



AS Management Council

Tuesday, November 18, 2014

4:00 p.m. VU567

Members: *Present:* Chelsea Ghant, Chair (VP for Business and Operations); Morgan Burke (AS Business); Josie Ellison (AS Communications Director); Sadie Normoyle (AS Environment & Sustainability Programs Director); Ana Palma Gutierrez (AS Ethnic Student Center Program Support Coordinator); Cooper Anderson (AS KUGS Program Director); Brian Bates (AS Outdoor Excursions Coordinator); Hannah Brock (AS Personnel Director); Camie Herk (AS Productions Director); Patrick Eckroth (AS Representation & Engagement Programs Director); Abigail Ramos (AS Review Editor-in-Chief); Morgan Haskins (AS Publicity Center Account Executive); Ashlyn Doltar (AS Club Coordinator)

Advisor: Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director of Student Activities)

Secretary: Emma J. Opsal (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)

Guests: Giselle Alcantar-Soto (AS VP for Activities); Jeff Bates (Publicity Center Coordinator); Casey Hayden (Student Activities Director); Raquel Wilson (Finance Office Manager)

Missing: Samantha Goldblatt (AS Resource & Outreach Programs Director)

Motions:

MC-14-F-3 *To approve the Management Council minutes from November 4, 2014. Passed*

MC-14-F-4

To fund the involvement calendar with 350 dollars from the supplemental fund. Passed

Ghant called the meeting to order at 4:02p.m.

I. Minutes Approval

MOTION MC-14-F-3 By Ellison

To approve the Management Council minutes from November 4, 2014.

Second: Herk

Vote: 12-0-0 Action: Passed

II. Elections

At a previous meeting, Herk Brock and Ellison were nominated for the position of Vice Chair. Each was given 2 minutes to speak as to why they should be elected to the position. Brock stated she had experience with leading, as she was head of the Personnel Committee, was familiar with parliamentary procedure, and after 3 years in the AS was willing to step up when asked to lead in the absence of the Chair. Herk followed, stressing her experience after 4 years in the AS, and helping to lead staff meetings within her office of 14 individuals, and setting time limits to discussion, similar to the format of the Management Council meetings. She also stated how her experience in the AS had given her insight to how the organization not only impacted itself through their committees, but the campus as a whole. Ellison was last to speak on why they should be elected. They mentioned their involvement within the AS and other organizations. They gave background to their time in the AS, as the year prior Ellison had served as ASVP for Academic Affairs, and the committee on which they had served the previous year. Through this involvement, Ellison stressed their knowledge of the organization, stating they had practically memorized most of the guiding policies. They also stated they had been one of the leaders in

bringing parliamentary procedure to the AS Board, and hoped to bring a similar format to the way Management Council was run if elected. The council moved on to nominations for Representative to Management Council, Palma-Gutierrez, Eckroth, and Bates. Palma-Gutierrez was first. As a first year employee in the AS, she had already served on the Personnel Committee. This had opened opportunities to her for learning about the AS and the campus, as she was a relatively new student. She felt she was a good candidate, as she had already served, but also had leadership experiences at her previous school. Palma-Gutierrez felt she was good at bringing new ideas to the committee, and was able to communicate them due to her strong communication skills. She stated she enjoyed the work, and creating the environment of acceptance the AS strives for. Bates had self-nominated, since the Outdoor Center realized they had not had representation on the Personnel Committee in previous years, and the office was trying change their image into one more involved with the AS. He was surprised there had not been a representative, because as part of the OC, he had been involved with numerous interviews and supervised many employees. He saw this experience as an asset to the Personnel Committee, and could very well bring new insight to the decision making process surrounding it. Eckroth was last, and started off by stating the reason to accept the nomination due to his recent experiences with the hiring process. Over the summer he had hired 10 people, and redeveloped 3 job descriptions in the prior months. He also stated he had received feedback, both unsolicited and not, about the hiring process, and he saw this as a reason to change many aspects of it, from making it less intimidating to some, to changing the language of the policies to be more inclusive.

III. Involvement Calendar

The council was reminded ASVP for Activities Giselle Alcantar-Soto's request for funding of an involvement calendar. She had requested 350 dollars from the 3000 dollar supplemental fund.

MOTION MC-14-F-4 By Herk

To fund the in volemment calendar with 350 dollars from the supplemental fund.

