

**Western Washington University Associated Students
STUDENT SENATE**

Date: February 25, 2019 Room: VU 567

Attendees: *Roster Attached*

MOTIONS

- ASWWUSS-19-W-11 *To approve the minutes from the January 14, 2019 Student Senate meeting and the January 28, 2019 Student Senate meeting with revisions. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-12 *To approve the revisions to the agenda. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-13 *To extend the conversation for five minutes. **Passed.***
- ASWWUSS-19-W-14 *To approve the Resolution contingent on AS Communications Director edits for language to ensure its alignment with other AS resolutions, to be reviewed by one final Google Document with 50% of membership from each constituency. **Passed.***

Levi Eckman, Interim Senate Pro-Tempore, called the meeting to order at 6:38 PM

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Adah Barenburg motioned to approve the minutes. Schorr noted a needed revision to the minutes from January 28, 2019, in that Schorr and Hensyel sit on the Graduate Student Advisory Council, not the Graduate Council, as reflected in the Graduate School board report in the draft of the minutes. Hensyel seconded the motion to approve the January 14, 2019 and January 28, 2019 minutes with the revisions.

MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-11 by Barenburg

To approve the minutes from the January 14, 2019 Student Senate meeting and the January 28, 2019 Student Senate meeting with revisions.

Second: Hensyel

Vote: 21 – 0 – 0

Action: Passed

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

- A.** Yokuda motioned to move the Shred the Contract Core Demands agenda item from Information Items – Guests (5a) to Information Items – Senate (9e) due to her guest's planned late arrival. Embly requested to revise Information Item – Senate (Discussion on Students for Renewable Energy Resolution of Support for fossil fuel divestment, 5d) to Action Items – Guests. Koltiska moved to approve the revisions to the agenda.

MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-12 by Koltiska

To approve the revisions to the agenda.

Second: Wood

Vote: 21 – 0 – 0

Action: Passed

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

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS – Guests*

V. ACTION ITEMS – Guests*

A. Discussion on Students for Renewable Energy (SRE) Resolution of Support for Fossil Fuel Divestment

Emby introduced Trever and Emma from SRE who wanted to give a presentation on the [SRE Resolution](#). Emma shared that SRE students work toward promoting climate justice at WWU and sustainable investment. Emma claimed that the Resolution (Document 7) was written to the Board of Directors of the Western Foundation to encourage their divestment in an investment manager that uses fossil fuels. Trever noted that there is currently a request for a proposal for different investment managers for the Western Foundation to choose. Trever claimed that there is no framework for investing in sustainable avenues, and SRE is working closely with the Foundation to find other ways to invest in sustainable practices demand for funding in justice-oriented avenues. Emby noted that the Senate could show its support for the Resolution and the SRE's intentions, as the contract only comes up for renegotiation ever five years, and it will be up for negotiation next month. Barenburg asked how the plan coincides with the Sustainable Action Plan mentioned within the document. Trever responded by saying that the environmental social governances (ESGs) are anticipated to be included in future developments and that transparency with the student body will be continued, and the SRE is asking for this within the Resolution. Hensyel asked if there was an alternative to the Commonfund. Trever stated that the original proposal was sent out to ten larger and local institutions, and that a final pick would come in May 2019 and money would be switched over in the summer if a new investment manager is chosen. Trever noted the importance of the choosing an investment manager that is ethical and that has ESG options. Hensyel asked if they could share the name of the applicants and Trever responded by saying that it was considered proprietary information and that he could not share it with anyone who was not given clearance from the Foundation. Yoshiyama asked where the \$79 million endowment fund would be directed. Emma stated that the Foundation gives that money to Commonfund now, and that Commonfund uses comingled funds and long-term private investments with around 700 companies. Emma mentioned that the returns on that money do fund scholarships and other campus activities, and that a different investment manager would be investing that money into companies that do not use fossil fuels or use positive renewable energy. Barenburg asked for further elaboration on the transparency that was mentioned within the Resolution. Trever responded that it would likely look like the Foundation releasing the name after a choice is made, but that the Foundation is private and is not required to share meeting minutes and other documents. However, Trever expressed that it could be more likely to increase transparency with the support of more students, faculty, and alumni. Makrakis asked if the search was national or global. Trever responded that it was a nationwide search among 10 different institutions with questions to each institution from the Foundation. Eckman stated that the allotted time for the item was over and asked for a motion to extend the conversation. Emby motioned for an extension of debate for five minutes. Ewald seconded (ASWWUSS-19-W-13). Ewald asked if

