to help students feel safe again on campus. Akelipa reiterated that he would hate to see something like this happen again, and highlighted that investigations can often get side-tracked and ultimately help preserve the dynamics and hierarchies that are already present. McMillan asked if it was possible to make a decision in today's meeting. Eckman responded that a resolution could be released on this item during this meeting. Barenburg shared that, although expediency is important, she stated that it would be important to hear from Meza-Roa before making a decision that is lasting. Makrakis claimed that he agreed with Barenburg, but that Meza-Roa was invited to the meeting and decided to not attend. Wood shared that it is important to take student concerns and accounts into serious consideration when discussing these issues. Frost said that a public statement could be shared by the Senate with a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority vote. Monkah shared that, during a Fall Retreat in Anacortes among Board Members... Frost asked if this was public information. Mejía described the Retreat being public but not generally attended by the public. Solomon stated that, although Meza-Roa's actions are both within and outside of his job description, he has been in the position since June and, though it is now January, he has not fulfilled multiple aspects of his job. Monkah stated that she had decided to not share the information about the Retreat until she could affirm that it was, in fact, a public meeting. Yoshiyama inquired about the AS Election Code for running unopposed. Eckman and Solomon responded that there were no rules preventing candidates from running unopposed. Makrakis expressed concern that the Senators may not be entirely familiar with Meza-Roa's job description, and mentioned that Senators should be cautious to reach a decision without this information. Romo noted that, should the Student Senate reach a resolution, it will not automatically signal Meza-Roa's impeachment. Rather, Romo claimed, it would signal that Eckman, as Senate

Pro-Tempore, would bring this resolution to the BOD at a meeting to report on the Senate's recommendation. Koltiska shared that he found the [job description for the AS VP for Business & Operations](#) and that it included: "To serve the diverse membership of the Associated Students in a professional and ethical manner; being familiar with and upholding the AS Charter, all WWU policies, and all AS policies including the Employment Policy, Code of Conduct, and Program Standards; and attending all AS staff development events including, but not limited to: pre-fall orientation, pre-winter, pre-spring, and mid-quarter staff developments." Koltiska reiterated that there was clear evidence that Meza-Roa had not been fulfilling his job description, based on the AS Review article and information from BOD members during this meeting, and that Koltiska wished to send out an email to the student body regarding the Student Senate's position on the AS VP for Business and Operations and other information that students could review regarding the concern. Ballard expressed concern about the fact that Meza-Roa did not attend Fall or Winter training and inquired whether or not there was any way to verify that Meza-Roa attends his office hours. Eckman shared that Meza-Roa did not post his Fall Quarter office hours until six weeks into the quarter, and that when he did share them, only three hours were listed, even though the job description lists that five office hours are to be held. Juliet Knowles, AS Board Assistant for Academic Shared Governance, shared with the Senate the few times she has seen Meza-Roa in the BOD Office. Monkah stated that she could share the information from the Retreat in September 2018. Monkah began by telling the body that their concentration for a discussion was on inclusivity, and Solomon added that during this discussion and throughout the retreat, there was little attention paid by Meza-Roa to BOD bonding activities and talks. Monkah continued by saying that Meza-Roa disagreed with discussions that stressed the importance of not mis-gendering people. Mejía added that the AS strives to create a culture of inclusion, and that Board Members are also very passionate about this inclusion being practiced in all AS interactions. Mejía claimed that she was very upset by Meza-Roa's actions and felt troubled by the Retreat. Monkah added that she, Eckman, Mejía, and Solomon were not trying to sway a vote within the Senate body, however, they believe that it was important that the Senate be informed of his actions and relationships with the Board Members. Solomon added that he committed to trying to properly gender individuals. Buss claimed that it seemed that there was quite a bit of evidence that action needs to be taken. Eckman reiterated that the Board Members were not trying to sway a vote and that this was the first time that the retreat was discussed in public. Ruth Ewald stated that it is important for the Senate to set expectations for employment within the AS, and that establishing these expectations may prevent problems in the future. Koltiska urged the body to be conscientious about the time, but that it was important for the body to express its concerns in a statement to the student body. Hensyel reiterated that there is much evidence already available that is public. With the instance of Meza-Roa's drinking on the job, Hensyel claimed that most people would likely lose their job, and that adding an investigation may formalize the process, but that it seemed that there was quite a call to take

