



Western Washington University Associated Students Sustainability Equity & Justice Fund Meeting Minutes

February 28, 2022, 5:00 PM

Attendees:

Committee Members: Laura Wagner, Glory Busic, Grace Wang, Zinta Lucans, Rahma Iqbal, Rosa Edwards, Roman Vieira, Johnathan Riopelle, Charles Barnhart, Anna Phippen, Jose Ortuzar

Guests: Javareah Owens, Eduardo Toledo, Jalen Thibou, Brandon Joseph

Staff and Assistants: Delfine DeFrank, Jennifer Black

Motions:

Laura Wagner, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:03 PM

I. CONSENT ITEMS

- a. Approval of the Minutes – Minutes were not approved due to time limitations

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

- a.

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. **Strengthening Experiences for Black and Brown Men at Western Washington University**

- a. **Javareah Owens** – Welcome everybody to our presentation. It's about strengthening experiences for black and brown men at Western Washington, Me, Eddie and Jalen are founding members of our club, which is called the Black and Brown Male Success Collective. With that being said, we'll just dive right into what our groups about. The black and brown male success collective is a research affinity group, and it was based off branding creating it. It was based basically to improve retention and graduation rates. That is kind of what his study went into when he also recognizes group on different campuses. SO that's kind of what the small background in terms of why it's a research group and when Brandon founded it. It particularly pertain to Wester and was very intriguing because of as you guys can see, the statistics for students of color at Western and how it gets even smaller when you go into majors and like

specific fields and everything and how that these numbers could be so small that you could feel a little alone, you know, which is why when we came with this group and we all gathered together around one of the first meetings and got to like, chat, talk, meet up and be able to like, interact with one another, we came up with the founding principles and it was just like academic excellence, exploring healthy masculinity, cultural identity development and cross cultural connection, community service, learning, holistic well-being. We came to those principles because of the simple fact that being on a campus that is predominantly white and not allow students of color, you need, you know, a few resources, whether it's to make you feel more at home or make you feel like you belong or make it seem like you have a sense of community around yourself. SO that also is why Brandon and Lucas, who is our other advisor in our group, they kind of implement. We have this intergenerational mentorship model. Where is we learn from them, they learn from us and it always everything is tabled between the two. As in, when opportunities come up or if we need mentorship on whether we're planning an event as a group or individual because all of us branch out to a lot of different clubs that we get access to resources like this until like advisors. So, because of the simple fact that we don't have a lot of models like this on campus, and yeah, and we'll move on from there.

- b. Jalen Thibou** – The main premise of this trip is going to be the many color national summit. It's going to be hosted at Clemson University, April 21st and 22nd. The annual summit is really just focused on supporting students and helping them thrive, whether that be education, career development, or just being leaders. We will have the opportunity to learn from different leaders within the community, whether they're business professionals, educators, or government officials. The summit itself is going to have a lot of different aspects to it. There will be 10 total keynote speakers along with structured workshops, breakouts, and discussions. Some of those workshops centering around the topic of light, mentorship, unconscious bias, and career development. Outside of the summit itself we would also like to maximize the trip, the trip will also have the opportunity to go to Atlanta, GA and do some cultural interventions and do some of that, going to HBC and use the Kings Institute National Center for Civil and Human Rights and then also having some social outings to strengthen relationships, not only within or group, but the relationships

that we have back here at the campus itself. I would like to highlight that though this research has proven that cultural excursions and experiences support retention, persistence, and graduation rates not only in high school students but with college students as well.

