



**ASBSU**

Associated Students of Boise State University  
Assembly Meeting  
02-20-2019

---

- I. Call to Order - 4:34pm
- II. Notable Attendance-28 swiped
  - a. All Exec present.
  - b. Adviser- Jenn Fields
- III. Approval of the minutes from **2/13/19**
  - a. motion to suspend the reading: Riley, second: Kieley
    - i. Vote:
      1. For- Unanimous, Against-0, Abstain-0
- IV. Officer Updates
  - a. Secretary of Government Relations
    - i. Day at the Capitol
      1. Working on sign-up sheet excuse list for classes
    - ii. breakfast with the Governor
      1. Discussed Idaho Opportunity Scholarship and climate change.
    - iii. Tracking what is going through the legislature
      1. Not much pertaining to higher education
  - b. Secretary of Student Orgs
    - i. Funding Board
      1. There will be one or two hearings this Friday.
    - ii. Election
      1. ASBSU Info session is 4pm, next Monday and Thursday
  - c. Secretary of Academic Affairs
    - i. Golden Apples
      1. Still working on logistical planning
    - ii. Dead week policy resolution
      1. Drafting with Cade
  - d. Communications
    - i. Flyers
      1. Day at the Capitol
      2. Elections
    - ii. Share posts and follow @asbsu on all social media
  - e. Vice President of Inclusive Excellency
    - i. VPIE Elections
      1. Slating closes this Friday, but will possibly be extending.

APPROVAL

- a. There will be an email with information including links with flyers.
      - b. Second Info session: tomorrow, 7:30pm at SDI
    - ii. FIJI convention
      - 1. IESC Members helped facilitate a workshop at the convention.
    - iii. Organizing big meeting
      - 1. To discuss future training procedures
      - 2. Will include Exec, F.B., and IESC
  - f. Chief of Staff
    - i. Committee sign-up sheet
      - 1. Each Committee chair explained their corresponding committees
    - ii. Completed Purchase Requests
      - 1. NRHH bill
      - 2. CNMI Donations will be sent out by the end of this week or early next week.
  - g. Ethics Officer
    - i. Code will continue to be presented.
  - h. President
    - i. Dance Marathon (this weekend)
      - 1. All proceeds will go to St. Luke's Children's hospital.
    - ii. Executive Tuition Fee Committee hearing
      - 1. There is nothing public right now, but he will continue to update with information once it becomes available.
    - iii. Talk with Nicole Nimmons
      - 1. Window SUB Signage
        - a. Using Pacific Oregon University as an example of signage.
  - i. Vice President
    - i. Food Pantry
      - 1. Logos were shown to Assembly, and will be used ASAP.
    - ii. Assembly Meeting Rooms
      - 1. Compiled a list of rooms for the next 3 years that Assembly will be in.
- V. Haydn also gave a brief description of his Health and Wellness committee at this moment.
- VI. Old Business
  - a. IESC code
    - i. Reagan clarified that questions will be asked at the end (in the interest of time).
    - ii. Started from "General Rules of Meetings" section
  - b. Discussion
    - i. There was a motion to amend Section 3. (E) (3b) from "any" to "of": Corinne, second: Riley
      - 1. Vote:
        - a. For-Unanimous, Against-0, Abstain-0
    - ii. There was a motion to amend Section 4. (A) (5) from this "Constitution" to this "Code": Kieley, second: Cade
      - 1. Vote:
        - a. For-27, Against-0, Abstain-0

APPROVAL

- iii. There was a motion to amend Section 3. (B) (F) (i) to clarify “IESC Article” to “Article V of the Constitution”: Miranda, second: Corinne
  - 1. Vote:
    - a. For- Unanimous, Against-0, Abstain-0
- iv. There was a question about the role of IESC with funding board decisions.
  - 1. Clarified that the IESC is more knowledgeable than the Ethics officer (who receives the complaints)
  - 2. There was a discussion about whether it should be clarified further what the IESC’s knowledge can pertain to.
    - a. Funding board officers receive Viewpoint Neutrality training, so there are some issues will be more appropriate for the IESC to handle (e.g. racism)..
  - 3. There was a question about page 4, E (3) (A): Reasons for complaints clarifying what IESC’s “consent” constitute?
    - a. A clarifying example was given: if they went out and advocated for their personal opinions, and not the opinion the IESC agreed on as a whole. (there was no consultation)
    - b. This would apply to all IESC members
    - c. Then, would they have to vote on what IESC’s stance is?
      - i. It would be a case by case basis
- v. There was a motion to end discussion: Wyatt, second: Zac
  - 1. Vote:
    - a. For-Unanimous, Against-0. Abstain-0
- c. Sustainability Resolution
  - i. The resolution passed in Exec, but it was amended.
    - 1. Kaleb explained the amendment. (removed incorrect verbiage regarding the increasing costs of fossil fuels)
  - ii. There was a motion to end discussion: Wyatt, second: Zac
    - 1. Vote:
      - a. For-Unanimous, Against-0, Abstain-0

