

**Western Washington University Associated Students
Board of Directors Meeting**

Friday, February 24, 2012

VU 567

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Anna Ellermeier (President), Fabiola Arvizu (VP Academics), Mario Orallo-Molinero (VP Activities), Travis Peters (VP Bus Ops), Deng Duot (VP Diversity), Iris Maute-Gibson (VP Governmental Affairs) and Sara Richards (VP Student Life)

Student Senate Representative: Kendall Bull, Chair

Advisor(s): Kevin Majkut, Director of Student Activities

Guest(s): Chris Chatburn, ROP Director; Jason Austin, ESP Associate Director; Ben Brockman, Personnel Director; Blake Westhoff, Student-At-Large; Jamah Abdulla, Student-At-Large; Hailey Thomassen, Student-At-Large; Emma Gardiner, Student-At-Large; Representative Rick Larsen

MOTIONS

ASB-12-W-27 Approve the AS Employment Responsibilities Recommendation, with stated change. *Passed*

ASB-12-W-28 Approve Personnel Item A excluding the Women's Center Program Support Staff, AS Personnel Coordinator, and any other AS Personnel Job Descriptions. *Passed*

ASB-12-W-29 Table the major changes to the AS Management Structure in all AS Board Job Descriptions and task the AS VP for Business Operations to establish a task group to assess the proposed management changes or others, if necessary. This task group should work to develop recommendations for the Board on necessary structural changes and collect input for a wide range of people and positions in the organization. The task force should make their recommendations to the Board before the end of spring quarter, when the board will take action. Any changes will go into effect for the 2013-2014 AS Board of Directors. *Failed*

ASB-12-W-30 Table AS Board Job Descriptions until the March 2nd Board of Directors meeting when it will become an Action Item. *Passed*

ASB-12-W-31 Approve the Academic, Campus Activities, Community Involvement. AS Employment and Leadership Scholarships as stated in Doc. 5 with the previously stated changes. *Passed*

ASB-12-W-32 Approve the Diversity Award Application with the amendment that the first question state "What does diversity mean to you and how have you worked to promote activism, awareness and enthusiasm for diversity issues." *Passed*

ASB-12-W-33 Table Child Care Voucher Application until next week. *Passed*

ASB-12-W-34 Approve Consent Item A. *Passed*

Anna Ellermeier, AS President, called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

Richards tabled Information Item A until next week's meeting. Peters struck the Personnel Office Job Descriptions Document. Duot struck Steering Committee from Consent Item A.

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

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

V. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

A. AS Employment Responsibilities (15 minutes) Peters Doc. 2
Duot explained that there were some changes to the document including adding the word

diversity. Kevin Majkut pointed out that by replacing including with a “;” the sentence regarding mandatory training seemed to limit the job responsibilities to the listed trainings and did not allow for the addition of others. He also noted that under the salaried employee requirements it states that the new employee must work with the previous employee to do a fifteen hour internship, and that once a person is under the job description the old employee would have left the position. He said that he wasn’t advocating to remove the requirement but have it act as more of a suggestion rather than a requirement because it is an unenforceable condition to having the job. Peters said he was concerned about the training section becoming cumbersome and overly-wordy if “including, but not limited to” replaced the “;”. Richards said that including was struck after all the intended trainings were added and said that this should cover all of the trainings employees would be expected to attend. Peters suggested asking Ben Brockman if he had any preferences. Brockman suggested changing the “;” to “including, but not limited to.”

Peters made a motion: Amend the second bullet under the salary classification to read “including, but not limited to.” Arvizu seconded. Vote: 6 - 0 - 0

Peters suggested striking the wording leading up to the “fifteen hour internships”. Ellermeier and Arvizu said that they liked the idea behind it even though they could not mandate it. Ellermeier said that this is an expectation even if it is not enforceable.

Peters made a motion: Strike the text leading up to “providing a fifteen hour internship to the incoming position holder.” There was no second.

MOTION ASB-12-W-27 By Arvizu

Approve the AS Employment Responsibilities Recommendation, with stated change.