- c. **Eduardo Toledo** – I will just briefly go over the budget on what we estimate that this trip is going to cost. First and foremost, we have the student and advisor conference registrations at \$125 and \$225 and after that, of course, is airfare, and lodging, lodging for both Clemson and Atlanta. We are estimating that lodge in a Clemson is going to be about \$169 plus taxes and fees and Atlanta \$244. With the size of the group that we are bringing, we are also hoping to get a rental van for 15 passengers, which will be around \$1,700, with gas to estimated cost for travel at about \$135 for a full tank of gas. Also, we got the food stipend and the miscellaneous spending as Jalen has already explained. There is some cultural excursions and social outings that we are looking into though these aren't definitive as it is relying on whether or not we get funding for this trip and the consensus of the group. We will talk about sustainability, equity, and justice fund and how our trip meets the four pillars. First, I would like to touch on the creating economic vitality district in investing in the professional growth of every single person on this trip, but also the growth of people on campus. The conference will provide the opportunity to network and build relationships with industry professionals and with other students from around the country. We will also be able to talk about our experience and promote future enrollment to not only our club, but Western as well. It's also important to build a strong alumni base for men of color at Western because students can reach out for advice, help navigating college life, professional life, anything really. It's hard being a person of color on a predominantly white campus, but even some of the men of color here on campus are first generation students, and it is really hard. It was really hard for myself as a first generation college student. Si, having that alumni base would have been awesome to have when I first started here at Western. The fact that there is a community feeling within the club and Western where you know they can feel comfortable reaching out to the intergenerational models, what Javareah was saying plays into effect. Second, promote human health. There is a feeling of reassurance when you know that university is vested into your success as a student but stands behind their commitment

to diversity and inclusion. These funds will do just that. The other personal and professional well-being of men of color, by funding these strips, the students don't have to worry about working extra shifts or hours to be able to go to an amazing opportunity to be in a space where you're in a room full of people that look just like us. People who are there to learn and grow. You know, they don't have to worry about missing now and having a bad college experience. This is the perfect opportunity to promote a positive campus experience and for our students who really reciprocate that feeling to others as well.

- d. Jalen Thibou** – Next I will look at protecting local and global ecology. When we talk about the ecology, it is all about relationships, not only in our group or with Western, but with our personal identities and being able to take pride in that and bring that back towards the communities and groups that were a part of up here at the school. My understanding, the part that we plan in those communities as well. So, with this fund, it definitely helps build that trust that way trust between the institution and students towards the sustainable ecosystem. Then also just having that support ensures that institutional influence contributes to the thriving of men of color. It is good to know that when students are able to see value in a trip like that and see the benefits that it would have and have that validation not only emotionally, but financially from the institution itself, that definitely goes towards building that sustainable ecosystem that we're talking about. Then when we talk about upholding social equity, mainly I wanted to highlight that you know a trip like this more times than not when you look throughout history, this type of trip is more accessible to white counterparts, and it is harder for PLC or more difficult. PLC has the financial stability to be able to go on this just in general, but as a college student and then when you build in that I mean all three of us on this call are first generation college students as well. So, having that financial support from the university itself definitely goes towards combating that systemic racism in the ways that we see it taking effect to our communities today. It helps build that sense of belonging up here on this campus when you actually do feel validated in the value and the experiences that you would want to see that aren't generally accessible up here. One just being able to be in a room or an area that looks just like you. I think over in South Carolina it is over 50% of people of color out there and so that is not something that is accessible up here

on this campus. So, being able to just be in that room is something that could be beneficial even outside all the aspects of the summit itself. And like we said, you know, investing in the experience of BIPOC students. It definitely shows that commitment to social equity that westerners have been preaching these last few years.

- e. **Javareah Owens** – I'll talk about mainly what really brings everybody's attention of how exactly this trip will come back and have a direct campus impact because I feel like that is a very important step and I will say this that first I will draw back on the past of what events like this and like certain situations could bring back just in terms of like information in unity. I would say that we even through an event during the height of the pandemic, I don't know if you guys got to attend or not, but it produced hundred of attendees. Attendees or students, parents, faculty, staff, alumni, the president of our institution, actually attended and was in. I can attest to my personal workshop and he got to really see how to unite his faculty and teachers to students and improve their relationships in terms of the experience is the students have been through. So, just like that, overall, going back on campus and having that sense of unity really created a better community and a bettering understanding of like connection between students itself, let alone the faculty and staff and students. Then also just how this trip and visiting HBCU, for instance, will allow us to draw from their methods or how they have this really great glue for their group, how everybody is in tune. Especially like faculty and staff because they not only look like each other, but also feel comfortable to share their general interest whether it is academically or within their lives and how it will allow us to bring these methods back to Western and introduce them to our students that allow our students to be more unified as a whole and that allow everybody to build on certain connections and just allow the facts to actually end up going way past any of our time here at Western. Also, I want to talk about how Jalen and Eddie serve on DI committees themselves and how within their committees they have multiple board members that are on BSU, ACC and other clubs and how they use this trip will allow them to advance their leadership techniques using their own respective clubs as well as bringing our club closer. I also want to talk about how we are all products of Western at the end of the day, when we graduate, we are alumni of this school and how this trip will allow for not only us, who's specifically will go on it to draw from these

