



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

**STUDENT**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**

Student Academic Senate  
January 30, 2014

The meeting is called to order 7:01 pm.

Attendance:

Kelsie Miller, Chair

Valry Hensel, Administrative Assistant

Aerospace Studies, Anthropology, Aviation, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Communication, DHC, Economics, Education – Language, Literacy & Special Education, Engineering Technologies, Safety & Construction, English, Family & Consumer Sciences, Finance & Supply Chain Management, Geography, Geological Sciences, History, Information Technologies & Administrative Management, Law & Justice, Management, Military Sciences, Nutrition Exercise and Health Sciences, Philosophy & Religious Studies, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Science Education

Gallery: Jesse Nelsen, Sharon Jonassen

*Additions or corrections to the agenda*

Add “Seahawks”

Reportbacks: English

Committee reports: 1 min for General Education Committee

**Management** would like to add 1 min for Recruitment and Publicity Committee

*Approval of agenda*

**Management** so moves. **English** seconds. No discussion. **PASSED**

*Approval of minutes*

**CHAIR** entertains a motion to approve to minutes from December 5, 2013. **Political Science** so moves. **Geology** seconds. No discussion. **PASSED**

**CHAIR** entertains a motion to approve the minutes from January 16, 2014. **Geology** so moves. **Management** seconds. No discussion. **Political Science** abstains. **PASSED**

### *Announcements*

Executive Board meetings are now held on Mondays at 7 a.m. and will be on hour, fast-paced; **CHAIR** advises senators to submit materials in advance in order to prepare the board members.

On February 12, 2014 from 11-1 pm there will be a meet-and-greet with Dean of Student Success, Sara Swager.

Lobby Day, which is being held on February 14, 2014 is still taking sign ups.

Final SAS meeting of Spring quarter has been reschedule to March 6.

The BOD's letter-writing campaign is still accepting signups. **English** With whom do senators put interested parties in contact? **CHAIR** Put them in contact with me. **Military Science** has copies of letter to circulate for senator viewing

Seahawks 12<sup>th</sup> man photo will be taken of all interested students in the Barge courtyard on Friday, January 31, 2014.

BOD is revising its Constitution and Bylaws. Bryan Elliot has created a task force to clarify for grammar and spelling issues.

**ITAM:** Friday, January 31, 2014 is the last day to get a 25% discount on apparel at the Wildcat Shop and entry into a raffle.

### *Tabled Items*

No budget changes, remains tabled

### *New Business*

Roberts Tip: ETSC explains the difference between "Move" and "Motion."

Executive Board Nominations: DHC

There will be a one-minute presentation from the candidate, two minutes for questions from senators, and three minutes allotted for discussion.

Presentation: Jesse Hegstrom Oakey reiterates his strong interest in the position and reviews his qualifications: He has chaired the Student Rights Committee since the resignation of the previous DHC chair and meets regularly with the director of his program. The DHC is in the process of creating an internal governance structure which will feature elections from each of the four classes, with a president at the helm, with the intention of ensuring that the senate and executive board seats remain filled. JHO again emphasizes that he is qualified by both experience and education and maintains a working relationship with his department chair.

Questions:

**ETSC** requests that JHO tell senators about the work that he has done as chair of the Student Rights Committee, and to remind the senate about how he has handled previous funds requests activities. **JHO**: No specific legislation has occurred, as candidate hasn't "been involved in Executive Board." The Committee hasn't met so far this quarter, as the candidate has not called a meeting (because of the issue of who is chairing the committee). Nevertheless, a continuity binder is in the works, and a 35-page working list of student rights has been compiled. The Committee has ruffled feathers, as there is a great deal of interest in student rights.

**Biology** moves to exhaust the speakers list. **Geology** seconds. No discussion. **PASSED**  
**Speakers list: Biology, English, Philosophy & Religious Studies**

**Biology** regarding not ruffling feathers: Does JHO have a specific plan for how he will approach committee leadership; can the executive board expect candidate support? **JHO** Committee has assessed student rights, which are few and far between. Many rights that students should/do have are violated. JHO would like to work with the Faculty Senate to clarify any discrepancies. Many of the violations are due to faculty ignorance and a lack of recourse (i.e. plagiarism). JHO can't imagine the Student Rights Committee would act in an objectionable way, as the primary goal is to compose a substantive document of current rights, then petition for rights that do not have.

**English** requests that the candidate please answer the previous question – "IF" a discrepancy arose, how would candidate react? //How will the committee as a whole move forward if they have not met – is there communication? **JHO** As the senator for Geology has stated interest in assuming the role of Chair of the Committee, Committee is not moving forward at this moment. At end of last quarter there was a lot of discussion with great ideas and a strong interest in moving forward once chair position has been decided.

