Kendal Bull, Student Senate Chair called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm

S-12-W-15 Amendment of the minutes of Wednesday, February 22nd, 2012. Passed
S-12-W-16 Approval of the minutes of Wednesday, February 22nd, 2012. Passed

I. Approval of Minutes

MOTION S-12-W-15 by Espinoza
   Amendment of the minutes of February 22nd, 2012
   Second: Olsen  Vote:  8- 0 - 0  Action: Passed

MOTION S-12-W-16 by Olsen
   Approval of minutes of February 22nd, 2012
   Second: McCardle  Vote:  7- 1 - 0  Action: Passed

II. Revisions to the Agenda

III. Public Forum

IV. Information Items

V. Action Items

VI. Discussion Items

A. Bottled Water Initiative
   Senate started this issue off by watching a short video called “The Story of Bottled Water” that introduced the background and problems associated with bottled water. Senate Chair introduced this as an initiative that the Students for Sustainable Water proposed to the AS Board of Directors to be included on the 2012 ballot that aims to end the sale of water bottles on Western’s campus. He explained that Students of Sustainable Water were looking for approval for the verbiage of the proposed initiative. Fabiola brought up that the Board does not have the power to approve or deny an initiative and that the Board only looks at an initiative to make sure the language is clear and concise to approve the language for getting it on the ballot.
Vainikka asked if it did cut the sale of water bottles, would that also mean that the university would create more water sources on campus. She suggested that more water sources on campus should be added to the language of the initiative. Glemaker suggested having more water bottle refill stations around campus. Brown believed that there were already many water fountains, especially in the newer buildings and does not feel like there needs to be more access to water fountains. Fabiola wanted to make sure the senators thought the language was easy and clear to understand.

“Shall we the students of WWU find the selling of bottled water to be an unsustainable practice and strongly urge the university to take action to discontinue the sales and distribution of bottled water on campus?”

Glemaker agreed that the language was easy to understand, but he wanted to know if this would be the exact language that would appear on the ballot. Fabiola confirmed that it would be how the language would be stated. McCardle asked if this initiative would be on the ballot this year. Fabiola explained that it would be put on the ballot this year and if it is passed by the student body then it is the new board’s responsibility to take ownership of the initiative and take action, but the board was unsure if they could get the university to follow through with this initiative. Olsen mentioned that there are other universities who have done that. He named Evergreen State University as one of those institutions. Lisa, senate advisor brought up that maybe the language should be “sale” and not “sales” to keep with the singularity of “distribution.” Brown suggested making both “sale” and “distribution” plural. The question of what constitutes distribution arose. Brown suggested adding language to make it more specific or remove the word “distribution” because it leaves a gray area, for example when it comes to events that provide water bottles. Fabiola brought up the contract obligations that the university has with Airmark and Pepsi, and that they have a right to sell what they want to sell. McCardle said that even if it is not possible for the board to ban the sale of water bottles, it is still good to try for the students who may pass it. Fabiola wondered about the policy and procedure and the extent of effort the Board is required to make to ensure the initiative is fulfilled. McCardle suggested getting someone involved with the contracts who would know the information to know whether this proposal would be possible or not if it were approved.

VII. Board Reports/Concerns

Fabiola reported the Board of Directors had a really productive meeting last week that mostly revolved around the AS structural changes of advisory roles, but the board had decided not to vote on it yet because there was a feeling that there was not enough internal input on the issue. She reported that the issue went to management council and said that there was a work session scheduled the next day that is open to the public suggesting to any senators if they wanted to offer input. She remarked that the board felt that this was in the best interest of a few of the vice presidents and their workloads, because their responsibilities are not realistic anymore in the way the AS and its offices have grown in the past few years. She said that the issue would be voted on at Friday’s
meeting. As for other business, she reported Academic Coordinating Commission (ACC) was still working on an academic policy, and that it had moved from commission up to the faculty senate, who will review it, and present something to ACC that they can approve of, so that staff, the community and students can have final input.

VIII. Senator Reports/Concerns

Espinoza reported that at President’s Council the Russian Club ended up not showing, which was unfortunate, but in addition the council discussed the lack of communication and coordination with President’s Council and the Ethnic Student Center (ESC). They are hoping to merge the two’s interests together more.