experiences, but from the ripple and domino effect that it would create once we implement certain methods into our campus. I would like to attest to experiences, I don't know if you guys were specifically on the committee at this time but the African Caribbean Club a few years ago because of the pandemic reasons when to a conference in Florida and it was similar to the conference we are trying to go to now actually and it allowed them to take certain actions on our campus and they use methods they learned from other respective schools on how to approach the committees at our school, and they actually implemented change. It was about renaming buildings at Western and how to dedicate certain things to show that we are community, we are all on the same page. We are all united. They petitioned and they got to share their opinions and they were heard and showed how Western supported them through the methods that they learned on this trip that they went on they were able to approach specific problems they didn't know how to approach. I hope that we can go. We're moving on to our personal testimonies, and I just want to say for myself that I am a fourth-year senior I'm in multiple clubs. I was in ACC BSU, I'm a bio molec and cell major. I'm in pre Med club and I just can say that this trip will allow me to really benefit from seeing how diverse relations are created and how they're sustainable and how it can go beyond us being at Western and when I come back to know that it didn't just disappear again that I actually made an impact and these methods lived long after I've been there brings a true sense at home and community on our campus and establishes a connection with others and makes our campus a better environment for a variety of students and for future students. So, I just want to say at the end of the day to be proud to say that we were supported through our time here at Western and that we know our future students, whether it's our kids, whether it's their kids, whether it's our friends, kids are all supported, including when they come to our school.

- f. **Jalen Thibou** – Myself being up here at Western, I've just been trying to be as involved as I can. I come with things that I think are really impactful to students up here at the school. When you come into the institution you really want to leave, you know a positive influence and look back and say like Javareah saying, you were proud to be part of the community, but you're a part of the things that you do withing the community. I look at, you know, my little brother, for instance, I know he's going to come up

here at some point. I mean it is a possibility that he will come up here in the next three years when he graduates high school. So, being on some of these different committees it has been something I really wanted to be a part of, and then I know that this trip itself will be really beneficial cause I've been on both sides of a summit like this one. Being able to attend the Highline College Summit a few years back and then being the project manager for a building this last summer, which is an event that is put on annually so that we can get younger individuals like high schoolers in this stem and more specifically supply chain early on and help them build some of those foundations. Not only educationally, but then giving them the resources on how they can get funding to get to higher education as well. SO I know that being able to go on this trip would be beneficial.

- g. Eduardo Toledo** – I know we are out of time but I just wanted to finish this off by saying that I do believe that just a trip like this would provide an invaluable experience to everyone who goes on this trip. You know, thinking about it, fighting for social justice is just no easy task. As we take a beating emotionally, mentally, and spiritually and oftentimes not find success, the three of us, were in the midst of the fight, but there are young men in the club that their fight is just starting. It is important for everyone to remember why and what it is that we're fighting for. Visiting historical sites reaffirms that we should not give up because our heroes started or resistance and some gave up their lives for the fight. It is a journey to reach the mountain top, that Dr. King famously said. You are able to have a deeper connection to the cause to the past and provide the opportunity to establish a deeper and fuller appreciation as expressed. This experience will absolutely be an invaluable experience and thank you for your consideration.
- h. Rahma Iqbal** – I don't have any questions, but I did want to say it is really nice to see people of color using this fund for themselves and taking advantage of what exists at the school. I think everything looks great. I'm pretty much in approval.
- i. Glory Busic** – I am speaking as myself right now, but not as Jasmine. I attended the workshop that you all hosted, and I thought it was great and I'm excited about this proposal to, but I have no questions.
- j. Roman Vieira** – I don't have much to comment. I thought the presentation was great, I read the application and I saw that you guys were supposed to go in 2020, I believe, who was supposed to fund you?