## VII. New Business

- a. Election Code (presented by Reegan)
  - i. Explained that this needs to be passed before monday
  - ii. Mentioned that the reason for changes was to clarify existing verbiage
  - iii. During the reading, there was a Point of Information: what is background and purpose of no Exec member endorsing candidates?
    - 1. It was unsure, but mainly to consider biases.
    - 2. Secret endorsements would be unfair, because election decisions are made by certain Exec members
    - 3. Counterpoint: U of I Exec is allowed to endorse (and Arkansas school)
      - a. There was a suggestion to have exceptions to the rule.
        - i. Only apply it to the Elections manager and Ethics officer

- ii. There were disagreements to this including that all Exec have big titles, so there would still be an influence.
- iii. There would be awkward moments where you might train who you did not endorse
  - 1. There were agreements that ASBSU/ exec staying unbiased.
  - 2. Another counterpoint was that Exec sees the qualities that is needed and therefore should be able to endorse.
- iv. There was support for not muting the entire Exec and suggestion of not being able to endorse corresponding candidates to avoid the awkward situation.
- v. Another point was that as students, Exec members are directly affected by next leaders of ASBSU.
  - 1. Example: RHA considered endorsing a candidate last year, but they were 50/50 so they did not.
- vi. Reagan talked to Charlie about this section.
  - 1. Endorsement can come off as "ASBSU believes that" when an Exec member says something.
    - a. There were several counterpoints e.g. that a statement could be issued (not ASBSU's opinion) and it was compared to avoiding bias on Twitter.
    - b. There was an argument that the rule was limiting Exec members.
- 4. There was a point to recognize power with the [Exec] position and the perception of power throughout campus
- 5. Last year, Exec was not allowed to endorse, but the rule was broken and it lead to a lack of trust especially with the rules of the tie-breaker.
- 6. There was a conversation about personal views and not associating them with the organization.
  - a. People would still look at you as part of that org.
    - i. It will make people think there is a bias.
    - ii. There was a point that the students at the university are adults and as such, should be able to discern that it would not be an ASBSU opinion
      - 1. A contrasting point was that the university is a smaller arena of less people and there has been a low voter turnout.
- 7. There was a suggestion that if Exec can't endorse, than no one else in ASBSU can. (including Student Assembly)

- a. Then, there was another suggestion to just have no hired position endorse.
  - b. Whatever decision is made, we should apply to all positions of Exec due to rumors. IESC endorsing students of color will be more scandalous. Suggested to have it apply to all Exec and other entities of ASBSU.
- 8. Kaleb has limitations to things he can do as President. He already is under a certain amount of restriction.
- 9. There was a point of information: would posting an endorsement on personal Insta [an Exec member's] be allowed under these laws?
  - a. It would not be allowed
- 10. Someone brought up that everyone in Exec has a role in elections and if endorsements were allowed, it may divide Exec.
- 11. Last comment (Chair decision) on the topic: if there is no perceived bias, then why can't they post on insta?
  - a. Due to transparency/ accountability as Exec has a privilege no other branch has.
- 12. Moving on, there was a question about how the number of signatures was decided on.
  - a. It was discussed with Jeremiah Shinn.
  - b. Mentioned that it started off as a percentage.
  - c. More candidates would equal more turnout.
  - d. This was discussed with Michael.
    - i. The higher number would weed out people who are not passionate about it.
    - ii. 200 is nothing with the amount of people at BSU.
    - iii. Compared to University of Oregon's 50 and Nampa mayor only needed 5.
    - iv. There was a question about when the highest turnout was, and it was last year.
- 13. There was a suggestion to have 100.
  - a. Some agreed that it was not that hard to get signatures.
- 14. There was a motion to cut required # of signatures from 200-100 (P & VP) and 100-50 (Secretaries): Zac, second: Kennedy
  - a. Vote:
    - i. For-Unanimous, Against-0, Abstain-0
- 15. There was a motion to strike Section 5, subsection F, 4: Wyatt, second Zac.
  - a. There was a point of information that there is no appointment process normally.
    - i. motion to discuss: Haydn, second: Zac
      - 1. Regarding hired positions, some brought up that there are positions in U.S. government who cannot endorse. (i.e. supreme court cannot endorse and FBI agents)
        - a. However, the Executive of the U.S. can.

