



## **ASCWU Executive Board Public Meeting Minutes**

April 16th, 2025 | SURC 236

### **Call To Order**

**President Cantu** called the meeting to order at 7:05am

### **Roll Call**

President

EVP

Senate Speaker

Director of ESC

Director of Governmental Affairs

Director of Student Life & Facilities

ASCWU Advisor

### **Reading and Approval of Minutes**

**Speaker Hondo** motioned to approve the minutes from 4/14 with **Director Garcia-Sanchez** seconding.

3-0-2

### **Reading and Approval of Agenda**

**Speaker Hondo** motioned to approve the agenda for 4/16 with **Director Garcia-Sanchez** seconding.

3-0-2

### **Unfinished Business**

S&A Fee deliberation + S&A recommendation discussion

**Speaker Hondo** – Taking out frustration to S&A is not the way to go, I am in firm belief that we should take next steps in what ASCWU will do for the upcoming S&A recommendations. I am under the impression and interpretation that there is confusion for things that were cut. I feel as if some of the cuts that had taken place were unjust as some of them do not fall under the guidelines that justify the cut. I also admire the work the S&A does I respect but to ensure that these actions do not happen we should put forward some more steps to ensure that these steps do not occur again.

“S & A fees are for the purpose of supporting student activities and programs. 2 Students must propose budgetary recommendations to the college or university administration and governing board. The boards of trustees of the state’s colleges and universities have the express and



exclusive authority to determine what constitutes bona fide student activities. 3 In its ordinary and usual meaning, “student activities” refers to any college cocurricular or extracurricular activity participated in by students in the furtherance of their education.”

Starting with message of the Instagram received by working wildcats where theatre students reached out to aid the theatre students:

“I’m writing on behalf of the theater department student employees regarding the recent S&A cuts. Our entire departments budget was completely slashed. So, I’ve no paid employees for the next 4 years, and I want to know if there was a better way I can get in contact with you.”

“I just want to clarify, first, that we are not a club where official university employees and just like people and dining on the place on campus is definitely an allocation issue.”

With some further questions, as well as

“What advice you might have for us that as we take this to S&A and ASCWU?”

“I was hoping to seek clarification on how the working wildcats could aid the theatre student employees in fighting for funding from S&A, since we won’t have any employees the upcoming years. We are hoping to have both incoming students and current students as employees so the practical knowledge that they gain can be used in the theatre field when they finish their degree. We however don’t fall under the Killian guidelines, so we aren’t sure why we are being defunded.”

As expressed by the packet “things that are not cocurricular” they do not fall under the Killian guideline. “Theater arts was valued at \$0. The committee values the contributions of programs that enhance the academic experience. However, they believe that snaps are more appropriately directed towards initiatives that are not co-curricular to require classwork”. As expressed by students from the theater program yesterday, and it’s expressed by this student here. From my understanding, they do not fall under the guidelines, the Killian guidelines, which means, I believe, there was a mistake in the defunding of that, using the justification of the killing guidelines. I also had similar concerns with Observer and pulse. I did have a chance to meet with the advisor, like I said yesterday with Jennifer Green for both programs. She did express to me serious concern about parts of the conversation regarding S&A, and I also have equal concerns with that, and I think this is where I think another mistake was made, and the reason why I bring these mistakes up is because I think this is the message that our student government should craft to the board of trustees who is now in their hands. To request for re-deliberation, read, and for further investigation.



**President Cantu**—Thank you **Speaker Hondo**, we have brought Robbi here to clear up some of the confusion, if you would like to ask them any questions to help alleviate the confusion?

**Speaker Hondo** – In the march 14<sup>th</sup> S&A mm under Point B. It states that “there were concerns with the amount of physical copies that are handed out versus the amount of students reading them. The magazine is free and will be less impactful, if they only publish digital copies removing printing copies would reduce the request.” I have an issue with this respectfully, because the fact that when I spoke to Jennifer Green about this, and I spoke with **Vice President Villa**. And I asked him, was there data to support this? **EVP** said no, there was not. It was amongst many concerns when I asked Jennifer Green, is this legitimate issue? She expressed to me that no, they keep copies of archival purposes. But traditionally, polls does not have that issue. So I feel like there was a once again a misunderstanding of what exactly how these programs function. I know Observer had requested in their initial funding request to S&A a tiered system to also print online with their funding cuts as well. I once again, I'm going to tie right back to the original wording of the S&A. They do classify under co-curricular. Because the fact that for at least under my interpretation of co-curricular, they have that part that is the employment side, and the part that is the academic side itself to me, that is co-curricular, that falls under the guidelines of S&A. And so for me I think there was a mistake made, and I think that for student government our actions should be to not sit here and bash the members of S&A. I don't think it's gonna do any good right now. You know, recognize all the work you guys put in for those crazy 16 hours, especially but, like Will said, this is now in the higher ups hands. Personally, I think we need to make it clear to the board of Trustees. Given the information we have gained from S&A. Given the information we've gained from our student body and gained from the information we've now learned from also from the advisors and the faculty side of things that there was a discrepancy used and that this should be sent back to S&A for further deliberation.

**President Cantu**—Thank you **Speaker Hondo**. Seeing that you know all of us here on the board understand that there is those feelings, that there may have been discrepancies and everything. That is the reason that we have invited Robbi and Erin to be with us today. So that way we can get a little bit more of a clear insight as to what their process was behind making these decisions and to answer our specific questions. Because if we feel that there are misunderstandings or different misuses. I think, firstly, we need to get a really solid understanding of what their process was, and what their thinking and considerations were. So at this time. I do want to invite the Board members to ask the current S&A members here specific questions about what their process was. And any other curiosities you may have, so that we can allow them the agency to speak on their process behind it. Are there questions that you all have that we can offer to the committee members here today?