- k. **Jalen Thibou** – I know that we got approved, but I don't think it was through this fund. We had a meeting with this committee before and we were denied funds. I don't know if Brandon can confirm that. He is on the call.
- l. **Brandon Joseph** – We actually did get a \$5,000 approval from SEJF. There was another fund we were seeking that we got denied and then counseling health and wellness, my program student resiliency at the time it was men's resiliency, which is mental health promotion and such, we were going to subsidize the rest of the trip and literally COVID hit like 2 weeks before we were about to go. SEJF did approve \$5,000 at that time.
- m. **Charles Barnhart** – No questions, I just want to mention that I am good friends with a professor at Clemson. He's a director of sustainability there and so if you get this award, let me know and I can hook you up with some connections.
- n. **Rosa Edwards** – I read through your application, I saw that in the metrics section where you judge the effectiveness of the project, so to speak, or the visit, it'll be based on qualitative interviews with attendees, and I was just wondering who would be conducting these interviews? Not that it's incredibly important, but I'm curious whether you have somebody designated for that already.
- o. **Brandon Joseph** – Yes, that would be myself. Part of my research currently focuses on a theory called critical self-authorship, which you're probably alluding to. Which kind of is rooted in sense of belonging but essentially self-authorship asking how do we become ourselves? How are we able to show up authentically but historically, self-authorship is rooted in a very white space, and it doesn't always take into account the racial dynamics of students, and so the critical component inserts critical race theory into self-authorship, and it essentially asked, ok, how do myself and I identify as a racialized student on this historically white campus. How can I show up authentically myself SO when I think of our students that we work with they speak about those feelings of isolation. Being the only one in their classes, so if I'm the only black man in my class, everywhere I go, can I show up authentically as a black man or do I have to mask, the way I move in order to conform with the campus culture. So, I would be the one to conduct these interviews. My dissertation was rooted in critical self-authorship and indigenous methodologies, which essentially also says that even though for instance

I'm talking to Jalen for instance, I'm at the basket in Muskogee Creek, so native, we don't have a shared racialized identity. However, as men of color on this campus, we have a shared identity, and we can kind of have a more authentic conversation about what it's like to be that to carry those social identities on this campus. To answer your question long windily, I would be conducting those interviews.

- p. Jose Ortuzar** – I don't have any questions, I just want to share that it is impactful what you all are doing and to keep doing the good work, because I think this institution really needs some students to be advocating for these types of things and using these resources for exactly this type of work that you all are doing. Congratulations
- q. Laura Wagner** – I really loved the application, especially just adding on going to really important cultural and historical sites on top of going to the summit, I thought that was a really nice thing. Just if you're already down there and you could explore that, being able to do that. I do have one question just out of curiosity, I saw that y'all talked about exploring healthy masculinity and obviously I'm not involved in those types of conversations that men have about. So, I was wondering what those conversations look like for y'all. I saw that it was also a theme for this even as well. What does that look like for y'all and what are some realizations y'all have had?
- r. Eduardo Toledo** – I think in our group that is one of our main pillars is healthy masculinity. I think where we go into the definition of what that means to be honest with oneself about your own feelings, needs and desires, but also means treating all of the others with kindness and respect that you deserve. It's not using your size, strength, or power to get what you want from others. In the group we worked with combat historically notions of masculinity, by having open conversations such as about mental health, self-compassion, love and many other topics, that are rarely spoken in our households or really just anywhere. If you talk about having self-love that is a conversation that a lot of you don't hear a lot of people having out there. Really, it's a matter of there is a stigma of men are men, they can't show weakness or cry. So it is really just tearing all of that apart and really being vulnerable with one another by having these conversations from all of your experiences, having speaking on this conversation with Brandon or Lucas about how they're raising their children, how we were raised, all of those conversations really help us

understand who we are and how we identify in terms of, I do realize that I grew up in a toxic environment and that isn't who I want to be. That isn't how I want to raise my family. That is just some of the realizations that personally I've had in the group.