- b. This amendment would allow the Ethics and Election chair to endorse.
        - i. There would still be grounds to remove if both are unethical.
- 2. The discussion originally had a time limit, but it was pointed out that there can be no limit on discussion.
  - a. Back on the subject, the Ethics officer would be able to decide what he wants= no trust in election cycle=huge transparency issue.
  - b. motion to move to previous question on all pending business: Haydn, second: Riley
- 3. There was a point of info regarding amending an amendment.
  - i. Vote: For-Majority, Against-1, Abstain
  - b. Vote on amendment (Wyatt's):
    - i. For-4, against-majority, abstain-1
  - c. There was clarification on what Haydn's motion did.
- 4. There was a point of order since this needs to be ready by Monday. Several suggestions to have an Emergency Assembly meeting after. (It could not be moved to after the presentations on the agenda since not enough could stay after for quorum.)
  - a. With the motion, they voted on Code document and there was clarification that someone can make another motion (to amend, etc) after it passes.
    - i. Exec can have special meetings to vote on Code. (these will take place the second it passes.)
  - b. It was clarified that, yes, this would be the Code candidates have to follow once packets open.
    - i. If it's amended next week, he will have to look at the verbiage. Ethically speaking, this is how it will be for this election cycle. (as long as

any amendment is before  
friday.)

5. Chair clarified if Assembly votes no, the Code to be used for this year's election would last year's.
  6. There was a motion to discuss Corinne's amendment about limiting just Ethics officer and Elections manager, but there was no second.
  7. There was a motion to amend the code to have it say "All ASBSU paid personnel":  
Zac, second: Kennedy
    - a. For- 19, against-0, abstain-0
- b. Presentation: Rich Weigel- University Dining Services with Bryan (Res. District Manager for Aramark)
- i. purpose: asking questions to Assembly
  - ii. Presentation notes:
    1. Aramark does not use frozen vegetables (except maybe corn)
    2. There is a bakery on campus (they bake almost everything)
    3. There's more than 3 stations at BRC.
      - a. 5 stations
    4. Dining services was given an A+ by PETA for vegan/vegetarian options.
  - iii. 3 comments:
    1. "Quality":
      - a. Asked to define quality
        - i. no food poisoning (must be within temp)
        - ii. flavor (subjective)
        - iii. nutritious (every single item has the facts)
        - iv. There was a question about how often is salad changed out.
          1. End of the shift: should change out as the day goes along. tell somebody to change it
          2. Encouraged to ask for supervisor if something is wrong
      - b. Explained Campus dish: where they hold all things dining (hours of operation, links to navigate meal plan, nutritional info)
      - c. Dining with the Director (past dining services program)
    2. "Not enough selections"
      - a. Clarified that the menu changes everyday (4-week cycle) with some mainstays
      - b. Encouraged to ask to taste something
      - c. Some members agreed that Dining has good selection based on looking at other campuses
    3. "No value"
      - a. not wanting to pay \$10 at the BRC for lunch
        - i. Compared to Moe's, Chickfila, Subway

- ii. Expanded on recent sustainability piece: reusable to-go containers
      - 1. There are around 2100 right now
      - 2. They are \$7 right now on first time purchase
      - 3. Also mentioned the BSU branding will be used for promotion by the branding company
  - iv. They both encouraged talking to Dining services so there would be no assumptions.
    - 1. Reminded about the dietician on campus and gave examples of students talking to staff about diet issues and what they did to help.
  - v. There was a question about cross-contamination issues at the BRC specifically regarding peanut allergies.
    - 1. They have touched base on it, but are still figuring out how to completely control it.
  - vi. Emily mentioned doing an official Assembly Request of Opinion on the 3 above.
- c. Swipe out Hunger by Sarah
  - i. purpose: explain the program and get support for it
    - 1. collecting students' unused meal swipes which is comparable to full Broncos
  - ii. Issues with Full Broncos: there was no component to break the stigma of food insecurity.
    - 1. This program has, and gives back in some way.
    - 2. National chapter in California will help with branding and with consistency.
      - a. There was a question if the meals will roll over, and they said it depends.(either a cap or conversation rate)
        - i. 1 guest-swipe per student per semester
        - ii. cap 5 of 5 per students
        - iii. cap per students depend on the meal plan
        - iv. Will be what works best for BSU's campus.
          - 1. based on the contract with Aramark
    - 3. Full Broncos was being abused (some saw it as final's relief)
    - 4. There was a question about students who don't live on campus, how can they donate?
      - a. It depends on how implementation will work.
    - 5. There was clarification that this is more organized and long-lasting than Full Broncos.
      - a. Ashley will try to write the resolution
      - b. Is Full Broncos is inactive?
        - i. Explained that Swipe Out Hunger was presented to the board and got positive feedback
        - ii. Then, next week Full Broncos was implemented (which was planned in 3 days).

VIII. Announcements- N/A

IX. Meeting Adjourned at 6:28pm

APPROVAL