**Speaker Hondo**— I noticed in the March 14th meeting minutes in the March 15th meeting minutes, when the 2 different discussions about the observer happened. There was conversations about funding the Observer, for example, and then very quickly, on the following March 15th meeting, there was very quickly applying the killian guidelines into in order to basically use it as a justification for it. So, I guess my question is, what exactly was the interpretation used? Because, like I said, on the very front page. It pretty much spells it out what falls under the S. And a category. So I guess I'm just looking for some understanding of what would the interpretation in order to justify using it? Because from where I'm kind of sitting, I don't feel like that's an issue.

**President Cantu**—Additionally what was the arc of thought?

Erin—I think that with the observer specifically where the other part of the killian guidelines this is on the permissible uses section. If you want to look at that, it's the 4th bullet, and it specifically says, “Support for college employees in student programs operations. 11 S&A fees may be used only to the extent that the employees are engaged in student activities and programs--as opposed to normal maintenance and operation functions of the college.” You know, obviously, we all are trying to do our best. There's not a an ill intent to try to defund or silence students, and and quite the opposite in in this particular part the question really becomes is it curricular or co-curricular? And that's probably something we could have a debate for about of how that really goes. In looking at some of the Observer. Classes are part of the major and it's not a decision to defund the observer. It was really a decision that are these things that should be included in your tuition? Or is it something that should be paid with your student fees? Because the charge of the committee is to protect those dollars and to make sure that they're not being paid for services that should be included with your tuition. And that doesn't mean that this committee is going to get it right and perfect every time, and it doesn't mean that the observer is bad and something else is good. It's really trying to figure out like you all are paying your tuition dollars, especially in a in a effort to tie to a course, and admittedly, we have never taken an observer class. I read the Observer every week, as I sit in my office and value it. But is part of that effort, what you all are paying for your tuition, and that is kind of where I think the curricular versus co-curricular, and it is a I would say. It's kind of a gray area. I think your question going back to the 2 days of deliberating about the observer. To my recollection, the 1st day they went through everything and looked at what they still needed to cut for funding. And that was, you know, the the difference between the 4% increase and not an increase without getting a 4% increase. And I'm gonna kind of, you know, bring these together. Is that that means not only do we go back to deliberation, but then we also cut another \$200,000, and so the fee increase is to try to not get into that situation because another 200,000 that's even more whether. I think that there was a 1st run through and then a second run through. And that was for all areas it wasn't like, let's pick on the Observer now, and or Pulse. It was all of those areas, and there was an attempt to apply that



logic evenly across all of the areas. 100% we did our best, everybody in this room, I believe, on a daily basis. And so that's kind of where that logic came from the the option of no printing for observer that was the option that the committee went with to say, Okay, we'll do the digital printing and then removed the amount for the student wages because of that under application of curricular versus co-curricular. I hope that helps answer your question. And I welcome anybody to add to that.

**President Cantu**—Thank you, Erin. One of the things that you bring up. That also came to my mind when I 1<sup>st</sup> saw the recommendations was the idea of the colleges kind of taking on that responsibility now to fund the programs. I talked with one of the theater students as well. And they had mentioned that while they were talking to our department chair. Even our department chair was already pretty. You know, pretty confident that the Dean would not fund this type of thing, which I think is where the real kind of issue lies is, you know, if these are such important things, I think it ought to be the responsibility of the colleges rather than the responsibility of the students to fund.

Erin—I totally agree. And some of these academic areas also have alternate funding sources, and that isn't what the decision was based on. But it is. You know, there are foundation accounts, and obviously those are usually one-time monies, the university has like a hundred 1 million dollars, and they make a lot of choices with that. S&A is 5 million, and it's has a lot of contractual obligations tied to it for the maintenance of this building and the bond payment. So there's not as much to go around. But yes, exactly. Is this a S&A, or is this a university? And is the university willing to prioritize also these areas that are important to students. Observer, Pulse, and all of the theater department. They're important to not even just the whole university, but also the Ellensburg community and surrounding. There's not been a moment where that hasn't been acknowledged as well, so that makes it even more difficult to know to try to apply all of these things to the reality of our students.

**Speaker Hondo**—When I met with the Provost last he had questions about this whole conversation, because it had gone even up to him, and I didn't have the answers at the time, and I told them to that honestly. I know when I spoke to Jennifer Green she expressed that funding from the Deans puts these programs at risk. Because if the art Observer has to write an article or the information, let's say about another Dean, or, said Dean very quickly. Their funding is now being held, basically at Choke point to being funded and taken away like that. If they don't like the article being taken away. That is one of the reasons why I think the idea of the alternative funding does not really exist, I think, because of the just, the genuine fear. And I can even attest as board members. We've even received emails from university relations regarding, you know, interviews and stuff like that that has to go through them first, and from my understanding Observer and Pulse do not have that same restriction. But one of the reasons why and this kind of



goes into my leading to my next question, because, according to the meeting minutes from that March 14th meeting, it says here, discussion about ties to curriculum similar to pulse, and how that violates the Killian's outline. The concerns about this relate to their curriculum ties. Students that write the paper are required to be enrolled in the class. When I spoke to Jennifer Green she expressed to me that students in the curriculum side they take 3 additional courses once they do, that they can apply for the actual paid side of the class is what was expressed to me, which actually, coincidentally enough, when I 1st spoke to about this, I was right that there was 2 separating entities. Part of this. I just didn't know what that split was based on the conversations that I have with Vice President Villa the funding request that came in from the Observer from pulse was to fund their part of the employment side of their of their program, not the curriculum side. That's kind of what I've understood from the Provost. They don't have that capability like they don't fund like they don't pay their students during the classes. Obviously right? And so I'm a little bit, I guess, just still confused, because from where I'm sitting. Look at the meeting minutes, and what kind of just expressed this kind of violates the killing outline. And you just said yourself, it's a very gray area. I guess I'm just a little confused. How exactly is that a violation of the killing outlines? If this is a gray area which goes into part 2 of my question. Why was there conversations or concepts? Ideas of bringing back set presenters to further clarify in order to make that decision, because what was expressed to me by Vice President Villa the decisions was made based off just solely alone other presentations that they gave. So I guess I don't know if it was a timing thing, but I guess I once again I'm a little confused here, because it is certainly gray area from where I'm still sitting. This is still a co-curricular problem, because situation, because their funding that requested goes to the employment side, not to the curriculum side, which is funded directly by the Dean. So I guess if something I need elaboration on that, because once again, I'm still just not grasping the area where that that gray area turned into a very black and white line. Pretty quick.