**Philosophy & Religious Studies** acknowledges that JHO is clearly passionate about being on the Executive Board and asks him why he has such passion? JHO enjoys being on a committee and following order. **JHO** is passionate about political science and wants to be engaged on campus; It is important that the DHC is represented at the senate. DHC is an amazing interdisciplinary program with specific views, needs and interests. JHO has concerns that an entire program has been unrepresented for two months, which the candidate believes is long enough. He wants to ensure that the DHC has a voice in the senate this year and in the forthcoming years; all voices should be heard. Democracy is important, and the current constitution is filled with ambiguity and confusion and repetition to the point that the senate has become, in his mind, undemocratic. **CHAIR**: Point of Information – the Senate and Executive Board seats are filled through two separate, independent processes: Senators are *appointed*, with elections only for Executive Board seats. **JHO** The DHC's internal governance system would be a democratic process with elections that will remove the "cliquishness" JHO perceives exists in the senate. **English** requests clarification – You state that the DHC is not represented; did you mean exec board or senate? **JHO** Executive board.

Discussion:

Speakers list: **ETSC, Military Science, Biology, Political Science, Management, Geology**

**ETSC** Is the candidate the senate's only choice? **CHAIR** – YES. **ETSC** Many are in a similar position and despite the candidate putting his foot in his mouth repeatedly, he is the only candidate and the position needs to be filled.

**Military Science** JHO is passionate and adamant; but his only answer to "Why" is "I'm the only one to fill the position" specifically, why he wants to participate on senate

**Biology** Maintains the reservations expressed during the previous election; nevertheless, the candidate has returned and is determined. The seat needs to be filled and it is best to represent the students of the department.

**Political Science** JHO is a great guy, is qualified and has good intentions.

**Management** JHO has shown that he is determined; public speaking aside he is fighting to fill the seat and that should be considered in vote

**English** Still has reservations regarding his ability to answer questions; Candidate has a reasons for why a problem isn't his fault.

**Geology** JHO never answered the questions put to him, even after JHO was re-asked. He has done no work with the committee; JHO does not stay on topic and it becomes about "him," not the DHC or the Committee. Geology expresses concern about candidate's ability to be brief and stay on topic.

**Philosophy & Religious Studies** If brevity is a concern, the CHAIR can intervene. P&RS argues that JHO *did* answer questions, however indirect. He is adamant about DHC being represented. She believes that as a political science major JHO would apply critical thinking and analytical skills to the Executive Board and the Senate; JHO might talk in loops, but that doesn't make him not qualified.

**CHAIR** entertains a motion to exhaust the speakers list. **Management** so moves. **English** seconds. **ITAM** , **Physics** abstain. **PASSED**

"Kelsie Miller, CHAIR, would like to appoint Jessie Hegstrom Oakey to the Executive Board as the representative of the Douglas Honors College and is seeking the support of the Student Academic Senate to ratify that decision by a simple majority."

Vote:

Yes 16

No 4

Abstentions 2

### *Reportbacks*

**ENGLISH** Senate approved funds for a writer to come to campus. Not only was the writer “super awesome” she voluntarily attended “Slam event” before the meeting in order to see CWU writers. English got to introduce the writer at the event. The event garnered the highest attendance record it has ever had, with an estimated 150 – 200 students in attendance. English was invited to a workshop with writer Elizabeth Austin. Not only did a lot of students from multiple departments attend the event, it proved a fantastic networking opportunity for several students, with great exposure for the student who won the SLAM event. This student was able to perform a spoken-word before the event. According to English, the experience was the “Best shit ever,” and is very grateful for the funds approved by the senate for hosting this event.

### *Committee Reports*

#### **Recruitment and Publicity**

**Management** The committee has not yet been able to meet up, but committee candidates are asked to stay after the senate meeting in order to exchange contact information and schedule a meeting. The goal of the committee is to fill ever senate seat, with alternates for at least half of all seats.

#### **General Education**

**Science Education** The current goal of the Gen Ed Committee is to improve new courses to fulfill the breadth requirements. The committee is also working on an evaluation system and an appeals process. They are also exploring academic holds and majors. The Committee is seeking more committee members.

#### **Constitution & Bylaws** : Title 9

The committee asks the senate to review the changes made and submit questions or comments. **Gallery**: Sharon Jonassen from SURC Accounting will field technical questions that result from any changes.