Second: Ellison

Vote: 13-0-1 Action: Passed

IV. Returning Salary Employee Hiring

The advisors were welcomed to the table to discuss the policies regarding the hiring process around returning salary employees. It had already been brought to the Personnel Committee, as Brock explained, but she wanted more feedback from a larger group. She proposed questioning the process through which people wanting to reapply to their positions did so. She suggested eliminating the formal interview process, so it could be decided by a committee whether or not an employee would be retained for another year. She also suggested in the case of an employee saying they would like to reapply for their job, but also apply for other jobs. As the conversations of the personnel committee had taken up multiple meetings, there was a pretty strong grasp on the pros and cons of this system, and the system that was currently in place. The benefits Brock saw were the retention of employees with experience, knowledge, and projects in progress applicable to the organization. The main deterrent to Brock was how accessible the positions would be for the general student population. She also mentioned how abstract the process for rehiring staff members was at the time of the meeting. She also mentioned in Personnel Committee there was mention of how if the hiring process remained the same, those reapplying would have a substantial advantage over the others because they have the experience those

applying for the first time would not have. Burke suggested an evaluation system, similar to the process used to hire Resident Advisors in the dorms, to assess the quality of the staff member who wanted to return. Brock suggested employee, self, advisor, and supervisor evaluations for this system. Palma-Gutierrez also mentioned the use of the legacy documents, as they could be used as a self-evaluation measuring the growth of the staff member, and highlighting the accomplishments, and the goals the employee wanted to reach the following year. Herk was concerned about using the legacy documents this way, as people could write the legacy documents to make themselves look better. Bates was also concerned about this approach, as the OC's hiring process involved more hard skills and knowledge, which in his opinion were hard to convey in a legacy document. Palma-Gutierrez said from her perspective, the legacy document could be used this way, as she liked to acknowledge improvement from her past mistakes. It was also a reflection of ways she could improve moving forward. Additionally, she felt the completion would allow the organization to see how they could teach the new staff members hired. Ellison stated they liked the RA process, with the use of an anonymous committee to review, as well supervisor supervisee evaluations. They also saw some benefit to the legacy documents being completed the second year of an employee's term with the AS, as their institutional knowledge would be at its height. They understood why someone would or would not include something that had gone wrong, and thought that could be an excellent piece to discuss when the committee reviewed the reapplying staff member's materials. Herk was concerned with the institutional rehiring of the same staff members, the AS would no-longer look open to all students. She alluded to a large student population that did not think they could get a job in the AS, and how they would further be deterred if the AS suggested returners would get priority over the new applicants anyways. This would, in her eyes, also shrink the applicant pool. Normoyle was confused whether or not someone not asked to return to their position would be allowed to reapply to their old position. Brock mentioned this had come up in the Personnel Committee meetings, and there were multiple issues surrounding this idea. She was concerned if an employee had not been satisfactory, how someone would be able to tell them they would not be asked to return. Additionally, if the employee was not asked to return, would they be discouraged from reapplying for their job, and if they got the job, would there be any tension between them and their supervisors and other employees. Hayden wanted some clarification on what percentages of employees had returned for the past few years. Rosenberg stated it had been approximately 10 percent for the past 4 years. Hayden also stated, from his perspective, it was very rare that a new applicant had beaten out the former position holder for the position, although it had happened a few times. Hayden was still concerned over the openness of the organization if the policies suggested stayed in place, and whether or not the new policy would encourage people to stay in their positions, taking more positions off the table. Wilson was excited over this possible policy change, as she saw it as a way to create both transparency and efficiency for the AS. She was uncomfortable, however, with the terminology being used when talking about the rehiring process, namely words like "invited," and "nominated." She saw this process as more of Letter of Intent process, so those wanting to stay in their current positions would have until a specific time to sign a letter of intent, and would have to tell their supervisors and advisors of their intentions to return to their positions. The advisors and supervisors would have to agree to recommend the staff member to return to their positions. She did not want to tie the process to a new legacy document or new type of evaluation as that would not be as efficient. She mentioned how much of an impact this would indeed have, however, as removing a few interview processes from the schedules of those having to partake in many committees would save a lot of time. Palma-Gutierrez liked the letter of intent idea, as it helped deter the use of the wording Raquel had issue with. She also discussed how the interviewing of employees would be uncomfortable for some involved. As the committees and the returning employees would have to