Robbi—So you are correct. So how the process has been done is that we've been reaching out to advisors of all of the areas as early as fall, saying, here's what we're projecting. We need everybody to submit all of the documentation by December first, and that included annual financial reports that showed how the funds it includes program review questionnaires, where they answered specific questions about how they related to S and A and things like that, as well as the presentations that everybody sat through and during that time that is how the committee made their decision. It was. It was made very clear that we can't go. Once deliberations begin. We can't stop deliberations and say. Oh, I have a question for Hondo. We better stop right where we are. Ask Hondo, and then come back. So the information was provided. The students had to make the decision on the information that was provided by the advisors. Correct as well as I believe. I see that you have the annual report. Yep, and I have the one for post as well. Great. And if you reference that report, I believe it's question 6. “Please provide detailed information



regarding who utilizes your program.” Okay? So if you read that question and students, you're more than welcome. But the interpretation of how that question was answered is that it's a requirement for Com 444 students to be a part of it, which is what led everyone to believe that it was curricular in nature and not co-curricular because it was students who are enrolled in an academic course credit.

Ian—Representing my personal opinion on. But if I'm given a situation where there's a lot of murky gray area, too, which once again we were giving these presentations and just information there, like Robbie, had mentioned. That was kind of the answer. I was given without further clarification, at least for me. Personally, I would want to be a little bit more careful of how we're deciding something like this, because it kind of allows for a situation where there is a lot of gray area, it's maybe hard to determine what is particular, curricular and co-curricular, and you could get into a situation where effectively. It ends up just about us, necessarily realizing directly it's due to limited information presented. That is, pretty much funding at a class at that point. So in a situation of why, gray area, I would personally myself be more inclined to err on the side of caution, in order to make sure that same money is being appropriated for what should be.

**President Cantu**—I think a lot of this opens up so many different questions now. Right? I think I think one of them. In our communication to the board of trustees. I think they're may also be a need for the bot to reevaluate the process, to maybe be a little bit more clear since we're finding now that there's so much gray area here. So I think, instead of putting that kind of pressure with this many challenges onto the student leaders. I think that needs to be an exception by the board of trustees as well as the funding from the colleges. I wonder about specifically for Pulse and Observer. The university recently, essentially confirmed that they need to start reimagining pretty much everything about the university. So I wonder if this, then brings up an opportunity to have a conversation about how pulse and observer can receive that funding while also having similar autonomy to that of like student government. We can kind of do whatever we want. I mean, we are sma funded as well. So that definitely helps. But I wonder how we can bake student media into the college funding with clear expectations, and I guess guidelines, as far as protecting their autonomy and protecting their right to not feel any retaliation or anything like that, because if we're planning to already have these cultural shifts, I think that could be something worth prioritizing within the University. As we move forward.

**Speaker Hondo**— I will say, I know, on the College of Arts and Humanities side, based on conversations I have with the Provost. They are very quickly reducing the amount of programs and classes and faculty they have in those programs due to low enrollment due to budgetary reasons, which is why I'm a little bit more cautious to have that conversation, because the fact this is, I've I'm already directly, seeing that happen. But just in my role as a student in the arts



and humanities. Side. I can absolutely see this happen. So I'm not entirely sure how that conversation I would be open exploring it. But that's something I would want to work with, obviously, with the editors in Chief and the advisors, obviously observer pull specifically. But I think you are correct. I think the message that we can also craft to the board of trustees. I think there needs to be also evaluation process for me to kind of take the flip side of your coin. I don't. When it comes to murky gray areas. I would rather ensure I have all the information versus just having this gray area and try my best to apply something. I just that's not my brain style works like in this particular situation. So I think something we could say as student government is to inform the Board Trust is to reevaluate that process so that way. Like I said, this does not happen hopefully does not happen again in the future. But the other part of that, too kind of shifting from Observer the Pulse. And this is where I'm gonna come back to the questions to S&A. Theater, because I'm also equally confused on theater, because, as I read earlier, they do not follow, they do not have that co-curricular side so, or the curriculum side at all. So if I'm playing with the same logic that's used on Observer and Pulse. What, exactly is the justification on theater, as they don't have that curriculum side, but yet killian guidelines still apply in this situation. So I guess I'm a little once again confused.

Robbi— I think we. I believe the logic was applied similar to Erin's comment regarding is the are the experience that theater arts. Students are getting in fabrication and in shop building, and all of the things that go into their performances and things like that is that, should that be on the students? Or is that part of a university function? Because we offer a theater arts department, we offer practical experience? We do. They do performances and delays. Should that be on the students to pay for that person or university function so similar to Erin's comment from the killian guidelines.

**Speaker Hondo**—Thank you for that, because that helps. Here's my follow up to that. We also have. And we also have a fund for a green Fund committee which all students pay which goes to a group of students that present ability projects as well, and that goes into a pool that's facilitated by that. And yeah, so all students pay that fee. So, for me, I guess once again, still relatively confused here, because there are certain fees that are paid by students that affects a lot of things like I said, the one I can really think of is the green fund and sustainability which is presented to us by the sustainability is overseen by the sustainability field. The question should be, then should those funds that are there using come from sustainability?