other schools had done this divestment. Emma stated that quite a few schools have divested from various investments, and she and Trever mentioned Reed College, New York University, San Francisco State University, which has a student-run investment board. Yokuda asked how SRE planned to reach out to the student body to educate them on the issue. Trever talked about tabling in Red Square and a petition that they have passed around. Yoshiyama asked if other clubs on campus support this. Emma and Trever responded with some clubs that did support it, but that there was no written support at that point, and that SRE was thinking about reaching out to more clubs. Schorr added information related to the Resolution. Embly noted that the reason he submitted this agenda item as an Action Item was because it was time sensitive, and if the Senators were to vote on the Resolution at the next meeting, there would be less time to bring the Resolution to the student body. Embly recognized that this was the first time that the Senators were being presented with this Resolution, but that the Senate could pass a motion to adopt the Resolution contingent on edits from the AS Communications Director. Eckman stated that, although he would abstain from a substantive vote, the Senate could vote to on the Resolution. Embly made Motion ASWWUSS-W-14. Romo added that all Senators who voted in favor of the Resolution would have their names included on the Resolution and those who abstained would not.

MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-13 By Embly

To extend the conversation for five minutes.

Second: Ewald

Vote: 21 – 0 – 0

Action: Passed

MOTION ASWWUSS-19-W-14 By Embly

To approve the Resolution contingent on AS Communications Director edits for language to ensure its alignment with other AS resolutions, to be reviewed by one final Google Document with 50% of membership from each constituency.

Second: Hensyel

Vote: 15 – 0 – 3

Action: Passed

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

VII. ACTION ITEMS – Senate*

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS – Senate*

A. AS Student Senate Handout (CSE/Document 4, 5)

Yokuda discussed the [Student Senate handout](#) that was presented at the last meeting and noted that it has been a helpful document for the CSE Senators. Yokuda mentioned that it was well-received by the Chairs of the CSE, as well as the Dean and the Associate Dean, and it facilitated dialogue about the AS and the Student Senate between the Senators and their College. Makrakis noted that it was a great document and it was very helpful. Buss asked where Senators could access the document, and the Senators discussed that the Senate SharePoint site would be a good place for the document so that all Senators

could access the template and edit it in accordance with their constituency and Senator goals.

B. Proposed Subcommittee to Discuss and Formulate the Creation of a Disciplinary Advisory Committee (Huxley/ Document 6)

Noesen discussed Document 6, which is the [Discrimination Complaint Procedure](#), which is a revised procedure as of December 2018. Noesen then claimed that there have been many concerns in Huxley about the way sexual harassment has been handled within the College and at the University. Noesen highlighted that the Provost and Deans are in charge of employee sanctions within the College, and a student conduct officer determines student sanctions. Noesen and Embly had spoken with their Dean about how having student, faculty, and staff voices involved in the process of advising the Provost and the Dean on what kind of sanctions should be given would add more diverse perspectives to the process. Embly added that a subcommittee would help solidify and give strength to those diverse perspectives, as they would be able to provide insight to the Provost and Dean, and would provide more transparency to the decision, as he highlighted was not the case with the sanctions against Huxley Professor Paul Stangl. Ewald asked if the subcommittee would only handle sexual assault/harassment cases. Noesen explained that they hoped that any complaint that would fall under the Discrimination Complaint Procedure would have the advisement of the committee. Barenburg asked if there were confidentiality concerns involved in this. Noesen responded that she and Embly had anticipated any participants on the committee signing a confidentiality agreement that would clearly outline the confidentiality of all cases. Barenburg asked if other Colleges have done this. Noesen responded that they needed to do further research. Romo added that training would be helpful to reduce implicit biases of a Disciplinary Advisory Committee. Wood asked if other Colleges could get involved and Noesen clarified that it would be a University-wide body. Tran asked how students would be selected for the subcommittee. Noesen responded that Senators would participate in the subcommittee to form the proposal for the University-wide subcommittee, but she was not sure how students would be selected. Eckman added that a Disciplinary Advisory Committee could be a standing subcommittee of the Student Senate, and Charge and Charter determining the powers and design of the subcommittee could be presented to the Senate.