action against Meza-Roa. Embly added that it seemed concerning that Meza-Roa could have missed training and not have lost his job. Embly added his intention to bring a motion for impeachment. Maya Noesen inquired about the Election Board to Romo. Romo said that the Election Board deals with grievances. Noesen asked if the Senate could express a grievance, or if that would have to be done by individuals. Romo said that it would be individuals. Noesen asked what the channels of addressing this grievance would be. Romo stated that it would ultimately go to the BOD, which would need to agree with a  $\frac{3}{4}$  approval. Hensyel then asked if the Senate were to vote today by  $\frac{3}{4}$  to impeach Meza-Roa, if it would then go to the BOD for a  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote. Eckman responded that it would, in fact, go to the Board for a vote this Friday, and would be a powerful statement from the Senate to the BOD. Wood inquired what, regardless of the impeachment process, would happen with the pay for Meza-Roa if he were to be impeached—if the pay would be refunded. Romo responded that it would not. Ballard added that, although a resolution is a good idea, action should be taken at this meeting, and asked Solomon what she would vote at this Friday's meeting were the Senate to take action. BOD members responded that Solomon could not answer that question. Hensyel asked if an emergency meeting could be held if the Senate were to release a statement. Eckman responded by reading from the [Student Senate by-laws](#):

“The Senate will hold bi-weekly meetings on the 1st and 3rd Tuesday of every month, in consideration of other standing meeting times. 1. It is the discretion of the Senate Pro-Tempore and Vice-Chair to hold additional meetings as necessary, in the case of an urgent situation. 2. Meetings may be called by any member (voting or non-voting) when agreed upon by quorum of the seated voting membership, in written expression to the Senate Pro-Tempore. 3. All meetings conducted by the ASWWU Student Senate will adhere to the Open Public Meeting Act of Washington State, codified in 42.30 RCW.”

LeClair expressed concern of voting on an impeachment at this meeting, due to a lack of clear discussion. LeClair also expressed that the body be cautious about the actions taken and the motions voted on. Embly added that impeachment could not be voted on today because it was not on the Agenda. McMillan claimed that, for the students who expressed their concerns with interactions they had encountered, it is difficult for them to bring those concerns forward and that the Senators could not get comfortable in their positions by not taking action. Sarah Soulliere added that the precedent that the Senate would be taking swift action on this concern goes both ways. Buss stated that it was more difficult to impeach a Board Member before the Senate, and Solomon and Eckman agreed that it used to be less accessible. Romo reminded that body that it would be making a recommendation to the BOD, not actually impeaching Meza-Roa. Tran made a motion to file a recommendation for impeachment to the board. Schorr asked for a clarification to see if the BOD would have this on their agenda for this Friday's meeting. Koltiska wished to know more about making a statement for the student body regarding the concerns of Meza-Roa's actions. Mejia also brought up the fact that the AS BOD released a statement in support of marginalized groups, which was signed by all BOD member except for Meza-

Roa. Makrakis asked whether or not each Senator would sign the statement or if each College would sign. Eckman stated that each individual who wrote the statement would sign. Fox made a motion to launch an investigation on Meza-Roa to provide information for the Senate's recommendation to the BOD, and also to the campus community. Solomon reminded the body that they already made a recommendation to the BOD to impeach Meza-Roa, and that if they wished to investigate, they would need to withdraw the motion to impeach. Fox then removed his motion. Embly made a motion to have the Election Committee investigate Meza-Roa in relation to his job obligations. Akelipa stated that he understood the benefits of the motion, but that he didn't understand what other evidence would need to be presented to the body if were to do an investigation. Makrakis added that, because the Senate is a new body whose first meeting was today, a motion for investigation coming from the Student Senate would be best, but that an investigation would likely not change any opinions. Ballard reminded that body that the BOD works the closest with Meza-Roa, and that the Senate should trust the BOD to make an accurate decision due to their experience with him. Barenburg added the importance of an investigation to demonstrate to the student body that they take their jobs seriously. Yokuda responded by stating that she had been on the receiving end of such a concern in the past, and that it is frustrating when action is not taken. Mejía stated that, as a BOD, members are aware of the situation and that it is not new information to the BOD.

*MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-5* by Tran

To make a recommendation to the AS Board of Directors to move to impeach Genaro Meza-Roa.

*Second:* Yokuda

*Vote:* 19 – 0 – 2

*Action:* Passed

*MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-6* by Koltiska

To write a statement consisting of one Senator from each College, and two At-Large Senators to express to the student body the Senate's concerns with Genaro Meza-Roa's actions.

*Second:* Buss

*Vote:* 20 – 0 – 1

*Action:* Passed

*MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-7* by Embly

To have the Election Committee investigate Genaro Meza-Roa in relation to his job obligations. Kolsitka moved to amend this motion for the Election Committee to review Meza-Roa's conduct and fulfillment of his position, which would go into effect should the ASBOD not pass *MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-5*.

*Second:* Ballard

*Vote:* 20 – 0 – 1

*Action:* Passed

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

**X. BOARD REPORTS**

**XI. OTHER BUSINESS**

*MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-8* by McMillan  
To table the rest of the Agenda until the next meeting.  
*Second:* Makrakis *Vote:* 21 – 0 – 0

*Action:* Passed

***The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:50 P.M.***

**ASSOCIATED STUDENTS STUDENT SENATE – ATTENDEE ROSTER 01/14/2018**

VOTING ATTENDEES				NON-VOTING ATTENDEES		
Student Senators				Senate Pro-Tempore		
1	Nicole Ballard	<i>At-Large</i>	P	21	Levi W. Eckman, <i>AS VP for Academic Affairs</i>	P
2	Adah Barenburg	<i>At-Large</i>	P	<b>Advisory</b>		
3	Tatum Buss	<i>At-Large</i>	P	22	Leti Romo, <i>AS Assistant Director for Student Representation and Governance</i>	P
4	Courtney Yoshiyama	<i>At-Large</i>	P	<b>Recorder</b>		
5	Jona Akelipa	<i>College of Business and Economics</i>	P	23	Juliet Knowles, <i>AS Board Assistant for Academic Shared Governance</i>	P
6	Nicholas Makrakis	<i>College of Business and Economics</i>	P	<b>Guests</b>		
7	Ruth Ewald	<i>College of Fine and Performing Arts</i>	P	24	Sam Frost, <i>AS Communications Director</i>	
8	Paden Koltiska	<i>College of Fine and Performing Arts</i>	P	25	Camilla Mejía, <i>AS VP for Diversity</i>	
9	Luke LeClair	<i>College of Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	P	26	Ama Monkah, <i>AS VP for Activities</i>	
10	Laura Meerdink	<i>College of Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	P	27	Millka Solomon, <i>AS President</i>	
11	Nina-Tuyen Tran	<i>College of Science and Engineering</i>	P	28	Erasmus Baxter, <i>AS Review</i>	
12	Kelly Yokuda	<i>College of Science and Engineering</i>	P	29	Soleil de Zwart, <i>AS Review</i>	
13	Dayjha McMillan	<i>Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies</i>	P	30	Nate Jo, <i>AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees</i>	
14	Sarah Soulliere	<i>Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies</i>	P	31	Cody Clark, <i>Western Front</i>	
15	Phillip Hensyel	<i>Graduate School</i>	P	32	Ian Ferrer, <i>AS Assessment Coordinator</i>	
26	Anna Campbell Schorr	<i>Graduate School</i>	P	33	Ella Banken, <i>AS Review</i>	
17	Riley Embly	<i>Huxley College of the Environment</i>	P			
18	Maya Noesen	<i>Huxley College of the Environment</i>	P			
19	Hudson Fox	<i>Woodring College of Education</i>	P			
20	Nicole Wood	<i>Woodring College of Education</i>	P			
<b>Voting members in attendance</b>			21		<b>Voting attendees</b>	<b>21</b>
					<b>Non-voting attendees</b>	<b>12</b>
					<b>TOTAL ATTENDEES</b>	<b>33</b>