Robbi— Or should I think you raise a great question. I think the difference is that sustainability is listed in the vision mission and values of the institution, which is an institutional goal, not an S&A goal.



**Speaker Hondo**—Great, that actually helps a lot. Because, like, I, said I, for me, and this is again. I hate somebody. I apologize for that, but I'm looking at the justification reasons here, and it states they believe S&A fees are more appropriately direct towards issues that are not co-curricular to require coursework. And once again, from what I understand from the theater students that are in this room. From what is expressed to us through social media. Their funding goes to their funding for their programs, for their, for their clubs, for their ways, for their student wages. Stuff like that which I don't think that falls on the Arts and Humanities. I feel like that is something that if that is already incorporated as a student fee, and that fund is getting pulled into there. If that makes sense. I feel like this justification is very misleading. Because, like I said, it states very plain black and white. They believe that they're not appropriately more directly, appropriately directed towards an issue. They're not for curricular. But, from what you just said, that is the opposite of what's listed, and we'll stay for us to student body is. That's where my once again my confusion is coming into play here, because it seems like there is one reason versus what's actually being shared with student body. And what's and what the information we're learning from students is completely counterintuitive to other aspects of this conversation. So, I guess. **Present Cantu** for me I feel like with hearing from what our students are seeing, and especially since we now know it's more of a it's more of a gray middle area, especially knowing that I think we should ask the BOT to reassess the proposals of how the system is done. I'm on that same similar train that I feel like, based on the information we know from our students. And basically this conversation, at least for me. I would still like to send a message to the Board of Trustees to have the S&A funding request sent back for redeliberation.

**President Cantu**—Well, and I think in this the question, then, that comes up for me, and I think for a lot of us is this desire for S&A to have the recommendation sent back for redeliberation. I do, then wonder what exactly does that process look like, and what would the S&A have to essentially go through, and what kinds of steps would they have to take in order to get there? And what does that process look like?

Robbi— There's 1 point of clarification that I would have to seek advisement on, and that is, whether we can take into account new information that was provided. So in light of the conversations that you all have been having and sharing with us? Can that information be taken into, or are we solely responsible for taking in the submitted information back in December, as far as the considerations for re deliberation. But my understanding is that if the Board of trustees sends it back. S&A would then go back into deliberations and start over. So we would look at what needs to be cut, and the decisions would be discussed and deliberated and recommend. New recommendations would come from that.



**President Cantu**— What exactly do you think that timeline would be? Especially considering that we're getting close to the end of the S&A members terms.

Robbi—Yeah, I think that's a really good question like, and I think that's 1 of the questions I have, because the board of trustees doesn't meet again until July, which at the end of July, if I remember correctly, which exceeds our fiscal year. So I think this is something I would need to seek advisement on what the timeline would be.

**EVP**—I know. Previously last year we did meet over summer, so the S&A can meet over summer just require the consent of the committee members and the recruitment of those committee members as well

**President Cantu**—I believe it wouldn't be this committee; it would be next year's committee or a summer committee.

Erin—For, as far as the process goes, because we kind of have 2 things that that are tied together, but also they are kind of separate in that when the original, the current recommendations were made that was based on assuming that there would be a 4% increase to the fee. And I bring this up because this is really gonna make a big difference on redeliberation's. Because, let's say, we have to get the cost of tuition for the future students posted at some point, so that people who are coming next year know what they're going to pay, and part of that calculation is the fee increase. So if assuming that all of this comes back the committee will need to know how much money they have to allocate out, and so the difference in that fee increase was 211,000 ish. So if it would be possible to at least make a decision on that part at some point, so that at least for budgetary purposes and for because if the if the fee is not increased, then the committee is going to have to cut another 211,000, no matter what, and so that that piece would be helpful if we could figure that out, and that would kind of help the process a lot.

**Speaker Hondo**—I think you were at the Board meeting we had on Monday. I know for me the reason why I voted against that was just because, particularly because I knew we were gonna have this conversation. And I knew we should get to during that board meeting. We just ran out of time. Yeah. And that's mostly just like I said once again, I want to have further kind of just understanding, because I'm not Nick, and I don't sit in sma, so I'm not super familiar with it. So I want to have a more firm understanding. At least how the process works. And but he did express to me kind of like, especially the need. For that reason I do absolutely understand that. So at least I guess, in a way, for me if there's a possibility that we can get this sent back for re-deliberation, especially with the new information that has been shared. Especially, I have a little bit more from understanding than I'm willing to vote in pro to to increase that s and a fee especially, but on the same place, on the same side. I. If there is a way we can get this set back for re-deliberation, and that will take the scale for re-delliberation as well, then, I I'm in favor of it.



Erin— I don't want to say that that will tip the scale for re-deliberation. Because, yeah, the increase isn't going to tip the scale for re-deliberation. What it's really going to do is it's going to either. I mean, my assumption is that if the fee increase is approved, then we will be operating under the amount that is in the current request. Now, if this gets pushed back this amount would still be, but it, but it could potentially be allocated differently. If the fee increase is is not approved. And this gets pushed back. Then it would be another \$200,000 that would need to be cut with all of the reallocations. I just don't want you to think that you're voting for something, because it might move something. And in and in fact, just full disclosure. I think if you don't approve the fee, increase, it sort of automatically comes back. But in a way that we have to cut another \$200,000.

**President Cantu**— My understanding just clarify. This is that with without the fee increase in you know, being decided very soon, then it would essentially make the job of this committee this year even more challenging.

Erin—Yeah, either it would go through at the current rate, and the 1st order of business for next year's committee would be, you know, okay, welcome to S. And A. Now you have to cut \$200,000 from what's already allocated. Or this committee would have to do that, and I don't know if there's enough, you know, time to go back through and then try to cut another 200,000.