Second: Richards Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

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

A. Job Descriptions *(15 minutes)* Peters Doc. 3

Ellermeier stated that since the Personnel Office Job Description was removed from the document they could not be reflected in any motion the Board would make regarding the document. Brockman added another page to the document explaining why the AS Club Coordinator position should be changed from an Assistant Coordinator classification to a Coordinator classification. Peters suggested going through each proposal by themselves and focusing more on the recommendations earlier on in the document because they would lead to more discussion. Duot asked if the people affected by the changes knew about them. Peters said that they were and that they had been discussed in length and each position knew about potential changes. Brockman said that many of the changes were created, and all were agreed upon, by the personnel committee and none were too contentious.

Ellermeier asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding the AS Communications and Marketing Director. There were none. She then asked if there were any questions or concerns about the AS Communications and Marketing Assistant Director. Arvizu asked if this position’s pay rate would change with the name change. Brockman said that with the classification change the salary would increase about \$100 a year. Arvizu also asked if the Communication and Marketing Office would still be doing marketing with the name change or if the office’s responsibilities change. Brockman said the responsibility of the office would not change. He added that he would rather call the office the AS Marketing Office because it is more action oriented, but the current staff believes it should be the AS Communication Office with the driving force behind the change being that the name of the office was simply too long.

Ellermeier asked if there were any questions or concerns about the Women’s Center Support Staff for Creative Programing position. Arvizu said she believes the name change is too lengthy. She added that this name would make it hard to market the position or communicate

its responsibilities. Richards said the sense she got from Lisa Rosenberg was that there was a heavy focus on “creative”. Chris Chatburn said that he does believe that the name is long but would not suggest taking out the word “creative”. He suggested possibly taking “assistant coordinator” out of the title because that becomes clear when reading the job description. He said that “assistant coordinator” was originally in the title to inform people of what they were applying for, and in that case “creative programming” is more important. Brockman asked if the position could be called the “Creative Programmer.” Duot suggested calling it the Women’s Center Assistant Program Coordinator. Arvizu and Brockman reminded him that “creative” was the most important word in the title. Peters said it might be hard to change the title. Arvizu asked what the need for an event increase from the Women’s Center and if their budget will reflect that. Chatburn said the reason for increasing event load was in order to promote Labyrinth—such as an event for the artists held in the Underground Coffeehouse similar to the Erotic Poetry Night. These events would be low cost with the goal of getting the name of the Women’s Center out. Arvizu clarified that these events would be centered around Labyrinth. Chatburn said that there would not necessarily be a direct connection, but they would allow for the Center to get the name out and promote ideas like creative expression that could tie into Labyrinth or other Women’s Center events. Duot noticed that this proposal would increase the hours from 10 to 15 and asked if this would help. Chatburn said it would and would make the position salaried. This would allow the Labyrinth position to come to trainings and meetings because the current structure is very restrictive to the position. Ellermeier confirmed that this position change was part of the larger TAP report, and asked if this could be addressed then. Peters said this was approved by TAP but if it isn’t passed by the Board now the position would not be able to go up with the other AS job descriptions. Brockman said that it would be fine as long as it would be passed next Friday. Majkut expressed his concern about increasing programming and responsibilities. He said that by adding five hours most of that time would be taken up with the meetings and trainings they currently cannot attend. He worries that increasing responsibilities would create too heavy a load on these positions. Chatburn said that with the entire TAP report this request might make more sense. Duot asked if this change from hourly to salary would mean that an employee could work more than fifteen hours a week. Majkut said yes, they could, and this would allow for more flexibility, but the employees should not be working more than fifteen hours too often. Brockman asked if the Women’s Center job descriptions should be submitted in the TAP report or in Personnel Documents. Ellermeier said he should submit it as a Personnel Document but could discuss them together.