**Political Science** Question: Clubs are allowed \$2000. **History** SAS can decide allocation limits, and up to \$5000 can be voted upon. **CHAIR**: Point of Information – Club Senate has a larger budget. **History** Money from SAS comes from the Goods and Services budget, which includes the administrative assistant’s salary and office supplies, so when deciding upon allocation budgets, those factors need to be born in mind.

**ETSC** Comic Sans font used in previous document is the scum of the font world; Times New Roman will be used in the revised edition.

**Political Science** Regarding the funding process **IX.3.b** looks bulky. **History** Examples provided are temporary and will be placed as references in a separate document; They are currently included to explain “quorum” requirements of the senate and executive board. The Committee is looking to create new title, which is a work in progress

**ITAM** Pg 5 “guest speakers can request \$1500” should be “Students can request \$1500 for guest speakers”. **History** There is a difference between guest speakers and requesting to go to event. Senate can’t put limit on students attending an event that hosts a guest speaker, as each events are open to all students and public. **English** suggests rewording to “For guest speakers, students can request \$1500.” **CHAIR** recommends “For the purpose of hosting a guest speaker, students may request ...” **History** favors CHAIR’s suggestion, as the wording would be consistent with the language of the document as a whole.

**DHC** has several recommended changes.

9-1.a “Eligibility for funding” reads “Students must have a declared major from within a recognized department.” DHC wants to know if the language can be played with to ensure all students can attend/request. **ITAM** Is there already language in the bylaws? **History** This is another topic that will be worked on. **Biology** would this not also apply to **Military Science** and **ROTC**? **ETSC** No, because those both have majors. **History** It won’t cover undeclared students or those with only minors, but as long as “at CWU” is included in the wording, students can attend and request funding regardless. Currently it would bar only undeclared students from requesting money.

9-3. Funding process: “Quorum and plurality of votes” DHC requests clarification regarding abstentions. **CHAIR** a simple majority doesn’t include in total vote, so abstentions don’t count toward an affirmative and a motion would not carry. Abstentions are for those with bias, conflicts of interest, or not enough information. **DHC** An abstaining vote is essentially a “no” vote. **History** That’s not how abstentions read. If all abstained but only 5 people vote, 3-2 would provide a simple majority and the motion would still carry. Simple majority of *those who vote yes or no*, abstentions don’t count, so it lowers the total number of votes, but not the overall ratio. **DHC** doesn’t agree, but will discuss it later. **ETSC** Constitution & Bylaws Committee has discussed this topic at length; refers candidate to 9-3.B. The point is to ensure that everyone can understand.

9.3.d Formal dispute of requests. This does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Council of Probity. **CHAIR** clarifies that the Council of Probity is a review body for *all* student government activities and is above the Senate. **Gallery:** Sharon Jonassen confirms that the CHAIR is correct and has been involved in Council of Probity hearings to provide clarity. Council of Probity has final say. **DHC** the Council of Probity exists to ensure that BOD subsidiary bodies operate constitutionally. **History** This section is included in the SAS Constituion & Bylaws purely to enlighten students that they have a grievance process; Regardless of its inclusion in constitution the process exists.

**Military Science** 9.1.A regarding declared majors.

**CHAIR** Any student who is declared can submit a fund.

**ETSC** Undeclared majors *can* make requests, and fall under 9.1-B.

**Physics** Aren’t *all* cases covered by 9.1-B? Why adjust A if B already covers it?

**ETSC** Two things in life that can’t be enjoyed if you’ve seen them made: sausage and laws.

**Biology** If it’s redundant to mention it in A, because it’s covered in B, should **DHC** be specifically mentioned even though other similar programs are not? **History** Yes. A shall remain, and all else is covered under B. **DHC** argues against it, as B includes others and executive board

members must sign off on such a request. **CHAIR** Any reasonable person would understand that undeclared majors from programs who fall under B will be approved. **DHC** expresses dismay. **History** duly notes DHC'S dismay. **Biogoy** Either mention no one in A, or else mention everyone. **History** agrees, and **ETSC** makes the appropriate change. **Nutrition** If DHC feels that students' needs are not being met, it is representative of senator's actions. **DHC** insists that if DHC is going to be stated as separate case it should be worded as such. **ETSC** clarifies that seven other "special cases" exist and have been specified, including the ROTC programs.

**ETSC** states that it is the recommendation of the Constitution & Bylaws Committee to pass title IX, but wants final input from senators. SAS needs to come up with an equitable process to recognize disparity in funding between radically different programs.