C. Proposed Subcommittee to Discuss and Formulate the Creation of a Self-Operating Dining System (At-Large)

Barenburg talked about the formation of a Senate subcommittee a self-operating dining system that she hoped could be running before 2020, when the University's contract with Aramark will be up. Barenburg then highlighted that she and Courtney Yoshiyama would be speaking with Michael Prostka from Students for a Self-Operated Dining System. Ewald asked if the subcommittee take the place of the self-operating system when it would finally be formed. Yoshiyama responded that she and Barenburg imagined that it would be a link for the Student Senate to be aware of the development of a self-

operating dining system, as there is a productive movement among students currently.

D. Discussion of the ASWWU Proposed Constitution (Eckman/Document 8)

Eckman provided background on the [WWU Constitution proposal](#), which contains a redefining of the AS Board of Directors positions and opened the floor for discussion. Noesen claimed that Document 8 was not the most updated version of the Constitution Proposal because the Structural Review Committee had changed some of the details. Noesen mentioned that the Senate Pro-Tempore is a voting member on the Executive Board and non-voting on the Senate, and the Student Union Board was only comprised of one member, so it did not make sense to include it as a separate branch of the AS but rather a subcommittee. Noesen claimed that it would be helpful for Senators to contribute to helping define the powers of the branches. Eckman noted that the current framing of the Senate makes it appear to be an academic body, but it should not be limited to academic concerns, and he encouraged Senators to look at the structure of the Associated Students of Washington State University. Barenburg talked about the by-laws of the AS and suggested that both the by-laws and the Constitution should be updated on a more frequent basis than they currently are. Hensyel reiterated that the Constitution is more difficult to change or ratify than are the by-laws, and the by-laws are more specific. Barenburg responded that the AS needs to consider whether or not it wants the governing information to be within one document or two documents. Buss mentioned that the BOD talked about the possibility of having a meeting with all Senators and the Board of Directors to facilitate dialogue between the bodies. Eckman shared that he hopes that the Constitution becomes the stronger, governing document of the AS since it has to be approved by a student vote and the by-laws can be changed internally. Yokuda mentioned that she believes there should be more of a push for the student body to know the importance of voting on the Constitution and voting in general. Romo noted the success of the REP with the recall election and the re-election for the VP for Business and Operations. Eckman encouraged Senators to look at the document further and to offer input on the structuring of the AS. Hensyel asked about the descriptions of the reformed Executive Board membership and Eckman explained that the AS VP for Business and Operations will no longer be a position, the AS VP for Academic Affairs will be the AS Senate Pro-Tempore, and the AS VP for Student Life will be split between the new positions of AS VP for Sustainability and AS VP for Student Services.

E. Shred the Contract Core Demands (CSE/Document 1, 2, 3)

Yokuda introduced her guest, Michael Prostka, to discuss the Shred the Contract Proposal (Document 1). Protstka stated that they were attending the meeting primarily to spread word and information about the Shred the Contract, a document of core demands from the club of Students for a Self-Operated Dining System. Prostka claimed that the club has concerns with Aramark and the ethics of its business, its monopolization, and its lack of transparency. Yoshiyama asked if the Dining Committee that Prostka had

noted would form by 2020 could be formed sooner since the contract with Aramark will end in 2021. Prostka stated that they are not expecting the year of the committee's formation to change, but that the University will be getting a dining consultant who will be able to discern whether or not a self-operated dining system could work at WWU. Prostka claimed that if the dining consultant believe WWU could have its own dining system, the University may be able to extend its current contract with Aramark by two years and then design the self-operating system in that time period. Koltiska asked what a self-operating system would look like. Prostka stated that the food would not likely change very much, but that the school would eliminate or reduce the role of a third party service and that it could possibly even be a student-run format. Ballard asked about the price range for a self-operating system since students at other schools have had to pay large fees for their food programs. Prostka stated that Shred the Contract was not yet certain about the ending cost and that the club does not have access to the current pricing with Aramark even though it is public information. Schorr commented that there was not much right to negotiate with the third party service about donating leftover food. Barenburg added that she and Yoshiyama will be meeting with Steven Wadesworth to talk about the contract with Aramark. Yoshiyama added that some students have concerns with fruits and vegetables, cultural appropriation of food, and frustration with unchanging food options.

