



## Western Washington University Associated Students

### AS Board of Directors

April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2019

VU 567

**Board Members:** *Present:* Millka Solomon (President), Levi Eckman (VP for Academic Affairs), Nate Jo (VP for Business and Operations), Camilla Mejía (VP for Diversity), Natasha Hessami (VP for Governmental Affairs).

*Absent:* Millka Solomon (President), Anne Lee (VP for Student Life), Ama Monkah (VP for Activities)

**Advisor:** Leti Romo (Assistant Director for Student Representation & Governance)

**Secretary:** Grace Drechsel (Board Assistant for Representation Committees)

**Guest(s):**

### Motions:

**ASB-19-S-7** Approval of the minutes from April 5<sup>th</sup>.

**ASB-19-S-8** To approve the AS Committee Charge and Charter Policy with minor language changes.

**ASB-19-S-9** To approve all committee appointments.

*Millka Solomon, AS President, called the meeting to order at [insert time].*

### I. Approval of Minutes

*MOTION ASB-19-S-7 By Hessami*  
Approval of the minutes from April 5<sup>th</sup>.

*Second: Jo*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Action: Passed*

### II. Revisions to the Agenda

To change the ASWWU Constitution Document to the most recent version that was discussed in Structural Review Committee today.

### III. Public Forum (*comments from students and the community*)

### IV. Information Items - Guests

A. Rich Brown, United Faculty of Western Washington

Brown introduced himself as the President of UFWW at Western. In light of the discussion at Faculty Senate on the topic of racial slurs in the classroom, he was present to answer questions pertaining to UFWW and what they do. UFWW is the faculty union which does not include staff. They primarily focus on salary, benefits and working conditions for faculty at Western. The CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement) is a 5-year

contract that will be re-negotiated next spring. Brown explained that the union is fairly recent, it was formed in 2006 and the first CBA was 2008. He explained that shared governance is different than a union. The UFWW works primarily with the administration.

The contract is negotiated with the administration and rules are set that all faculty agrees to work by. Once the contract is signed, the UFWW's role is to work as a referee and make sure that all the rules are applied equally and fairly to all faculty across campus, even those not a part of the union. The UFWW has a legal responsibility for fair representation of all faculty. The administration of WWU are the judges, i.e. they decide the discipline. The Union is not there to arbitrate or protect any faculty members who act inappropriately or violate the CBA. The university uses "progressive discipline" based on a restorative justice model, which is a 5-step process. However, the university can make an argument to skip through steps. Disciplinary action must reasonably fit the offense.

Hessami said that Section 19 talks about how the university should tailor discipline to respond to the "nature and severity" of the offense. She asked who makes the decision on the severity. Brown said that the administration makes that decision. Hessami said that that is where a lot of students have an issue with how this all works. There has been a far greater response to a MAGA hat being stolen on campus than racist vandalism a few months back. She asked Brown to speak to this issue. Brown said that it is a misperception that WWU can't address these issues because the union is stopping it, as the union has no say in disciplinary action.

Ballard clarified what "administration" means. Brown answered deans, VP's, provosts, and the President.

Eckman asked if the union ever proactively bargains things into agreements in response to actions on campus or the climate of campus as a whole. Brown said that UFWW will put out an email to all faculty asking what they are interested in bargaining for. Eckman asked if prohibiting the use of racial slurs in the classroom is something that UFWW could bring to the bargaining agreement next spring. Brown answered yes, they could frame it as a faculty responsibility to be aware of the students in the room and communicate effectively with them.

Brown added that the UFWW can collaborate with the Faculty Senate to change the Faculty Code of Ethics.

Hessami asked more about "progressive discipline". She asked if discipline is public information, because students want to know if any discipline is taking place. Brown said that it is illegal to disclose that because of Employee privacy. It is also frustrating on the faculty side of things because Brown has the obligation to evaluate every faculty. There can be faculty who have been disciplined for offenses but the people voting on their tenure have no way of knowing. He said that only the faculty union can grieve issues to the administration. Leti Romo asked about the faculty members who don't feel safe on this campus. Brown said that is out of the union's realm; its purpose is to protect departmental and college sovereignty.

Hessami told Brown that the College of Science and Engineering has continually cited the union as a reason for inaction to student issues. Brown said this is very frustrating for him and UFWW.