Ellermeier asked if there were any questions or concerns with the Club Coordinator position. Orallo-Molinario said that this change is very important because the office has expanded and evolved. He continued to say that the amount of pay the position currently receives does not align with the amount of work that the position has taken on. Orallo-Molinario said that the amount of work Maddy Vonhoff does in limited hours she is allotted is amazing. Peters said he would advocate for this change. He added that there are certain criteria for the Coordinator classification, and while the position does not necessarily oversee staff it does oversee the club system which includes hundreds of people. Jason Austin said that, in his experience, the Club Coordinator is a great support system to the clubs and is integral to making the clubs work well. Majkut said that he is not speaking against the proposal, but he worries that the work load may be becoming too heavy. He added that as more clubs are created there needs to be enough resources for each, but the work load must be balanced and possible, and that there are implications for more support in this area. Peters said that the budget implications of this classification change are minor, but there are bigger issues to address.

Ellermeier said she would be grouping all job description changes in the second table that are classified as “result oriented” in a group. There were no comments or concerns.

MOTION ASB-12-W-28 by Orallo-Molinaro

Approve Personnel Item A excluding the Women's Center Program Support Staff, AS Personnel Coordinator, and any other AS Personnel Job Descriptions.

Second: Arvizu

Vote: 6-0-0

Action: Passed

VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board***A. AS Board Job Descriptions***(45 minutes)*

Ellermeier Doc. 4

Ellermeier suggested tabling the discussion for the management structure until spring quarter and asked what other members of the board thought about this. She said the implications of doing this would be that the board would create a taskforce to gather more information from across the organization and look at what the problems might be and create solutions. This item of business would be revisited spring quarter and would take effect for the 2013-14 Board of Directors, and allowing next year's Board to look at this structural change as well. Peters said the structural change should be dealt with sooner rather than later, so people running for office would understand the scope and demands of the position. Peters continued to say that allowing the next Board to recall this structural change makes him feel a little better, however he worries that the changes might only please a small majority of the Board creating different issues. Ellermeier explained these changes would not take effect until the 2013-14 academic year and next year's Board would maintain the current job descriptions. Arvizu said she thinks the structural changes need to be addressed this year and put into effect for next year's Board. Arvizu suggested looking at the changes and working through the issues during a work session and have this topic be considered an Information Item this week. Duot agreed that it is important for not only the people who are running for Board positions to understand the changes, but everyone within the organization, and how these changes may affect their jobs.

Brockman said that the proposed structural changes could work with more deliberation and after consulting Management Council. Richards reiterated that the Board is capable of making the changes, but there are other groups that the Board needs to consult before making the changes. Ellermeier said that she didn't realize how large the changes would be. She is not convinced that the Board has all the information they need to make an informed decision when changing the management philosophy of the entire AS. Ellermeier isn't sure that there is enough time to gather the necessary information from the directors and employees directly involved in the management structure and deliberate on it while making sure everything remains timely and well thought out. She said that this would allow for the structural changes to still occur but also allow for elections to remain timely. Peters said that while he appreciates Ellermeier and Brockman wanting to bring this issue to Management Council he believes the feedback that was gathered earlier is accurate and there would be no new information. Peters offered to share his evaluations with the rest of the Board if needed.

Arvizu said that there might be some misunderstandings about what supervision would look like. She said her understanding is that the relationship between Directors and VPs would remain the same, just instead of Peters being the singular point of contact other VPs, more closely related to the office would take over the already existing oversight. She clarified that during discussions she does not want to focus on micro-management, but talking about who the direct managers of offices are. Orallo-Molinaro dittoed. Duot said he wants people running for positions and in the organization to know the changes well before they are put into practice. He added that employees in the AS need to know that these changes are forthcoming as well. Duot asked the Board how conflicts between VPs would be resolved if the Board Members were all supervisors. Richards said she supports the changes but thinks they are making a removed decision. She added that they need to remember this decision will affect a large number of people so more people need to be involved. Brockman said that the word supervise needs to be

clearly defined so future Boards understand the intent behind the changes. He suggested having accompanying documents to clarify these terms.