- s. **Jalen Thibou** – I would highlight the fact that we have Brandon and Lucas as a part of the group and before we had more administrators and professors that would come and join us in the group every week and so being able to have that like intergenerational mentorship model within the group itself is like, I can't go to my dad and talk about certain things, I could write, but it feels more comfortable to do it with somebody outside and get a different perspective from somebody who is not my father. I do like when we're able to talk about how we grew up to talk about fatherhood talk about us as adults, adolescents, and how it's played into who we are right now. Then also I think a big portion of it too is moving away from or dialing down racial dynamics as well, because historically it has been like a white patriarchy that has, been holding down or has negative impacts on a lot of different communities, and breaking that down into specific racial groups and how we see different areas of opportunities for us to build on, just like personal growth and development as we were trying to be leaders up here on this campus and so on and so forth after we're done and graduated.
- t. **Javareah Owens** – Besides learning how to deal within ourselves is how to deal with our feelings of feeling isolated on a predominantly white campus. How do you deal with your emotions and at the same time how do you handle all you're juggling? Your family is not here. This is all we have our group. Like Jalen said, I can't even go to someone in my house, well I can, but it won't be the same as if I go to somebody else. Basically, working within ourselves to be ourselves is a big thing in our group. Every time we meet, we show up. It is nice having Brandon and Lucas there in our group because every day we show up in no matter what is going on in your life, Brandon and Lucas make sure to say hey, like we do check ins. Like before we start our meetings and he's like how are you showing up today? Because at the end of the day, we have to show up to things whether we feel isolated or not and to be able to know how to deal with these feelings and know what you're not the only one having these feelings when you're being in certain places, not only on campus, but if

you want to go into classrooms or in stores, the mall. How do you deal with these certain things?

- u. **Brandon Joseph** - These conversations and that vulnerability doesn't happen without trust and relationships and that is kind of one of the pillars of this. If this trip is able to continue to grow those relationships, I've shared tears with these guys and those things don't happen in normal patriarchal systems, right? So, the fact that we trust in one another that we can be vulnerable to that extent, I think says a lot about our group and how we've been able to build it based off of being together and being able to experience things together.
 - v. **Laura Wagner** – Thank you everyone for such thoughtful answers.
- b. Laura Wagner – Charter and Bylaws**
- a. **Laura Wagner** – I wanted to provide an update that the simple majority language got approved. So, now it is six voting members. Something that I noticed when talking to Zinta is that due to institutional shifts, Johnathan was a member last year because he had Zinta's position but due to shifts and the new position he technically isn't a member right now. So, I was just going to double check everyone is ok if I add Johnathan and his position to non-voting members.
 - b. **Johnathan Riopelle** – I am not entirely sure that is accurate because what happened was not as simple as a position shift, but it was a renaming, and it was two years ago. I think all of the SEJF individuals are in this charge and charter, but the names are incorrect. I am concerned about that.
 - c. **Laura Wagner** – I went through with Zinta and the old charter had positions that no longer existed anymore, but the program coordinator position had the right language, but the program manager wasn't on there at all. I am just going to try and add it to the non-voting members so that it reflects what exists right now.
- c. Zinta Lucan – SEJF Grants – Committee Voting**
- a. **Johnathan Riopelle** – There are two items that are set to be voted on, one of which is the medium grant proposal period postal.
 - b. **Zinta Lucans** – I would like to briefly start this brief discussion by recognizing that most of us are new to how SEJF works, myself included. So, it is completely within your rights to ask questions if you don't understand something or what the process might look like. I understand some committee members have voiced that they're still a little unsure