**Speaker Hondo**—If the fee increases you all would be working with 5.67 million and if it doesn't then you all would be working with 5.4 million. Okay. So I'm gonna stick to what my original thing was, my point was earlier. If it will make it. If there was basically consensus with the rest of the board, that with the S&A fee, if it will, basically with the increase it would give S&A, this S and a, and also potentially future S&A as well. The ability to get this in back to regulation. It gives you guys the ability to have it if the increase and for reallocation at least my understanding. I think it's we can. I don't understand, because numbers and I have to be with each other all the time but **President Cantu** and **EVP** probably gonna have to help me here with the fee. If the fee increase does not go through right, then that number becomes the new number they have to work with when they go to reallocate. Is that correct?

**President Cantu and EVP**—Yes.

**Speaker Hondo**— okay, so at least for me, I have a more firm grasp of what the fee increase comes into play. But, like I said before, I think with the fee increase like I said, I'm willing to go back and revote on that, because, since I have a better understanding but it is still a firm belief that I think we should assume government, we should make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees to review the proposals, how discussions like this are done so that way. In case there is questions. Further questions. S&A will have the ability hopefully to pause for a second and be able to go back and get that information just because I don't want, I think, right now what we are



seeing we are seeing, and I could tell a lot of the justified anger and conversations have been kind of aimed at members of S&A, and that's not fair to put students up against students, at least for me. That is not why I joined student government. I don't want to ever put students up against students. So I think if there's a way, we can assist not only this S. And a. For future to ensure that this they will have the ability to navigate those conversations without that fear of we have, we can only do once we're in deliberation. We can only do deliberation, I think as soon as the government, we should do our due diligence to try to set up the next scenario, the current one to be able to do that and at the same front also express the bot based off of the new information we've had. We come to this conversation conversations with our students, with the fee increase. Try to see if we can get this set back for reallocation.

**President Cantu**—I will say last night I began drafting language for a resolution to this matter. I don't have full draft yet, but once I have that fully drafted, I did want to work collaboratively with the board. These students that have come forward with their testimonies and the S. And a committee. So that way.all of the resolution reflects as much of the context as possible, and a collaborative solution that we all think would be effective. And so I will say, once I have that language finish and drafted, I would love to propose it to all of you all, and work to edit it and tease it out in a way that we can. All kind of agree is an equitable way to move forward.

**Speaker Hondo**— Senator Genzel had requested on the agenda for Monday for the Senate to craft a similar thing of resolution.

**President Cantu** interjects to ask the directors if they are able to be in the meeting till 8:30 since they are running out of time. Director Carrillo had to leave at this point.

Eli—Was wondering if the BOT had already had a proposition. For S&A if they do go back into deliberations, what does that resolution look like? And what are the, I guess new funding priorities that you guys are recommending we look more into?

**President Cantu**—To understand the question a lot better. Are you wondering about what the Board would then recommend to S&A as far as how to reallocate?

Eli—What would the resolution outline?

President Cantu—Yeah, I mean part of it would be to provide context as to why we came to the resolution in the 1st place, so it would reflect the fact that S. And a budgets are already being cut



20% across the board. It would reflect the fact that we received significant testimonials. It would reflect the fact that the S. And A. Has already deliberated for 16 h, and pretty much any other context that you know, the relevant stakeholders would want to provide in it, and then, as far as the resolution itself for the solutions. I think that may reflect either the request to the bot to send it back to S&A and or request for the University to be to begin those conversations of moving that funding over to the college's responsibility is what I imagine it to be like. Of course, everyone else's input as far as what that would be.

**Speaker Hondo**—If we are going to make that recommendation, to send that funding back to, or try to get the colleges to pay for these programs. Then I think that is then something that we need to do, or I would suggest, and I'm looking for something here for a different conversation for this meeting. Then I think that city government currently should. Whether it's in this term, or set the next board to navigate those conversations with administration. Because, I said earlier. If there is a way that we can get the call. If if the bot says No, we will not send it back for re deliberation, we will go with these board cuts and if we can navigate the conversations with the colleges, then that is something that I think, as board members, we should work with the editors in chiefs and the advisors to ensure that if the colleges are going to pay for these programs, they will be able to maintain their autonomy and their ability to continue their work, as they already continue to do, without that sense of fear, I think, is same thing. I think the one other problem, not problem. One question I do pose to you, President Cantu, is with that kind of knowledge in mind being able to do that. Does that same thought process, then get applied to programs like theater, for example, like I said for me from my interpretations, are, they aren't under that co-curricular. So it means technically, whoever it takes to the Deans. If I was a dean I would probably say, this is not fall under us, because I think it's not. It's not a class right, it's not curricular. And I add to that. I wonder what how that conversation would look, because, like I said the Deans are gonna ask, is this a co-curricular or curriculum-based class based off of what S&A provided? And if we say No, it is not. I would say there are high probability that the Deans will tell you no. So, at least for me. I think one thing that should reflect in the resolution is that the funding for theater arts should get funded back through S&A. And if the Observer and Pulse and BOT says, No, we want to do it. Then I think what we need to do is navigate the conversation with the Deans in cooperation with the advisors and editors in chief to ensure that they can somewhat receive their funding, but to keep operation operationally, funding and working while maintaining their ability to be free of their essentially that fear of the censorship. Because I do understand that concept of the fear of that fund is getting used as a chokepoint.

**President Cantu**—Yeah. I don't have those answers right now, because I would want to seek out info from y'all, and clarification on what that process would look like, because, truthfully, I am not entirely sure, even if the Board were to pass a resolution, and I don't want to talk too much about the resolution today, because language not isn't even there yet. But I mean, that would



essentially again just be more of a recommendation. It's not necessarily, you know, the board, the trustees, or anyone wouldn't absolutely have to adhere to that. But yes, I do want to bring the conversation back to the fee increase itself. Just so that way we can find a decision on that and decide how to move forward.

