

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

Thursday, February 28, 2013

VU 567

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Ethan Glemaker (President), Victor Celis (VP Academics), Carly C Roberts (VP Activities), Hung Le (VP Bus Ops), Deng de Duot (VP Diversity), Patrick Stickney (VP Governmental Affairs) and Katie Savinski (VP Student Life)

Student Senate Representative: Christian Correa, AS Student Senate Chair

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

Guest(s): AS Women's Center: Briana Fitzpatrick; AS Assessment: John von Volkli; AS Personnel: Sara Richards; Student Senator: Matthew Hilliard, Andrew Entrikin; Glenn Tokola, Josie Ellison, Michael Hinku; Whatcom Community College: Dr. Shantaboure, Chandra Thompson, Benjamin L Zetina, Laura Singletary

MOTIONS

- ASB-13-W-21** Approve the job descriptions in Consent Item A. *Passed*
- ASB-13-W-22** Approve the institutionalization of the Assessment Process. *Passed*
- ASB-13-W-23** Approve the Queer Experience as a queer specific program. *Passed*
- ASB-13-W-24** Change the GPA requirement for every AS Scholarship but the Academic Scholarship award to a minimum 2.0 Cumulative GPA. *Failed*
- ASB-13-W-25** Approve the AS Scholarship Applications for 2013-2014. *Passed*
- ASB-13-W-26** Approve the AS Board Job Descriptions with stated changes, excluding the VP for Diversity which will be seen at a later date. *Passed*

Ethan Glemaker, AS President, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA- Move Board Job Descriptions to Action Item Board B. (there was a miscommunication on the readiness of the items without the VP for Diversity.)

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

The Board welcomed the Executive Board from Whatcom Community College and will be visiting with them after the meeting to exchange ideas and experiences.

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

A. Job Descriptions- Program Standard and results oriented changes.

Le said that they have been looking over these in Personnel Committee over the past few weeks. There are changes for Program Saturation and results oriented requirements. Richards said that a lot of the annual requirements aren't included anymore, but will be included in the legacy documents for reference. Programs that happen in the classrooms or in the Residence Halls aren't considered events anymore, but outreach. Since the materials are already prepared, it isn't really program planning. Majkut said the budget codes will eventually be added in. Le said that the Gallery attendants were VU staff, even though they are paid by the AS.

MOTION ASB-13-W-21 by Celis

Approve the job descriptions in Consent Item A.

Second: Roberts Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

V. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

A. Assessment Permanence

Le said that the changes to the reportage section were in an effort to show the close relationship between the VP for Business and Operations and this position. Majkut clarified that the job description will be going to the Personnel Committee for review and approval.

MOTION ASB-13-W-22 by Stickney

Approve the institutionalization of the Assessment Process.

Second: Savinski Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

B. Queer Targeted Program

Briana Fitzpatrick said that they would like to make the targeted nature of this program official. While they cherish their allies, the Queer Experience needs to be a targeted program because it is hard to have someone in the room that has not directly experienced the oppression that is the focus of the event. She feels that it is crucial to have this space for Queer Identified persons only. Glemaker asked if there had been a history of people who were not queer identified in the program before. Glemaker said that in his experience queer covers a wide variety of people; he asked who qualifies as queer. For instance, does someone raised by queer parents who have suffered marginalization qualify as queer? Fitzpatrick doesn't think that there have been allies involved in the process. They have not used GLBT experience because it is exclusive, for instance if questioning or other gender identities. She doesn't think these are included in the GLBT identity but they are definitely a part of sexual or gender identities that can cause discrimination. She acknowledges that it is a story that needs to be told about having queer parents; the issue is that the children still have straight privilege. She feels that this is close to second-hand discrimination. Majkut said that a young person going to school with two queer parents may experience discrimination first hand. Fitzpatrick thinks that they haven't run into that sort of situation yet, but she feels if the person wanted to identify in some way that wasn't strictly heterosexual they would be welcomed. Majkut said that if someone self identifies at auditions and the facilitator has a concern about whether they fit into the queer identity, how is that handled. Fitzpatrick said that in the interview process they get questions that would reveal their identity. She doesn't feel that there is a person who is not queer enough to participate in this program. Fitzpatrick feels that people who would audition are struggling with identities that are not necessarily a part of representation in main stream media. She feels that experiences and discrimination can happen even for people who are questioning. When the facilitators choose people to participate in the show they try to think about who would benefit from hearing the stories. Stickney clarified that if this passed, it would not limit the facilitators in their decisions. Majkut said that there is a process to explore issues in a collaborative way to decide whose stories would be shared in terms of how they work individually and as a group. Fitzpatrick doesn't think it would be likely that someone would audition with a fictitious experience. It would become evident if it was false because of the depth of the process. Duot has a goal of inclusivity, but thinks that sometimes it is important to make a safe space for marginalized groups with shared experiences. Savinski clarified this would need to come back every year. Fitzpatrick said that they do not gauge a person's queerness level as part of the audition process.