about what we will be voting for today and that specifically thinking about the difference between voting for a large grant and an abstract as opposed to a large grant final application. For voting each of there are three different kinds of grants, small, medium, and large. I wanted to fast forward to the large grants because that is what we are going to be talking about mostly today. Large grants, so anything over \$35,000, they follow the same general review process as small and medium grants, but they're more in depth just because of the sheer size of the grants. That is primarily why the process is split up into two sections. This is a meeting with the grant abstract and then the final application, and we'll go over that in the following slides. Again, all of that information will be available to you afterwards, so don't worry if I skipped over something's I know that you're not supposed to create PowerPoint slides that say word for word what I say out loud, but I did this just today for ultimate clarity because I want to send this to you for transparency so you can reference it. So, bear with me. As you saw from the previous flow chart, I just showed the process for a large grant application is much lengthier and more complicated than for the other two grant sizes. More research, thought and effort go into writing a large grant and more thought is needed in reviewing a grant of this size for the committee. Therefore, we split it up into sections, teams first submit a grant abstract. In the abstract, they mostly focus on value propositions so they attempt to answer questions such as these would be the project for who the impacted audience is wise. This project even important and needed how does it align with the mission of SEJF? Because we ask, the team should focus on value proposition in their abstracts We then committee members are mainly thinking about value when they review it. The point isn't to have all your questions answered, but rather it's an opportunity for teams to express the main idea of their project. It's up to the committee to determine a couple of things at this stage, such as does it fall within the mission of SEJF? Does it promote sustainability? Should it be funded? And these are all value leading questions. It's should and why instead of asking, can we fund it? So the committee at this point isn't thinking too much about viability and how the project will be implemented, that is for the full application to consider. When a team submits a full application, they're now focusing on details, taking into a consideration initial feedback from the committee. They're thinking mostly about what the

budget is, what a realistic timeline looks like, who are the stakeholders that must be engaged, and at this point, teams reach out and collaborate with all of the necessary stakeholders to be sure that the project is ready to be implemented. If it is approved there is a lot of details that go into that. Because we asked them to focus on viability for the final application, committee members are also then mainly thinking about viability when reviewing a final application. At this point, value has already been determined to be present in the project, and now committee members are determining the completeness of the plan. The information provided realistic have the correct people been involved the process of planning it? No you're asking the question, can this happen instead of should it happen? I think the point that is somewhat difficult to understand is this, the value alignment of the project with the SEJF mission should remain present in unchanged from the approved abstract. This is the core element that carries over from the abstract and it has to remain consistent between the abstract and the final application. That means that committee members take into account the value of a project even when voting for the final application. The point we're trying to make here is that since value has already been identified in the abstract, the vote for a final application can't actually nullify the approved vote for the abstract, no matter who the approving authority was. Regardless of that, your vote will ultimately decide on whether that project receives funding.

- c. **Jose Ortuzar** – Just to clarify it for the last time students are voting on value and viability in this upcoming vote, yes or no?
- d. **Zinta Lucans** – based on the presentation yes, it is all combined. They work together into the final deciding factor I think the main point is that we are not able to nullify what vote already did happen.
- e. **Jose Ortuzar** – If a student is not comfortable with the value, they can only vote no based on viability or can a student vote against it because of value reasons and I'm asking this question because this feels like a point that I've been trying to get thought this committee for the past couple of weeks and we had a meeting with Grace and Zinta and Melissa Nelson and Eric Alexander and Delphine, and we made this exact point that students should be allowed to vote for both and by you saying that they can't nullify the other vote is kind of coercing students to not vote no based on value.