Marisol— I just want to be fully transparent. There's questions that, like the certain areas, answered that as students we can see, and, like myself, I spent 3 different days, looking at the whole entire binder, and like highlighting and making questions for them. And then there's presentations that they brought during our meeting, and there's a killian guidelines, and there's past 4 year funds. And then there's the new funds that they're asking for, and there's a number that we have to work with. I'm not nitpicking at like whoever needs or wants more funds. I'm working with the information that is given to me, and I'm looking it over like several times during a report. And like where was I gone? Yes, there's all this information that we use to make these decisions. And there's the presentations. And then we can't call them like back and be like, Hey, we're making the decision now, could you come back and clarify so just full transparency. There's certain amount of information that we do have. And then there's the information that we need to work with, kind of like the fee increase like, do we want to make more cuts and not have an increase or work with what we have? So it's like as a student like, I'm not saying it's a fun project to do, because it's not. It's a hard project to do. And like this huge binder that we're working with. So just full transparency like we're working with what we have. We can't be like, hey? Like observer, we don't have enough info. Could you come in and then not have that, for, like board directors and student government can be bias.

**President Cantu**—Seeing that we do have someone in public comment, is there a motion from anyone on the board to briefly open public comment.

**Speaker Hondo** motioned to briefly open up public comment with **EVP** seconding  
3-0-2

Brandon Mattis Editor and Chief for the observer— I can speak for Jackson and I. We don't feel there was any malice from the S&A committee in these decisions, and I know that there's a lot of emotions about these decisions right now from a variety of students, and that it might feel like what we're here is like personally against members of this committee. I want to tell you, at least from our level. That's not our goal. It's not what we're looking at. But I also do feel that like I was there when the observer gave our our pitch presentation. If we had known then that we were under serious possibility of losing our funding completely. I think we might have taken a different approach to that presentation. I think, if there was clarifications that needed to be made like we had both gunner, the editor chief of the Pulse magazine, and I wasn't there, but he was on text with me the whole time. I think we would have been more than happy to answer any questions. So I think for me an issue that I'm seeing that I would like ASCWU to address in this



whole thing is when you're talking to the board of trustees about future handlings of these type of budget cuts and stuff, because there's going to be more budget cuts than ours are is like maybe more transparency in the process. And I know that it's S&A is a very transparent organization with all the meetings and minutes being posted online. But I feel as students. I mean to be perfectly honest before the observer did its pitch presentation. I didn't even know S&A committee existed. It's it's just one of those things that you just don't hear about as a student on this campus unless you're in one of these positions, where you're working with others. So I think in terms of this whole decision making process. I would have loved to maybe have known more about what the very real possibilities were. So I don't think we were operating under the impression we could lose all our funding. I think we were under the impression that we were going to get cut pretty heavily, and we were okay with that we were ready for that we were braced for that. So like I said, I think we would have changed our strategy, and I asked the ASCWU kind of recommends a reevaluation of how this process is handled for future students. Because I know right now we're going to be pushing for our cause at the Board of Trustees meeting and in the present moment, but I hope that for future students they will have to face that same process. Instead, they will be made aware that like, hey? You need to be very, very clear. And how you're talking to them about your programs. You know, there's no room for gray area. Here's the meetings you should go to to clarify when they're having these deliberations all that kind of stuff.

Kylie— Hi, my name is Kylie. I'm with the theater department. I work in the theater department. I am not a theater, major. I had a question more for the advisors based on one of the questions that was answered. I think our **Senate Speaker Hondo** asked you about, since technically it was a contradiction on what was written on the released statement from S&A about it being mixed with the co-curricular. And then it was well, we don't think as a whole student funds should pay for it because and then it was compared to the sustainability during that whole conversation I don't want to quote things exactly, because I didn't write things exactly, but in a sense it was. The sustainability is part of our mission statement here at Central Washington University. I understand that I would just like to compare that with the other things that were approved on this list that have nothing to do with the mission statement like the marching pet band, and the museum similar to the theater department. They provide an experience or a show, if you will, for students to have access to attend to even if you want to go that far, our radio station does a similar thing just on a more regular basis than the theater department, because we can't crank out that many performances in that little time, because it takes time. So I'm just curious. If it wasn't the co-curricular issue. And it wasn't because of the mission statement. How do we differentiate from the other arts departments that do similar things to us because we got nothing not even like a penny, like a thousand bucks. We got 0.



**President Cantu**— I would like to clarify also about just like, I know noticed the sustainability fee is brought up. That is a fee, because it was already voted on by the student body. So that was not a decision just from the Executive Board or from admin. It is because it is tied to the mission and vision values and because it got direct approval from the student body via the ASCWU elections. That's why that's in state. So just to clarify that.

Kylie—I was just curious, because that was the reasoning that was used. If you could clarify a bit more upon that, I know, you guys make hard decisions. But it just does seem like just discrepancy after discrepancy in a way.

Ian— Well, so was the marching band mentioned as being funded because I did not?  
Kylie—mentioned it was not funded.

**EVP**—At least from my recollection on the conversation. It was a multitude of things. One of it was specifically the killian guidelines, the question of it being falling under those killing guidelines and specifically, I believe, it's called the Ecc is associated with class equipment, and those are specifically only used for theater students. So that was one of the questions that was raised is, if that does or doesn't fall in.