MOTION ASB-13-W-23 by Celis

Approve the Queer Experience as a queer specific program.

Second: Stickney Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

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

VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

A. AS Scholarships

Glemaker had conversations with the Scholarship Office and the financial aid office about GPAs etc. He didn't see any changes proposed based on the information he sent out. Glemaker made his GPA 2.0. Duot said that he believes scholarships should be based on need and not on GPA. Stickney supports lowering it for all scholarships but the Academic. Le believes that they have a standard and these are competitive scholarships; he believes a 2.5 GPA is not too high of a standard. Glemaker said that each scholarship can be different. When he discussed this scholarship with Olivier she was in favor of changing the GPA. Roberts said that she and McCardle feel that regardless of how much a student is doing in their community they should be fulfilling school obligations because these scholarships are to help students stay in school. Glemaker said it seems odd for the Board to make a value judgment on what is academically

good when the university chose 2.0 as good standing. The way the Scholarship Office operates is that there is a box saying that recipients are a full time student; they can still get the scholarship with a lower credit load if they have permission from the donor. Glemaker said someone could request a waiver for having lower credits, then they could make a decision on an individual basis. The other choice is to lower the credit requirements to the requirement for AS employment (6 and 4 credits). Stickney feels that lowering the credits takes into consideration how life affects people during different situations. He thinks that people can be taking care of family members, commuting or working several jobs. He feels that keeping the credit load so high could cut off financial aid to students who need it the most. Celis said that with the credits he would be open to approving under extenuating circumstances, but with the Academic Scholarship he feels that they should stay at full time because if people are taking 2 classes and getting a 4.0 it is not the same thing as taking a full load and getting good grades. Roberts is looking at this as being involved and achieving a level of academic excellence while also being involved. She feels that if they are going to move to making these scholarships about financial aid, then they need to change the scholarships because as they stand then lowering the GPA doesn't seem applicable. Savinski dittoed. Stickney thinks that scholarships have a historical sense of exclusion; he thinks that some people were able to go to university and some were not. He feels that this has changed in terms of students needs as a state and as a country, and he feels that more life situations need to be taken into account. Roberts doesn't think it is appropriate to make these changes to all scholarships.

Roberts moved to divide the vote and Celis seconded. Majkut said that in the AS dividing the vote often considered a right of privilege. Roberts feels that some people are looking at this as more of a supplement to financial aid. Celis dittoed. She is looking at it as an award for doing all of these things and having good grades. Correa feels that they are defining academics and doesn't know if they can really put a number on that. Duot thinks that they should come to consensus on this and if they need more time they should take it. Duot said that if English is second language then it would be hard to even get a 2.0 GPA but that would still constitute success for this individual student. Stickney dittoed. Glemaker said that students' lives are comprehensive and they don't just do learning in the classroom, things like community service and leadership are also learning. For instance Glemaker doesn't have a GPA because he is a Fairhaven Student. He feels success for some people is different than for others and it becomes problematic when they put a number on success. Hilliard feels that the term scholar means that someone has the ability to go to a university, but this has changed. A lot of people who deserve scholarships and don't have a GPA of 2.5 often don't have resources that allow them to get this GPA. Stickney and Duot dittoed. Hilliard understands that there are different qualifications for each scholarship. He thinks that they should focus on the student's achievements as a whole. Stickney asked if they are making a decision to say that students need to get to that point or are they going to help people get to that point. Stickney thinks that people who have struggled but have been able to maintain a 2.0 GPA are commendable and should be awarded. Le agrees with Roberts that they are looking at merit rather than aid. He feels it is ultimately up to the discretion of the people choosing the scholarships how much they consider GPAs. Roberts agrees with everything that people are saying, but it's not a situation where some people on the Board want to help people and others don't want to help people. Savinski dittoed. She thinks when it comes to scholarships GPA is important and they don't have the time or ability to reinvent the scholarships. Roberts said that as someone who has worked very hard to get where she is and to move on in the future, GPAs are important. Duot said that they will be giving scholarships to students who are going to work hard regardless of GPAs. He wants more students who have the need to be able to attend college. Savinski shared her personal story and said that as someone who is only at this institution because of financial aid grants, tuition waivers and scholarships she really values what a scholarship award gives her. It says that she has a story. She doesn't have money and while she is a white woman without many appearances that she is marginalized, she is. She feels it is important to keep scholarships