Jason Austin stated that this structural change would change the bosses of many offices and in that case the affected offices need to be told directly. He said that there should have been more transparency and more people should have been consulted in the process. Austin added that his needs from the Board of Directors fall under the purview of VP for Business and Operations. He said that he is not fundamentally against the change but believes that there needs to be a discussion with a larger group of people. Austin stated that he thinks it at least needs to come to Management Council and be heard as an Action Item. Chris Chatburn said that his concern is that the VPs have their own certain areas to oversee and when deciding the VP that will oversee offices like the ROP the area of oversight of the VP and the mission of the office might not align. He added that he does not want his office to be limited to one VP as a supervisor because he has worked with many different VPs for different needs. Orallo-Molinaro said that the feedback from Austin and Chatburn is important and this topic should be talked about in Management Council. He emphasized that these changes are being made because there is a big gap in the Business and Operations position. Peters' position is being spread so thin and there seems to be a lack of support. Orallo-Molinaro agreed that this was a fast process it was done because there are needs that must be addressed and they wanted to try to fix these issues before the upcoming elections. He said that directors in offices are not receiving the oversight on policy and procedure that the Board receives and the goal of this change is to make the entire organization more efficient. Duot said that he agrees with Ellermeier's suggestion to discuss these changes later. He said he also agreed with Chatburn's concern about missions and purviews lining up. Duot acknowledged that there might not be a direct correlation between the two so clarifications on how this new management structure will work to address this must be talked about. He reiterated that he thought the issue should be tabled. Arvizu said she wants to clarify that the Board will be voting on whether to make changes not voting on actual changes. She emphasized that these changes are not definite and that there is still room for input and hopes for input in the future. Ellermeier said that the important thing is to have elections. She said that the choices the Board has are to push these structural changes through before elections are held, or to work on them next quarter and have them not go into effect next board but the board after. Ellermeier said that she would recommend giving the Board more time to gather more information and discuss the options because she is not sure this is necessarily the direction to go in.

MOTION ASB-12-W-29 By Ellermeier

Table the major changes to the AS Management Structure in all AS Board Job Descriptions and task the AS VP for Business Operations to establish a task group to assess the proposed management changes or others, if necessary. This task group should work to develop recommendations for the Board on necessary structural changes and collect input for a wide range of people and positions in the organization. The task force should make their recommendations to the Board before the end of spring quarter, when the board will take action. Any changes will go into effect for the 2013-2014 AS Board of Directors.

Second: Richard Vote: 3 - 2 - 1 Action: Failed

MOTION ASB-12-W-30 By Arvizu

Table AS Board Job Descriptions until the March 2nd Board of Directors meeting when it will become an Action Item.

Second: Orallo-Molinaro Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

Peters explained he wants to continue the discussion, and while he wants Maute-Gibson to be here because she has very strong opinions, he will be bringing this to Management Council he needs to understand what the board means by management and oversight to explain the

changes to the council. Peters said he doesn't see the change as being that different from how supervision really looks in the AS. Arvizu said she is okay with continuing if it stays within time limit. She also asked Ellermeier to forward Arvizu's and any other willing Board member's email to Peters so he can best represent their views at Management Council. Arvizu also asked that the work session would be largely publicized in the AS. Duot said he agrees with Arvizu's request because he wants people to come to share their views. He also said he will not support something that the Management Council does not agree with. Ellermeier said she would extend the discussion until 4:30 and that the work session will be adequately publicized throughout the AS. She added that she doesn't necessarily want to tell Management Council exactly what the board is thinking about the topic so they can see how the managers feels about the topic. Peters said that he wants clarification about what management and supervision looks like and talking more about being a resource than telling people what to do. Ellermeier said they would focus on that for the rest of the discussion.

Ellermeier called a 5 minute recess and Maute-Gibson joined the meeting, whcih reconvened at 4:15 p.m.