Kylie— So I'm not personally a film major, but I'm pretty sure you can quote me on this if I'm wrong, anyone can rent out the equipment it doesn't have to be a film major to rent out equipment in the ECC, so there's no correlation to the people working that job to build major specifically

**Speaker Hondo**—Thank you. This also brings me to another question that I have for EVP. 2 things with that one that is correct. I'm an English major. I can say right now. I don't think that applies here. That's in this particular situation, but I think the biggest thing that correct me if I'm wrong. The discrepancy that the question is referring to here is based on the question that asked earlier, based off of what is printed on black and white versus what is actually being told. We are looking at 3 different varying things, and that, I think, is where the discrepancy is of which one is it correct? Am I misunderstanding the question?

Kylie—No, its been 3 different excuses and none of them track.

**Speaker Hondo**—Because there is this discrepancy right where, I guess, because I and I do see, based on the funding recommended request on the document provided by S. And a you know museum did receive their funding for it, based on what I can tell. You also referenced Pep band, which was another area that I see that also received funding. So I guess the other parts to that question comes into play is what is so differentiating for theater arts that they would get slashed. Am I misunderstanding the question here?



**EVP**—It was a combination of all the things that we just had a conversation on. It wasn't necessarily one specific as well as the feeling that the theater and arts, the funding for it should come from theater and arts and film not necessarily from S&A. So it kind of comes back to what Aaron was saying is whether Sme should be funding this, or should the department be funding this.

**President Cantu**—I also want to point out that we have 15 min of the the 30 that we agreed upon, and still have our other new business. Item.

Kylie— the department. If they were, we've been funded by S. And A. Since 2,008. If the Department had money to fund us, they would but they don't, because we don't follow under the curriculum. So the question still stands. If every single factor that has been used to justify the theater department being defunded, is false and incorrect. How do we get that removed?

Speaker Hondo—If I can present with you to ask a really quick follow up question to that based off of the notes provided by S. And a right so repulse were defunded because of killing guidelines theater arts was is written to be defunded because of killing Island. However, that doesn't seem to apply. In this case. Mariachi Band was told that they not, cannot receive based funding requests from S&A. If that is the case, and clubs like that cannot receive funding programs like theater, they are not curriculum cannot receive funding. Co-curricular programs cannot receive funding. Then for me, I guess I'm a little confused here where is the S&A funds kind of going directing to, because for me, that's extracurricular that's co-curricular. But once again referencing the document. I'm just a little bit confused here and I think that's where I think my discrepancies are kind of coming into play.

President Cantu—To kind of seek out that clarity as well, and from my own understanding. Was that decision based on that interpretation of the fact that the work of the theater employees specifically directly impacts the shows that are curriculum based and different activities that are curriculum based?

Ian—I recall that was a lot of the reason that was discussed specifically on that issue.

Marisol— I also wanted to add that when we're when we're like looking at everything on this list and like saying like, let's look at what information they've provided, and how much we have left, and how much we have to allocate. Once that money is like, it's only a recommendation. It's we don't have the final say just to be fully transparent on that once that money is out there. S&A committee can't say like you have to lose the money on this this, it's up to them where that money goes.

Jackson— Yeah. So once again, I know it's very tough stuff for you guys. And it's not being the same world and I know that we were under the impression that we were going to be funded like



Brandon said, our statement or our Powerpoint would have been drastically different kind of explaining all the ins and outs of the observer during that meeting. But the work we do is beyond curricular, and you're putting in so much hours and like you said there's so much editing. We came here from being a design to nearly 2 Am. Last night. Now we're here at this meeting. So yeah, you can't even get a job in the class without completing the class course 1st as well. So it's not like you come into the class, and you're immediately just thrown into a paid position. But you're also getting credits and stuff like that. So you do have to complete the course and go through the ins and outs of working through the observer and stuff like that to work your way up to that point and I think that there was a lot of lot of talk about gray area. And I think with a minimal amount of research, you would have found there is absolutely no gray area of the program, whether it's curricular or curricular or co-curricular. Should that be from the students or university function? And for the observer or answer is yes, we are by the students and for the students. The only way for us to be independent is if we are funded by the students, and I think you can ask tons of students here on campus that they are willing to have their fees built into the observer as well because of how much stuff we are covering that impacts all of the students. As I said, for the students by the students, we're reporting on stuff that actually not only impacts students that are impactful staff, too cover stuff like budgets we cover stuff that are happening in the library athletic departments and stuff like that that really shine light on certain things. Yeah, the responsibility to take on when you're an editor, chief or really any staff position at the Observer as well is huge. You kind of become a public figure here at Campus. I personally have received hate for stories that I've written. I've received tons of love for the same stories and stuff like that. So you really like, I said, become a public figure. And so you take on a lot of the responsibility of what your writers are publishing which you personally are publishing. It is whatever goes out on the Observer. Our name is attached to it, and so we are as I said, very, I would say, very prominent figures. But people that I've had come up to me and recognize who I am based on the observer and stuff like that. I know Brandon has many of our quarters have, too. We this type of responsibility be completely impossible to ask for a student. And that is why we have these very separate paid positions and stuff, too, because this is not something that you can just walk into the observer and be able to take on that huge responsibility and that weight on your shoulders the amount of hours we're putting in stuff. So I feel like that is something that's important to be stated. And we also have all this proof of so much widespread support from our community students, staff alumni with over 330 signatures so far in support of student media and what we do and how important, noting how important it is to our community.

President Cantu—We would like to move along just just for the sake of time, and we have another question from one of the committee members.

Jackson— Well, I do want to ask is that ASCWU. In your drafted statement when you ask the Board to send these budgets back for reevaluation. If S&A cannot and quite literally will not



fund our program, we will close and we will close without this student funding. So we need this funding.

President Cantu— we will definitely consider that question. Once we move directly into our discussion about the resolution. So thank you for offering that. We have a question from Eli.

Eli—I believe this idea might help, Malik brought it up too: We talked about if the class/academic area cannot function normally without the S&A funds, it’s an implication that S&A is funding an academic area. It’s not an answer to where the grey area is but more shows if the line into academics is crossed.