Hamilton reported that Senate Library committee met and discussed that it had received a $10,000 donation, and she wanted to seek input from senators on what they thought the money should be spent on. Vainikka responded saying that more whiteboards around the library for studying purposes would be a good investment. Celis suggested looking at the money going to the Viking Village coordinator. Fabiola responded that the Learning Commons was looking at the university to fund that position. Chair suggested hiring someone to maintain the facility more to prevent fire alarms from beeping when they are low battery. Hamilton also mentioned that there is two million dollars spent on 8 different categories of books each year. She also wanted to ask the senators on whether they preferred online or paper books. She reported that there had been a lot of debate over this topic and that there were many adamant committee members for paper books because of the principle of the matter, but she wanted to know what the students’ opinions were. Espinoza mentioned that it is easier to find books online, but that he also thinks it is valuable to have paper books. Fabiola was in favor of paper books, because online sources require more printing. Also she mentioned that the university had no e-readers to check out to access the material. Hamilton mentioned that the argument for having online books is that they do not get damaged and have the need to be replaced after a certain amount of time. Brown stated that he was in favor of there being a choice of both online and paper sources of books if the library could. Olsen said that he prefers paper books but increasingly uses more online books. Glemaker said that he preferred paper books because online sources require him to print some material, and he thought that would be a mass waste of paper. Chair suggested looking into free online versions of books when purchasing a printed edition. He mentioned that some publishing companies do this and that it would be a good way to have both paper and online books. Glemaker mentioned that there is usually only one book on reserve for classes, and he thought another advantage of having online books is that more people would have access to those reserve books.

Brown reported that Parking Appeals Board had not met.

Olsen reported that Legislative Affairs Council (LAC) had been working on the federal agenda, dream act, direct loan and Pell grants, and some other anti-harassment amendment that would hold universities responsible for including all types of sexual harassment. He also reported that LAC had started a laser tag team that would compete on Saturday.

Glemaker stated that he did not have anything to report this week but next week he reported that AS Facilities and Services Council would be meeting as well as the Student Trustee Selection Committee.
Celis reported that Academic Coordinating Commission (ACC) met the day before and continued discussing academic honesty appeal processes. He also reported that they voted to cut the directing concentration in the theatre department.

McCardle reported that Structure and Program Advisory Committee (SPAC) disbanded for the year and that there would be no more SPAC reports.

Vainikka reported that AS Transportation Advisory Committee (ASTAC) met and discussed the fee language for the transportation fee and how it should look so that students can be aware of and understand that the price can go up, but that it is limited to a 5% increase per year.

IV. Other Business:
Olsen mention that the state senate had decided not to cut any funding from higher education in their budget and the house had only cut 2.5%. Fabiola talked about board reports and how they are structured. She suggested to Kendall to restructure board reports, to make it a time when senators can gauge feedback on issues and address concerns they may have. Celis liked the idea as a way to gain feedback and reminded us that senators are representing students and that it would be beneficial to get more representative input, but he also enjoys hearing what other committees are doing, so he would like to see a hybrid of the two types of board reports. Hamilton agreed with Celis. Olsen suggested formatting a document or template that would set up a board report. That way it would be written down, and would provide more specifics and allow for more accountability for what needed to be reported.

Chair made an announcement that the following Wednesday the Senate would be eating at Rudy’s Pizzeria on State Street. He said that they would be meeting in VU 567 at 6:30 and then carpooling or taking the bus down.

Celis wanted to bring to light that Senate spent a lot of time deciding on an issue of the quarter at the beginning of the quarter but then did nothing with it. The chair responded saying that Cindy never got it on to the AS website. Fabiola added that Cindy had been really sick this quarter. Celis believed that senate should be doing more with the issue of the quarter, and thought next quarter’s issue should be more attainable. The Chair added that senate would be putting on an event on next quarter’s issue. McCardle mentioned that the year before they tabled a couple hours each day for a week for issue of the quarter, and he believed tabling to be valuable and a really good way to get feedback. Fabiola brought up that next quarter she would be making a presentation to convince Senate to do issue of the quarter on the student tech fee and create a forum around the subject to gather responses of students on the fee. Celis liked that idea, but thinks that when picking issue of the quarter, it should be directed more towards campus, because it makes it easier for senate to be able to make recommendations and do something with the feedback. Brown agrees with Celis and suggested eliminating paper towels from buildings, because it is currently so inconsistent from building to building. Celis wanted to know what the situation was with senate reform, and thought senate should come up with something more formal to present to the board.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 7:33 P.M.