Mejía inquired further about how working with marginalized students counts as “service” for a faculty. Brown said that faculty is evaluated on teaching, creative activity, and service. All the faculty in each department decide what will “meet”, “exceed”, or “does not meet” these requirements. The Union has nothing to do with that.

B. Made to Waste Coffee Cup Initiative

Students Zach and Victoria came to the meeting to present their potential ballot initiative. Their idea was to separate the price of the beverage at coffee stands on campus from the price of the cup. However, they stated that they would like to withdraw this idea as a ballot initiative because they were advised not to.

Eckman asked if their advisor offered any alternative. The student answered yes, he said that they could go straight to housing and dining and talk to them about this idea. He believes that it will be a productive conversation. If they say no, then next year it will all be on the ballot. Eckman said that this could be strategy to get students to wait until next year’s spring elections, which would give them a whole year’s advantage to shirk student voices.

Mejía expressed that she sees this as a powerful and awesome initiative that would hold even more weight with the support of a student vote.

The presenters explained their proposal through a PowerPoint. They discussed how a 25 cent fee to buy a cup would be impactful because it demonstrates the student choice TO produce waste. They talked about a “shadow cost” and how what something is worth and the impact it makes, such as a paper coffee cup, is more than just dollars and cents.

**VII. Action Items - Board**

A. AS Committee Charge and Charter Policy

*MOTION ASB-19-W-8 by Jo*

To approve the AS Committee Charge and Charter Policy with minor language changes.

*Second: Eckman*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Action: Passed.*

**VIII. Information Items - Board**

A. AS Local Lobby Day Agenda

Jo asked about the “Environmental Stewardship” section and was concerned with potential financial burden on the everyday Bellingham resident. Hessami said that this has been taken into account and in practice, consumers will not be absorbing the cost.

B. ASWWU Constitution

Eckman asked about the difference between B1 and C1 in the document, specifically the differences between university administrative governance and university governance structures. Hessami answered that since the Executive Board deals with administration, this is a way to not limit the powers of the Senate – having administrative language shows

the direction of where their interactions should focus on. She specified that university and administrative governance is Presidents and VPs.

Eckman also questioned the idea of the Executive Board having the power to make recommendations to faculty or administration. He worried about giving students false hope when recommendations are not always taken. He also wondered what shared governance really means.

Hessami said that this document should definitely go to the deans of different colleges for review. Eckman agreed and said that he will take it to Dean's Council.

Hessami said that the purpose of the language is to delineate areas of expertise between the Executive Board and Senate, not limit either body. Maybe language needs to be added somewhere that says the language in this Constitution is not limiting.

Tatum Buss, Senator-At-Large, said that the Senate and Executive Board need to be equal, but not limiting.

C. MCC Board Assistant

Mejía brought to the Board the idea of having a Board Assistant for Diversity and the Multicultural Center. She said it would be beneficial to have this position as a regular Board Assistant, not just for a set amount of time.

Eckman agreed that this position needs to be funded. He recommended taking a look at all of the Board Assistant positions now and seeing how some of the responsibilities can be condensed.

**IX. Consent Items** (*subject to immediate action*)

A. Committee Appointments

*MOTION ASB-19-W-9 by Eckman*

To approve all committee appointments.

*Second: Hessami*

*Vote: 4-0-0*

*Action: Passed.*

**X. Board Reports**

**Nate Jo, VP for Business and Operations,** stated that they have been working on the AS Wage Determination Taskforce, as well as meeting with Jeremy and Justin concerning the AS website.

**Levi Eckman, VP for Academic Affairs** stated that Faculty Senate will be releasing a statement concerning academic freedom and the use of racial slurs in the classroom. He said that they are also working to changing DEP, or Department Evaluation Program. Faculty give other faculty evaluations, but they are only allowed to evaluate things specifically outlined in the DEP. Less than 1/3 of colleges have hate speech outlined in their DEP. McNeel Janson is also in support of changing this.

**Natasha Hessami, VP for Governmental Affairs** stated that campaigning has started for the new Executive Board positions. She said that it is not explicitly stated in the Election Code whether or not AS employees can like or share social media pages of candidates for the Executive Board election. Hessami stated that her personal opinion is that a like/follow to a social media page doesn't constitute an endorsement – it's just a student staying up to date on what is going on with candidates. She said that sharing is a grey area in the Election Code and could be perceived as an endorsement.

*Nate Jo, VP for Business and Operations, adjourned this meeting at 6:27pm.*

DRAFT