- f. Johnathan Riopelle** – The abstract is an opportunity to ascertain if the grant project would be in alignment with the SEJF mission, and in general with the Sustainability and the SFP. You are not saying, do I value you this, or is it valuable, you're asking is there value alignment. That is pretty specific and narrow lens through which to understand because again you were not asking what you think, we're asking do you think this aligns with the mission of the SEJF, and if that is determined. That is set aside, and then we're looking at a project that looks complete and thorough and makes sense. The budgets great, the timing is realistic, we can say yes based on when this will happen, students will be on campus, for example, right? So you're saying this is something that can be done and will be done in a way that will be effective. So the question about value alignment has already been determined and so the expectation and the hope is people say, well that's decided now. We're going to talk about this and one of the reasons that I think tremendously important is because the program is asking the student team to answer the first question. Value alignment in the abstract and answer the second question, which is the viability in the final application and so if you're looking for an answer that the student team hasn't been given the opportunity to provide within the given document, you know that becomes an issue of fairness and so that doesn't align with the process that we've currently established it again with the goal of giving the student teams an opportunity to get this right.
- g. Jose Ortuzar** – Johnathan you were not at the meeting with Melissa Nelson, Zinta, and Grace were, and we specifically went over this point over and over again about saying how because students weren't able to vote on the abstract that for this special location, we were going to have students vote about value and viability. I am just letting you know Johnathan that has already been agreed upon by all of those parties and in the bylaws it states pretty clearly that students can vote for value and viability, and that the value question has not been predetermined as you would like to say.
- h. Johnathan Riopelle** - I've obviously got a couple of concerns about that. I know that I can't speak to that event because that meeting, I wasn't even invited to it, even though I'm the manager of the program. So, that was a disappointment, Salovey. Now as for the bylaws, I am fully aware that the bylaws were out of date and they do not express things as they've

been done in the past five or six years. So, I do have some real reservations about falling back on them.

- i. **Grace Wang** – My take away from the meeting with the attorney general, Zinta, Eric, Delphine, Jose and myself was that although the process to how we got here might have been flawed, my take home message with Melissa Nelson, the assistant Attorney general, really drove home, is that is encouraged us to move forward and that here's a change to make things right by considering the merits of the proposals without being tied to any preconceived notions. We may, for various reasons I feel that from all perspectives that this is unfair, your voice wasn't heard, my voice wasn't heard, you have louder voice, you have more power. I think one thing that Melissa really encouraged us to do is to really move beyond that, and the three grants we're considering today; all of these grants have been approved before, hence a precedent has already been set that these proposals do meet the values of the SEJF and I am a little bit uncomfortable saying that's exactly what Jose said was the outcome. I took an entirely different message and I don't want to put you, Zinta, on the spot, or Delphine, but that's what I got out of it and I know I come from a place of privilege with having been probably the longest tenured person here on this meeting but that institutional member is actually kind of important but moving on beyond that, these proposals have been approved in various forms of the SEJF so clearly the value of these has already been established. I mean like as a precedent.
- j. **Jose Ortuzar** – I am sorry, I have a couple more questions surrounding that. I don't think that we need to completely just say, oh, the value has been predetermined. Therefore, students can base the value. Students can't vote based on value. I think that isn't something that we came up with in the meeting and I also think that we can obviously discuss this out of this committee meeting but again I just want to reiterate that we came to an agreement in that meeting saying that students will be allowed to vote for value and viability. So, I just want to make that point extremely clear that regardless of all of these anecdotal information's I again reiterate that was the agreement that we came to So I want to just let every student member know that they will be allowed to vote for value and viability.
- k. **Laura Wagner** – I definitely do suggest after hearing all that information that perhaps bylaws get revisited just so that it is updated with the best

information. I know I was going to meet with some people that is under the amount that is needed to meet Quorum next week, just to discuss what we can expect for referendum planning at beginning of next quarter as well as potentially charter and by law language as probably part of that discuss meant to be had

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Laura Wagner – Out of session processing language

a. I shared a document with the intention for people to make comments on about two weeks ago leading up to now. We have a basis for discussion today. My intention was also hopefully getting that SEJF out of session process language in place and voted on in the executive board by the end of the quarter, so that next quarter we have that language in there and we can see if it actually works. Another thing that is important to note is that anything regarding SEJF charter and bylaws language is entirely within the executive boards power to vote on and approve. However, it's totally normal for the committee itself as well as SEJF people from SEI to contribute opinions, comments, and suggestions to the language so that it is in an ideal situation according to these people's opinions before it gets to the exec board. That is why I brought it as a discussion item today I was hoping that we could open up the out of session process language together and look at it. I'm just going to reshare that link the chat. I am bringing it to the committee today to see if there is any final input that people would like to provide. I have already been in some communication with Eric, Delfine, and Jose.