President Cantu— thank you for that, Eli. Thank you. Seeing that we do only have a few more minutes, and we do have another item on the agenda. I’m going to recommend that the Board make a decision about the S&A fee increase before we move on to our new business item.

**Speaker Hondo** motions to approve the S&A fund increase with **EVP** seconding  
3-0-2

President Cantu—We have some more things to discuss but for times sake we will have these conversations later. Please continue to join us for these

## **New Business**

### ASCWU ADI Req. Letter

**Speaker Hondo**—The Faculty Executive Committee is requesting a statement from ASCWU (in support, opposition, or neutral) regarding a new graduation requirement called the ADI (Anti-racism, Diversity, Inclusivity). It was set to be implemented in the fall and would have been mandatory for all students, similar to University 101. However, concerns have arisen based on interpretations of Title VI and the Dear Colleague Letter (DCL), which warn that mandatory programs tied to race-related content may lead to federal investigations and a loss of funding if they’re not open to all students. Although individual departments can still offer these courses, making them a requirement for all students may be risky. Faculty Senate is divided, some believe in the importance of the requirement, while others are concerned about potential consequences, including federal or state funding loss. The ADI requirement is new, not longstanding, which adds to the debate. ASCWU has been asked to weigh in to help guide the Faculty Senate’s final decision. If the university is investigated and found in violation, federal funding could be pulled, possibly threatening the university’s operations. The speaker remains undecided but emphasizes the importance of protecting funding to ensure students can continue attending the university at all.



**President Cantu**—I think the answer is clear but I wonder before we take a stance maybe talking to the AG might be good. **Speaker Hondo** clarified that they believe those conversation have already been had but nothing official has come out. With **EVP** asking if his is a program in addition to orientation or like orientation? Speaker Hondo explained that the ADI requirement would be a new, mandatory class—similar to University 101—that all students must complete in order to graduate, starting as early as fall quarter. The intent is to provide students with greater education around anti-racism, diversity, and inclusion. However, there's concern that making it a requirement could trigger a federal investigation and risk the loss of funding, which would ultimately harm students.

**President Cantu**—Seeing as we are at 8:30 I would suggest that we table this

**Speaker Hondo**—The faculty exec team is meeting today so they would use our opinion to help with deliberation. In fact, they said, chair emailed me yesterday and they wanted that. I can read you the exact email if President Cantu will permit me to do so. I just wanna he sent. He followed up on email for me last week, but, he said, some executive committee is meeting this Wednesday to discuss some things related to the Ada requirement, and knowing where ASCWU stands would be helpful Peter Costerman.

**Director Garcia-Sanchez**—The opinion of the ESC won't be included if they meet today?

**Speaker Hondo**—No it will be included. This is just the faculty exec committee not the full faculty senate. They should be officially voting on the motion in May. I believe the Executive Committee is just going to meet themselves to kind of see where they stand on it, and they're asking where ASCWU stands.

**President Cantu**— I'll extend the meeting by 10 min. So 8:40 is where we'll reevaluate. I would want to talk with AG. I think it is a pretty clear answer Because, yeah, like, I said, from from previous conversations, as far as like initiatives like this and work like this in Higher Ed. Because of the DCL, it seems like a pretty solid answer that this probably wouldn't be a good thing to continue with right now in the current administration, but I am curious about.

**Speaker Hondo** said they plan to follow up with Peter Osterman to learn what was discussed with the Attorney General, as they aren't currently informed on that. They also want to consult with the Equity Services Council (ESC), who were heavily involved in earlier discussions.

**Speaker Hondo** has mixed feelings about removing the ADI graduation requirement. They emphasized that as long as individual programs can continue incorporating anti-racism and diversity content, removing the university-wide graduation requirement wouldn't necessarily erase those efforts. Given current political and funding risks—particularly with Senate Bill 5875—**Speaker Hondo** is leaning toward supporting removal of the requirement in order to



protect student access to financial aid and college itself. He emphasized the need for more information from both the Attorney General and the ESC before making a final judgment.

**President Cantu**—I would then wonder how the departments would go about this, hoping that the individual departments would pick it up rather than having all students do it.

**Speaker Hondo**—The main legal concern comes from the FAQ, which states that any requirement applied to all students—without giving them a choice—can be a Title VI violation. That’s where the risk of investigation and funding loss comes in. However, individual programs, like theater or education, that already include anti-racism and diversity training as part of their specific curriculum would remain unaffected. For example, a theater or education major may be required to take such courses, but a business or science major wouldn’t—unless this new graduation requirement is implemented. Because this would create a new, mandatory class for all students, Faculty Senate is currently split: should they keep the requirement and risk funding, or remove it and allow individual programs to continue and potentially expand this work on their own?

**President Cantu** expressed concern about needing more information, with **Speaker Hondo** adding that they will follow up with Petter to tell them that ASCWU will have further deliberations

**EVP**—In the at least for the timeline of things. We just need to get it in before the next faculty?

**Speaker Hondo** says that is the impression that I’m under. Yes, I don’t. I, from my understanding of the procedures of Faculty Senate. The Faculty Executive Committee itself does not have voting power on this issue. Only individual faculty members within their respective programs can vote—not the Deans or the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is instead working on drafting a statement to clarify their stance. They’re requesting a statement from the student side (ASCWU) so both perspectives can be brought to the May meeting, where faculty members will decide on the ADI requirement.

**President Cantu**—Looking at the time I suggest motioning to table this.

**Speaker Hondo** motioned to table this discussion which was seconded by **EVP**.

3-0-2

## **Announcements**

Spring splash today from 5pm-7pm

Gov affairs SB 5875 – help send emails to legislators to combat that bill



Show time this sat 6pm to 8 pm

There was no public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40am.