Ellermeier focused the board on defining what they mean by supervise/manage. Peters said that in the email he sent to Anna he ultimately laid out three possible models the board could move towards: the current, the proposed, and the "if people reject the proposed model then what they are saying is that they want this" model. He explained that the current model has VP of Business Operations with most of the management responsibility, but it is also partially distributed between other board members. The proposed model would have the VPs moved to management roles that are closer to relevant departments that are more meaningful and intentional. Each VP has specialized areas and the proposed model would speaks to and utilize this. Everyone agreed with this description. Arvizu said she wanted to address the fragmentation with this proposal in the work session. The idea she wants to focus on is how will VPs communicate in this model, and how will knowledge be shared. Arvizu also put forward the question when adding internal responsibilities on each VP, how will other responsibilities be affected. Peters encourage the board to look towards the university as a model. Duot said he agrees with the proposal, and that from his discussions with Brockman, Duot thinks this will work. He asked Majkut if this model was to be put into effect and there was a conflict between VPs, what would be done. Majkut said that there can be conflicts that arise between VPs in the existing model so there would most likely be no change in the way it would be handled. Majkut added that unresolvable conflicts can be taken to the board level. Peters continued on to explain the "If people reject this model then they really are saying they want this model" model. He said that if the proposed model is not accepted that means that the current model doesn't make sense either. If this is the case then the VP of Business and Operations would be supervising all offices within the AS making connection more intentional and meaningful. He said that this model is unrealistic. Peters continued to say that the BusOps position is already spread out too thin and if there are more offices to oversee the offices cannot be served to the best of the VP's ability. In the end, things must fall by the wayside, and if that is okay then there are other problems. Peter said that he recognizes that there are still problems with the proposed model it, but it looks the most realistic. Ellermeier reiterated Peters points and said that the board would be able to look at this in the work session. She pushed people back to defining supervision and management. Ellermeier asked Majkut for a definition. Majkut said at the Board level the VPs would act as administrators while the directors are at a basic management level and would be working with the day to day operations. The Board has more of an organizational rather than an operational sense of responsibility. The VPs would be there for support and direction in the areas that they would supervise; this would not be micromanaging but more connecting the Board of Directors more directly to each office. This relationship would look similar to that of a coordinator and a director: the director provides direction and assistance while the coordinator figures out what they will do for their office and how their office will reach its goals. Brockman said that it is hard to understand two different definitions of management and supervision

within one organization so it needs to be figured out. Ellermeier asked if there was a different definition of management. Orallo-Molinaro said he saw the word manager to mean more of a resource to the office rather than telling people what to do and how to do it. He said that a manager simply oversees the offices. Ellermeier asked if oversight included ensuring employees followed policy and having those talks with employees in the offices each VP managed. Orallo-Molinaro said that he would be in charge of having the discussion with an employee but Personnel would still be in charge of firing. Maute-Gibson said that her concerns were adequately expressed in her email and that, in the work session, she hopes for the board to look at and research other non-profit organizations outside of the AS to better understand how oversight works there. She said she also wants to make sure everyone to understand what is meant by supervision in the capacity of this proposal, such as what is required, including check-ins, meetings, setting the strategic direction, and other work that would be required. Maute-Gibson pointed out that this proposal would be taking time away from other important work requirements that need to be done. She added that each VP would need to find balance between serving students and the employees because they are voted into office instead of being hired by the Personnel Office. Maute-Gibson said she believes that the VPs' time should be better utilized to serve and meet with students instead of looking internally to how make the AS work more efficiently. Ellermeier said that there are two issues: the structure and the definition within the structure. She suggested taking these two problems and questions to Management Council. Richards asked that in those discussions the difference, if any, between management and financial management be clarified. Majkut said that there are people who will be impacted and people that won't be and that it is extremely important to get the feelings from the people who will be directly affected because their feelings might be different from those not being impacted. Brockman asked if he could come to the work session. Ellermeier said work sessions were open to anyone and that this work session would be well publicized throughout the AS. Brockman said he would do some research and bring a few definitions of management with him to the work session.

Maute-Gibson introduced Representative Rick Larsen. Representative Larsen talked briefly about the importance of the DREAM Act, Higher Education Funding, and Financial Aid and encouraged the board to continue to advocate for students' rights. He acknowledged the challenge of being both elected and acting in an administrative capacity. He added that Western's Associated Students has a great reputation and that this board has lived up to that reputation while trying to solve difficult issues. He concluded by saying that Western's Associated Students has continued to act as a preeminent student organization in Washington.