competitive because they are not financial aid, they are awards. They should go to people who are demonstrating fluidity thorough all pieces of their lives despite any adversity that they are facing. She disagrees that a C average (2.0) is acceptable because a student is speaking to their involvement in the community. She feels if they are not taking care of themselves and their academics and they are at an institution, that is concerning because they should have a demonstrated balance. She thinks it is difficult to weigh someone who has a 4.0 and is involved in 2 community events against someone with a 2.0 involved in 5 events. She feels 2.5 is somewhat reasonable to expect students to have with extensive involvement and it doesn't exclude people from having a story or not having a story. Glemaker disagrees with Roberts because there is a history of people in power knowing that something is better and still choosing to leave things as they are. Roberts thinks Glemaker misunderstood her. She recognizes the plight of the student. She can tell a story of someone who has a high GPA because they put that first and maybe lost a scholarship to someone with a lower GPA who overextended themselves with activities. She thinks that to receive the Activities Scholarship students need to demonstrate a balance. Glemaker thinks that they needs to take into account many students experiences and look at what the organization says: in the strategic Plan it says they value inclusion and nowhere does it say that they need to have a 2.5 GPA, it says they have to have a 2.0 GPA to work for the AS. Hilliard said that scholarship is a form of financial aid that a student earns. He thinks that scholarships shouldn't always go to the person who has the highest GPA because they might be learning skills in their outside activities that are just as valuable. He thinks it is important not to just look at the past, but look at what the person is capable of in the future. The AS resources might help them achieve what they are capable of. Tokola said that awards can be separate from academics to be not just looking at GPA but also efforts to be involved should also be celebrated and awarded. The amendment to divide the vote failed 3-4-0.

MOTION ASB-13-W-24 by Stickney

Change the GPA requirement for every AS Scholarship but the Academic Scholarship award to a minimum 2.0 Cumulative GPA.

Second: Duot Vote: 3 - 3 - 1 Action: Failed

The Board took a short break and reconvened at 7:12 p.m.

Roberts has the same sentiments about credits and said that students have to maintain 12 credits to receive full financial aid. Celis said that for less credits it is pro-rated based on your number of credits, basically people get the same amount of aid in ratio to what the credits a student is enrolled in. Glemaker sent out some language that said full time credits are required "unless otherwise requested". He feels this might be a little confusing and now believes the best options are to make exceptions on a case by case basis, or to make the change to lower the credit requirements. Le said that for a large majority of the scholarships students can ask for exceptions and he feels people know they can ask for exceptions. Glemaker is concerned that people might not apply in the first place if they don't meet the requirements. Savinski wouldn't know to apply for a scholarship if she didn't meet the requirements. Glemaker dittoed. Majkut clarified that if a student receives the scholarship and the situation changes then that would come back to the donor, but this discussion is more about what happens during the selection process. Glemaker said that if they change them to a 6 and 4 credits then this institutionalizes that the Board is willing to give scholarships to people who are taking under twelve credits. Majkut believes that it is very important to be clear at the beginning to make sure people know if they are eligible for the scholarship. He thinks that a lot of people wouldn't apply based on the requirements. Majkut thinks they could set credit requirement and people can request a waiver, but that is complex and they would have to come up for criteria for making exceptions. There would be a separate process to approve the waiver and after that they would be included with all other scholarships for review. Majkut thinks this is more complex than it needs to be. Stickney would support moving the credit limit lower or making exceptions. Glemaker had

more concerns about the exception process in terms of when people might find out about the scholarship. Celis doesn't want to change the language, but after the scholarship is awarded if something comes up it could be reviewed. Monger said that they could make a decision to award the scholarship any quarter during the year that the student is taking full credits. Savinski feels that the credit and GPA are specific for the Childcare Voucher but they are lower for a reason. She wonders if it takes the unique situation of having a child away by making them all the same. Roberts dittoed. Savinski recognizes that other students have commitments and trials and tribulations that could be equal to raising a child and going to school, but feels they should still recognize the unique situations that occur when supporting another person and going to university. Roberts said that they are assuming extenuating circumstances for every students. The scholarship she is in charge of selecting a recipient for is the Campus Activities Scholarship, and the purpose of this is to award students that are involved on campus. She followed the process and reviewed them with the Director. Together they decided that these requirements and questions will help them choose a recipient. Roberts said that as a student from main campus GPA is important to her and she works hard to maintain it, as do many people on this campus. She doesn't want to see the success of maintaining that GPA not being recognized. She feels that the decisions that they have been making all year are in support of this: the program saturation requirements, the Board restructuring they have shown that they would like students to succeed academically while being involved. Le dittoed. Le loves this conversation, but he thinks that they asked directors to review these requirements. He doesn't think they should be making sweeping changes without consulting the other people involved in the process. Celis, Savinski, Roberts dittoed. Glemaker wanted to remove "Western Students" from the Community Involvement scholarship. Savinski didn't get to speak with her assigned director about this and doesn't feel comfortable changing it. She feels the questions allow for discussion of two different experiences.