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

X. BOARD REPORTS

Levi Eckman, Interim Senate Pro-Tempore

Eckman shared information about the the Decolonizing Anthropology forum on Wednesday, February 27, 2019 in AH 319, and encouraged Student Senators to attend. Romo added that Senators should look at Sabah's Blog, which has a timeline on the projects and dialogues of the administration.

At-Large

Barenburg shared that, as the Vice-Chair of the Student Senate, she has been trying to meet with Senators to touch base about the work they have been doing and to offer support. Barenburg also mentioned that she and Yoshiyama had a meeting with the Chair of the Committee on Undergraduate Education, Dr. Donna Qualley, who informed them that there is writing proposal to include four mandatory writing classes for all students.

College of Business and Economics

Akelipa reported that ACC has been discussing special topic temporary courses that are not being used as was originally intended by their design. Akelipa then noted that he wanted to reach out to other constituencies to see if they had information on how temporary courses are used in other Colleges.

College of Fine and Performing Arts

CFPA had nothing to report.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

LeClair reported that the “Snowpocalypse” in early-mid February was very difficult for the disabled community, and that students are forced to miss class because the campus is not properly cleared. LeClair herself experienced a dehumanizing experience during the February snow storm. LeClair then shared that they believe that Senators should offer support in any way possible to the disabled community. Romo added that she believes there should be more proactive rather than reactive work within the administration, and that she was glad that LeClair was bringing it up. LeClair expressed frustration with the University because of a lack of support for students with disabilities who have been unable to get around campus and, in some cases, have had to drop out of classes because professors have not been forgiving of their inability to go to class. Ballard asked whether or not the email indicating that students with disabilities who could not get to campus would be excused from class was not accurate information. LeClair claimed that it was a suggestion to professors rather than a hard rule. Hensyel asked if the University was violating the Americans with Disabilities Act. LeClair claimed that the University was able to clear the bare minimum amount of snow. Romo noted that she talked to John Furman about the clearing on campus, and he told her that he had identified with his team the priority areas on campus, but that it is up to a different group of people to determine whether or not the campus closes. LeClair claimed that they know that John’s office have been doing their best, but it is not enough and the University needs to do more. Makrakis claimed that he, and believed all other Senators, supported LeClair. LeClair then claimed that they wanted to consider creating a subcommittee and they planned on bringing this up as an information item at the next meeting. LeClair then mentioned that they and Meerdink attended their first Budget Meeting.

College of Science and Engineering

Tran reported that there has been discussion about including EID language into the evaluation process for tenure reviews. Yokuda talked about possibilities of diversifying the College’s seminar series.

Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies

Fairhaven had nothing to report.

Graduate School

Hensyel reported that the Graduate Senators had been working on a Resolution regarding TA and GA compensation and asked the Senate for support for the Resolution that they would be bringing to the AS Board of Directors on Friday, March 1, 2019. Hensyel stated that he and Schorr were hoping for support from the Senate for the graduate students to be fairly compensated for the work they do. Schorr claimed that she shared the Resolution at the last Senate meeting, and that they will be having a meeting on March 8, 2019 with Melynda Huskey and the Dean of the Graduate School regarding the GA and TA compensation, increases in fess and the cost of living, and how competitively GAs are compensated compared to other Universities in

Washington State relative to cost of living. Schorr highlighted that the treatment of GAs goes against the University's 2019-2025 Strategic Plan, which claims to strive for graduate student affordability and the protection of mental health. Schorr claimed that she would be asking for support of the document both from the Senate and the Board of Directors. Schorr stated that she would upload the document to SharePoint so that Senators can look at it and make comments if they wish before the next Senate meeting. Schorr added that she and Hensyel sent out a communication to graduate students to ask them to respond to the President's blog. Fifty graduate students responded that they are also concerned about the issues addressed in the Resolution. Schorr claimed that the administration responded that it is aware of the issue.