- B. AS Scholarships (15 minutes) Ellermeier Doc. 5
 Richards and Arvizu had made changes that had not been recorded. Arvizu said that there should only be 2 letters of recommendation both academic. Richards said that for Community Involvement she would like to change "in Bellingham" in question 1 to "while at Western". In reference to the Childcare Voucher, Arvizu said that the second question is not necessary or too broad: 'tell us about your children' might not get the information needed to make an informed decision.

Ellermeier suggested that the Board vote on the changes to the requirements and then the individual scholarships. The first option that she has heard a lot of support for is changing it to must attend for the entire year to "must have attended 2 quarters of current year." Arvizu said there was a little bit of a concern with students attending less than one year because there could be students who had a high GPA because they were new students. Maute-Gibson said that when deciding they would have to look at quality decision rather than a criteria description and it should be looked at on a case by case basis. Bull suggested making a points system to put certain applicants over others. They could look at how long people have attended and maintained a high GPA as part of the selection criteria.

Arvizu made a motion: Changing all scholarships from must attend for the entire year to “must attend 2 quarters of current year.” Peters seconded. Vote: 7 - 0 - 0

Require students must attend 3 quarters of the year of the award and that does not include summer. Duot said that it should be moved to 2 quarters because some people do not know when they will graduate. By putting restrictions on them people in need couldn't get them. Peters suggested one disbursement (\$1,000) in the fall. Maute-Gibson thinks it however they do it is should be uniform for all of the quarters. If they keep it at the three quarter disbursement then if a student graduates one quarter early they would not receive \$333. Bull suggested including summer, because many people are trying to finish as soon as they can. Arvizu suggested either splitting it equally or \$1,000 up front because they are awarding a \$1,000 scholarship not \$333 a quarter. Duot likes giving students the \$1,000 in Fall because it will help the students whether they attend for one quarter or three. Ellermeier suggested moving this item until next meeting because the meeting had extended time. Looked for acclimation and there was dissent. Peters said that he dissented because the next few weeks will be crazy because there will be job descriptions and TAP information. Peters said that they give scholarships to invest in students and if they keep money then the money isn't being used to its full potential. He wants it dispersed all at once.

Peters made a motion: Amend the scholarship requirements to say that the student must attend Western at least one quarter of the next year. Seconded: Arvizu 6-0-0

The next issue is the credit requirement. Arvizu wants to stick to 12 credits for all but the AS Employee. Maute-Gibson would like to make the Child Care Voucher credits match the AS Employee requirements.

Arvizu moved to Uphold credit requirements for all scholarships except for AS Employee and Child Care Voucher scholarship to meet the AS Employee standards. Orallo-Molinario 6-0-0

Majkut said that other than the Childcare Voucher these scholarships aren't need based but achievement based. Since there is no information requested about need, they should not be using that as criteria for choosing a recipient. Maute-Gibson said that she is concerned about the Diversity. Peters suggested separating the Diversity and Child Care Voucher.

MOTION ASB-12-W-31 by Ellermeier

Approve the Academic, Campus Activities, Community Involvement. AS Employment and Leadership Scholarships as stated in Doc. 5 with the previously stated changes.

Second: Peters Vote: 6-0-0 Action: Passed

Diversity Scholarship: Maute-Gibson said she was concerned about question 1. It is not goal oriented and suggested changing it to “Why is diversity important to you and how have you worked to increase awareness or adding a goal at the end to show that someone has actually done something. Supporting the idea that the AS is goal oriented and the scholarship should reflect that. Duot said he did not want to make this application harder for students but he said he would be fine with the change. Ellermeier suggested having the question reflect the mission stated above. Duot accepted the change. Arvizu said she liked what does diversity mean to you and that is very powerful and integral. By taking it away might be problematic and since the AS isn't defining it diversity, it is important for students to define it. Maute-Gibson said she would be fine with keeping the first part. Duot agreed.

MOTION ASB-12-W-32 by Maute-Gibson

Approve the Diversity Award Application with the amendment that the first question state “What does diversity mean to you and how have you worked to promote activism, awareness and enthusiasm for diversity issues.”