**Gallery** Sharon: There are valid arguments for multiple methods. S&A recognizes that SAS funding is insufficient to ensure that all departments get funding. She urges caution with limitations SAS makes for funds requests, and does not advocate for setting bylaws aside. The S&A Committee established a process that provides alternate means of funding when a disparity arises. There is the potential for greater risk if SAS chooses to review "major" vs "department" qualifications for requests. She recommends consistency and looking at ways that void jeopardizing SAS funding. Alternative resources exist for students. **CHAIR** requests an example. **Gallery** Sharon: Music department is a massive department limited by bylaws, but S&A provided funds through other means; base-funding request helps with majors whose average travel support requirements were consistently higher than other departments on campus and could thus they automatically access more funds via individualized "pools."

**English** Student-to-major ratio is also important (not just the major-to-department ratio) and can cause consequences regardless of choice.

**Geology** requests that **ETSC** review with **SAS** alternate wording that allows for flexibility. He is concerned that the 15% limit to majors means that departments with many majors will take up more funds from smaller departments.

Committee recommends Title 9. Recommendation: question of vote requirements: simple majority vs  $\frac{3}{4}$ .

**Political Science** Discrepancies between departments who use funds more than other. **History** funding requests from students ....50% cap (9 – J)". 2/3 vote from SAS can allow students from heavy-requesting departments/majors to request more money. **History** also recommends that those from departments that regularly run out of funds to request base-funding from S&A.

**Biology** Not a good idea to base requests off of major, as some majors are larger than others. 2/3 vote is a good idea, but recommends proceeding with caution because of the importance of the method currently in place.

**Gallery** Jesse Nelsen recommends different approaches: Identify a potential challenge and create a moderate solution to allow for future changes once future senators have a chance to provide more concrete solutions. Constitution & Bylaws were written based on department status and *one* change made outside of that definition would allow large programs to gain

department status *within the senate* for the year – groups of students, if large enough, could apply to senate for department status.

**Nutrition** moves to refer the matter to the committee. **Management** seconds. **Geology** and **Physics** abstain. **PASSED**

**History** requires clarification: Does that motion cover the issue of departments vs. majors or the entirety of Title IX? **Nutrition** confirms that the motion meant all of Title IX.

**Geology** moves to reconsider the vote after the hasty action. **English** suggests that Title IX can be passed and individual parts can be reviewed. **Management** Seconds. **LLSE**, Chemistry, **Fmaily & Consumer Sciences**, **Supply Chain**, **Aerospace Studies**, and **Psychology** abstain. Motion overturned.

**CHAIR** entertains a motion to confirm and approve the SAS Constitution & Bylaws Title IX as contained in the document proposed bylaws for academic year 2013-215 -

**Physics**, **Supply Chain**, **Philosophy** and **Geography** abstain.  
**PASSED**

#### **Funds Packet**

**History** reviews funds request packet changes.

**Gallery Sharon**: University travel process is a work in progress. The requisite travel authorization number will be covered by SURC Accounting. **History** The committee streamlined changes, but there was nothing substantive. **CHAIR** would like requestors to type and attach supporting documents. **History** Reviews the process of requesting funds: Requestor must show up to Executive Board and SAS to present *unless CHAIR deems otherwise* (only for Executive Board – SAS presence is still mandatory for requests). **GEOLOGY** clarifies that if the senator is not attending, the presenter must show up to both. Multiple requests: Maximum funds available for a single event is \$1500; event is defined as a single, scheduled occasion. Multiple departments can request funds for the same event, however students from multiple departments can only receive a share of funding from one of the departments.

**Biology** requests clarification regarding “Single recognized department” for the requester.

**History** clarifies that the wording ensures that *at least* one student from a recognized department will be attending.

For Winter Quarter 2014, all requests must be completed, signed and submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by Wednesdays no later than 5 pm in order to be reviewed for the appropriate executive board meeting. As long as the bylaws are followed, requests can be made. A simple majority senate vote of  $\frac{1}{2} + 1$  is required for allocations, of which there are the following outcomes: allocate funds as recommended by the executive board; revise the allocation; deny the request with notice that re-request will not be entertained (but new events always qualify students for request); or deny funds with notice that re-request can be made for the same event (requires NEW packet, but T.A. # can be re-used). Requesting students have the right to dispute through the Council of Probity. Allocations are subject to availability.

Reimbursements are provided for airfare, motor pool, public transport, reimbursement for mileage, registration, lodging, guest speakers and "honorariums" (fee for guest speakers, limited at \$200 unless SAS raises that sum with a 2/3 vote). Fraud will lead to a cancellation of funds.

**Nutrition** Announcement: The Nutrition department will be conducting food research testing and needs volunteers. Brownies will be consumed.

**Geology** moves to adjourn. **English** seconds. **Political Science** opposes. **PASSED**  
Meeting is adjourned at 8:56 PM