Huxley College of the Environment

Noesen reported that they worked with the academic advisors in Huxley, and students now have a resource page to find further help with scheduling and finding general degree information. They also have a meeting with Rich Brown, the Union negotiator for faculty, to talk about how to include students on personnel committees and evaluation procedures, as well as how to include the Disciplinary Advisory Committee in the language of the Union. Noesen asked for Senators to let her know about any concerns or comments.

Woodring College of Education

Wood reported that she and Hudson sat on the Teacher Professional Education Advisory Board in Woodring and there has been discussion about waterfront land that Western has purchased, and the University will be reaching out to all Colleges about what WWU wants to do with that space, and Wood asked Senators to think about what they would want to see on that land. Wood also mentioned that the forum for students of color on Human Services brought up many concerns to the College.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:19 PM

VOTING ATTENDEES				Senate Pro-Tempore		
Student Senators				21	Levi Eckman, AS VP for Academic Affairs	P
1	Nicole Ballard	At-Large	P	NON-VOTING ATTENDEES		
2	Adah Barenburg	At-Large	P	Advisory		
3	Tatum Buss	At-Large	P	22	Leti Romo, AS Assistant Director for Student Representation and Governance	
4	Courtney Yoshiyama	At-Large	P	Recorder		
5	Jona Akelipa	College of Business and Economics	P	23	Juliet Knowles, AS Board Assistant for Academic Shared Governance	
6	Nicholas Makrakis	College of Business and Economics	P	Guests		
7	Ruth Ewald	College of Fine and Performing Arts	P	24	Brad Johnson, Dean of the College of Science and Engineering	
8	Paden Koltiska	College of Fine and Performing Arts	P	25	Jeff Young, Faculty Senate Executive Member	
9	Luke LeClair	College of Humanities and Social Sciences	P	26	Rich Van Den Hul, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs	
10	Laura Meerdink	College of Humanities and Social Sciences	P	27	Sue Guenter-Schlesinger, Vice Provost for Equal Opportunity and Employment Diversity	
11	Nina-Tuyen Tran	College of Science and Engineering	P	28	Emma Nordland, Students for Renewable Energy	
12	Kelly Yokuda	College of Science and Engineering	P	29	Trever Mullins, Students for Renewable Energy	
13	Dayjha McMillan	Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies	P	30	Cole Sandmofer, Western Front	
14	Sarah Soulliere	Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies	P			
15	Phillip Hensyel	Graduate School	P			
16	Anna Schorr	Graduate School	P			
17	Riley Embly	Huxley College of the Environment	P			
18	Maya Noesen	Huxley College of the Environment	P			
19	Hudson Fox	Woodring College of Education	P			Voting attendees 19
20	Nicole Wood	Woodring College of Education	P			Non-voting attendees 9
Voting members in attendance			19	TOTAL ATTENDEES		28

*This Senator arrived to the meeting late and participated in discussion following Action Items – Guests. Ballard was not present for the vote of motion ASWWUSS-19-W-14.

ASWWUSS-19-W-14		
Nicole Ballard	At-Large	--
Adah Barenburg	At-Large	Y
Tatum Buss	At-Large	Y
Courtney Yoshiyama	At-Large	Y
Jona Akelipa	College of Business and Economics	Y
Nicholas Makrakis	College of Business and Economics	Abstain
Ruth Ewald	College of Fine and Performing Arts	Y
Paden Koltiska	College of Fine and Performing Arts	Y
Luke LeClair	College of Humanities and Social Sciences	Y

Laura Meerdink	<i>College of Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	Y
Nina-Tuyen Tran	<i>College of Science and Engineering</i>	Y
Kelly Yokuda	<i>College of Science and Engineering</i>	Abstain
Dayjha McMillan	<i>Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies</i>	--
Sarah Soulliere	<i>Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies</i>	Y
Phillip Hensyel	<i>Graduate School</i>	Y
Anna Schorr	<i>Graduate School</i>	Y
Riley Embly	<i>Huxley College of the Environment</i>	Y
Maya Noesen	<i>Huxley College of the Environment</i>	Y
Hudson Fox	<i>Woodring College of Education</i>	--
Nicole Wood	<i>Woodring College of Education</i>	Y
Levi Eckman	<i>Interim Senate Pro-Tempore</i>	Abstain