Second: Duot Vote: 6-0-0 Action: Passed

Richards left the meeting

Child Care Voucher: Ellermeier said she feels the questions do not mirror the description at the top of the voucher application. She said while the questions might elicit answers highlighting the qualifications in the description but it might be more advantageous to ask applicants to talk about how their education has impacted their children. Maute-Gibson said that she and Brockman had decided to keep the questions as they were previously and suggested that instead the Board look into changing the description. Her goal is to highlight the fact that having a child is not a barrier to attaining a higher education. Maute-Gibson said she wants to give student-parents an opportunity to alleviate the financial burden of being a student and a parent without having them complain about their issues. She wants them the opportunity to celebrate their children and their education. While she acknowledges there are burdens that go along with being a student-parent, she wants to know why it is a celebration and why the student is choosing to obtain a higher education. Duot pointed to question 1 and asked if it was appropriate to ask applicants about their child/children. Maute-Gibson said that applicants could talk about whatever they wanted with the way that the question is worded. She pointed out that the previous year's application asked for much more data that could be seen as intrusive. She said that the current questions is open enough to allow more applicants to feel qualified. Maute-Gibson added that applicants can also choose not to answer it and choose what information to give out. Ellermeier asked what the Board is trying to do with this voucher: providing vouchers for people with children so they can attend higher education or giving vouchers to people who celebrate being a parent and a student. She said that the questions were leaning more towards the second and that narrows the number of people eligible for the voucher. Ellermeier added that they don't want to place values and perspectives on the parents applying for this voucher, and these questions makes it seem like they are looking for a specific applicant instead of leaving it open. Arvizu agreed and while she appreciates these questions they might not get the answers necessary to understand who needs the vouchers. Maute-Gibson said that while looking at the criteria from last year she saw them as limiting. She added that the criteria from last year might be priorities but they are not the only priorities that exist for all student-parents. Ellermeier said the description at the top are binding, and asked Maute-Gibson if she wanted to look at changing the questions as well as the description. Maute-Gibson said she did want to look and possibly change the description and the questions. Ellermeier suggested bringing the edited scholarship back next week. Maute-Gibson asked Majkut if that would be allowable. Majkut said that it would still be timely if this was brought back to the Board next week. Arvizu said that her main problem with the document currently is that the questions and description do not go hand in hand. Maute-Gibson asked for people to say whether the top or bottom needed to be changed. Arvizu suggested discussing that after meeting.

MOTION ASB-12-W-33 by Maute-Gibson

Table Child Care Voucher Application until next week.

Second: Peters Vote: 5-0-0 Action: Passed

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

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

A. Committee Appointments

Budget Committee

Ethan Glemaker	English Literature with Secondary Education Interest/Spanish	Junior (Senate)
Druksel Dorji	Business Administration in Management	Junior

Diversity Committee

Lorena Garcia	English Education	Freshman
---------------	-------------------	----------

Druksel Dorji	Business Administration in Management	Junior
<u>Election Board</u>		
Lori Shellman	Anthropology	1 st yr. Grad (Bookstore)
Kristin O'Brien	Public Relations	Senior (Student Publications)
<u>Excellence in Teaching Award</u>		
Lori Shellman	Anthropology	1 st yr. Grad (Bookstore)
<u>Student Senate</u>		
Druksel Dorji	Business Administration in Management	Junior

Arvizu suggested that there be more conversation between the VPs and the REP office to make sure that one person is not approved for three or four committees at once. Duot asked if AS employees should be on the committees and if students should serve on multiple committees. Ellermeier said it was fairly usual for students to serve on multiple committees; it was just unusual to approve one person for so many committees in one meeting. Ellermeier added that just Board members cannot serve on the Election Board. Duot clarified that he meant that he thought students should be given preference over AS employees. Arvizu said that VPs would seek diverse applicant pool but since it is the end of winter quarter and there are fewer people so any applicants are welcome at this time.

MOTION ASB-12-W-34 by Maute-Gibson

Approve Consent Item A.

Second: Duot Vote: 5-0-0 Action: Passed

X. BOARD REPORTS- were not given due to the length of the meeting.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 5:35 P.M.