MOTION ASB-13-W-25 by Duot

Approve the AS Scholarship Applications for 2013-2014.

Second: Celis Vote: 4 - 2 - 1 Action: Passed

B. AS Board Job Descriptions

Roberts said that they have done a lot of work on these and she is confident in having them as an Action Item tonight. Roberts would like to standardize the language under management to say " Position Responsibilities "Ensure that AS Services and Programs serve the best interests of the diverse student body and adhere to AS Policy by: Maintaining oversight for the [insert office names] by providing strategic guidance, providing connections to resources, and holding regularly scheduled check-ins. Roberts said and adhere to policies was added because there was nothing about policy in her job description anymore. Roberts would also like to change the Bus Ops liaison language to "communicating and meeting with professional staff as needed to serve as the AS Board liaison to [insert AS office name]" to match what is in the Activities job description. Le thinks that budget responsibilities section should be above salary section. Le said that some people have oversight in different places he would rather have these in the same places. Monger said that it was included in the way which encouraged the best flow because some oversight is connected to other position responsibilities. Stickney clarified that the Federal Lobby budget should remain with the President. Stickney requested replicating the Legislative Liaison language in the 5th main bullet point in the second bullet, he want to add "Approving testimony and positions of the legislative liaison prior to representing the AS WWU on any issue of legislative concern". Monger asked to include "excluding the VP for Diversity" in the motion language because while that job description is not in the documents, if someone was looking back historically it would look like all were passed.

MOTION ASB-13-W-26 by Savinski

Approve the AS Board Job Descriptions with stated changes, excluding the VP for Diversity which will be seen at a later date.

Second: Stickney Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board***X. STUDENT SENATE REPORT**

Christian Correa, AS Student Senate Chair reported that Student Senate discussed the Senate Reform. They will begin talking about how to establish the legacy document for the Senate. They will finally be getting to Stickney's questions about reaching out to the student body.

XI. BOARD REPORTS**President**

Ethan Glemaker reported that Dean of Fairhaven search has four candidates visiting campus and he encourages people to attend the open forums. Project Mug is working with university dining to have a reusable mug checkout system on campus. He has been having conversations about divestment and there will be an event next Thursday at 6 in AW204. Kudos to Roberts for organizing trip to legislative session and for her work on Elect Her. Also Kudos to Ben Crowther for his work with the DREAM Act. Glemaker said the administration has commented on what a phenomenal advocate and a champion Crowther is for that issue.

VP for Academic Affairs

Victor Celis reported that Academic Fee Committee read a huge binder to look at all fees for courses. He learned a lot through this process. Monday Faculty Senate decided to move the campus from Blackboard to Canvas starting in the fall, Blackboard is accessible for one year.

VP for Activities

Carly C Roberts reported that 25 people attended Elect Her and there were a lot of people interested in running for office, she thanked everyone for their support. She traveled to Olympia Monday with other Board members for the Western Advocates legislative reception. She was not at Activities Council, but it went well in her absence. She will be going down to Seattle tomorrow for the Western Foundation Governing Board Meeting.

VP for Business & Operations

Hung Le reported that he brought the Board structure changes to Management Council and they liked the changes. Facilities & Services reviewed a raft request for the OC and CDC rate increases request. Budget Committee will be requesting additional information from offices.

VP for Diversity

Deng de Duot reported that Presidents council was Monday he was not there, but it was about Relay for Life which will be benefiting to the American Cancer Society. Steering made a decision that they are going to keep the name steering for this year.

VP for Governmental Affairs

Patrick Stickney reported that the Supreme Court decided that the 2/3 super majority is unconstitutional. The board waved ditto cards excitedly. It may still be difficult to get revenue through, but it does open the way to remove tax exemptions that are currently on the books. They are organizing a rally March 14th from 12-2pm.

VP for Student Life

Katie Savinski reported that the resiliency group will be facilitating focus groups in residence halls to define resiliency and masculinity. Kudos to Graham Marmion and the REP for the "A Bit About Elections" event. There were many dittoes.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 8:05 P.M.