b. Johnathan Riopelle – I will just say Laura, and I will take this opportunity to talk about this. One of my concerns internally expressed this to Laura is it having too many cooks in the kitchen. Not because their voices aren't theoretically or potentially valuable but rather because invariably someone may be at or over capacity, where positions might not be filled. How do we balance the hope of getting the right insight with the potential of having a missing element, potentially blocking approval. I've maintained that if you include 3-4 individuals in a streamline process. That doesn't prohibit any of those individuals from saying you know, I'm kind of confused by this. I'm going to talk to this additional person and in fact I always encourage that. I think, hey, none of us know much but I think collectively we know a lot. When we have the willingness to say

before I say yes, I am going to speak with the ASB director, for example, I think that is really great formulation. I think my thoughts are on that. If VP for sustainability or maybe the ESP director sounds like it is a reasonable option or the ASVP persist for diversity also is a good option. Director of Sustainability, which is currently grace. I'm kind of inclined to save the director of the program on which will not be more forever, but because of that individual I hope has a lot of on the ground knowledge about the actual grant program on. I think those four pardon my thumb on or I think a decent fix and I think to your latter point Laura. I'm interested in the idea of the language by which one would determine and declare that they need to come step out of that process because I think that's also true for this entire committee. I am wondering if that language is established that can also go for the general process because on there are opportunities where we have to excuse ourselves.

- c. **Laura Wagner** – yeah those are all really great initial thoughts. Good to know that those 3 & 4 positions are ones that make sense in your mind. The whole question about in what situations would a person excuse themselves from voting is definitely one that would be good to revisit. Especially because I know broadly abstentions are only really meant to be used if someone feels that there is a conflict personal interest that might sway them to not be able to give an unbiased vote and then the second option is if they feel that they don't have enough information to make a solid vote, but those are still pretty broad and SEJF is now very broad encompassing thing compared to what it started historically. I think it would be good to maybe revisit that language perhaps next week when we're fitting in that one referendum prep discussion slash charter and bylaws.
- d. **Jose Ortuzar** – I think that is really good language that you've put together. To address grace, this point, I think it does make sense for us to work on this, this committee, just because then this will have already been settled and hopefully the next committee can have an easier time working through these issues and yeah, hopefully they're not going to have as rough a time. I think it will be a great legacy to leave for this committee to leave it a little bit better than we found it.
- e. **Johnathan Riopelle** – I'm on board Laura, I just want to quickly add to that list of things that one would be expected to excuse would be if one is directly or indirectly going to benefit from the approval of a grant. That's

really dangerous when we have to be thoughtful about.

V. ACTION ITEMS

Motion by Rahma Iqbal

To give ten additional minutes for questions to the Strengthen Experiences for Black and Brown Men at Western Washington University

Second: Rosa Edwards

Motion passed 9-0-0

VI. ACTION ITEM

Motion by Rosa Edwards

To move presentation by the Strengthen Experiences for Black and Brown Men at Western Washington university to an action item from an information item

Second: Rhama Iqbal

Motion passed 9-0-0

VII. ACTION ITEM

Motion by Rahma Iqbal

To approve medium grant - Period Postal in the amount of \$34,000

Second Glory Busic

Motion Passed 9-0-0

VIII. ACTION ITEM

Motion by Rhama Iqbal

To approve large grant – Climate Leadership Certificate and Sustainability Pathways capacity development – \$197,394.80

Second Glory Busic

Motion Passed 9-0-0

VIII. ACTION ITEM

Motion by Rhama Iqbal

To Approve medium grant – application strengthening experiences for black and brown men at Western Washington University - \$26,000

Second Glory Busic

Motion Passed 9-0-0

X. OTHER BUSINESS

Get your scheduled updated by mid next week so that Jen can get next quarters meeting scheduled.

Laura Wagner, Committee Chair, adjourned the meeting at 6:21 PM