discuss their accomplishments and failures while pretending the committee was ignorant to their work within the AS, as well as the difficulty of the committee discussing the candidates without positive and negative personal biases affecting the discussion. She was concerned over which would be best for the AS, institutional knowledge or accessibility. Haskins agreed with Wilson, as through involvement with other organizations she had seen a letter of intent system as the standard. She saw it as a fair way to acknowledge the accomplishments and experiences of staff members wanting to return. She also saw this as a way to improve upon the hiring process, as even though in theory it was completely level, in practice, when returning staff members were in the pool of applicants, it was not. Doltar was concerned those who are both involved and not involved with the AS were being limited in how much they could grow professionally, both for those who stay in their positions, and those who are unable to enter the organization because a staff member has stayed in their position for some time. Eckroth stated the conversation had been more focused on the benefits of the organization, rather than the students the organization was supposed to reflect. Eckroth saw this as encouragement for people to stay in their positions, and many staff members would stay if they had the opportunity. Burke clarified the some points around the letter of intent system suggested. It was similar to the process in which RAs would reapply for their positions. If given a positive evaluation alongside the letter of intent, the RA would not need to reenter the applicant pool, but if not, it did not hinder their ability to reapply. Instead, the RA would thus interview again, and re-earn their position. This process, in Burke's eyes, would make the process leaner, saving work for the advisor, and allow those who would sit on slightly redundant hiring committees to have more time to give back to the organization. Burke stated the numbers provided by Rosenberg did show the amount of returners was indeed very low, but could be impacted by returners. Although it had been discussed how valued institutional knowledge was, and whether or not it should be a deciding factor in whether or not a student is hired, Burke gave the example of the many interview questions and criteria used did reflect the value the organization had assigned it. This, in her mind, gave the reapplying staff members a much greater advantage. She saw this as completely wasting the time of the new applicants against the returning staff members. Ellison saw the conversation as something boiling down to growth versus the benefits of institutional knowledge. They also felt this would affect the image of the organization negatively, as the AS was already seen as a clique-y organization. From their perspective of the communications of the organization, they thought if this came to pass, it would need a large amount of spin to make it look more accessible. Ramos suggested assuring an interview for those wanting to return to their positions instead of the position. This way, she thought, it would be a way for the staff member to realize the privilege of how lucky they are to have their job. This would also leave the position open for other students. Bates saw this idea as not affecting the clique stigma surrounding the AS, because it was not a stretch to see the retention of employees with experience. He thought most students would see this as a realistic process, similar to "real world" job structures. He also mentioned how some of the OC employees do not need to reapply for their positions from year to year. Bates also agreed with Eckroth on the need for improvements in the hiring process. He thought the improvements could streamline the process. Hayden felt the pull to this model whenever a wonderful employee reapplied for their position and it was obvious they could not be beaten by a new applicant. On the other side, there were issues of if the evaluations were not effective, employees could become mediocre. He also acknowledged this was the case in the real world as well. He suggested reinstating the 2 year limit to how long someone could hold a salaried position, as for some, this could be an excuse to just take it easy their third and final year in the AS, in a position they know very well. He suggested also adding a process to approve someone for a third year if wanted, similar to the process of the past. He saw this as a way to encourage staff members to apply to other offices. However, this could change the amount of lateral movement, as coordinators

wanting to stay in their offices would close off their positions to other coordinators wanting to apply to their position. Hayden thought that a small change in numbers of returners would not be a huge issue, as the benefit could outweigh the issues surrounding it. He was also concerned about the times when staff members reapplying were not offered their positions, and the shock given to the position holders. He was concerned about how inclusive this could potentially not be, as those told no may feel shunned, and chose to leave the AS. He saw this as a lack of constructive feedback throughout the year. Hayden saw this letter of intent concept as a way to do so, so if an employee who was not stellar could be told so, but also encouraged to apply once more for their position. Additionally, he saw this as an encouragement to the employee to nail the interview, as well as check their privilege. He did feel there needed to be a strong structure around it, to not close doors, and to also prevent mediocrity. Normoyle was concerned about the accessibility, not concerning the amount of staff members choosing to utilize the process, but how the rest of the student population would feel about the process. Normoyle stated they would need to keep in mind how inclusive of the student population this process would be and would appear. Ghant suggested looking at the recruitment process, and how well they were reaching students on campus, and how accessible it really would be. Ellison was also concerned about any staff members running for an AS office, as there would be no letter of intent or interview. Bates agreed with Hayden's suggestion to limit the terms of the employees, but also suggested having fellow coordinator evaluations, as they would be the ones working the most with the employee wanting to return. He saw this as more peer level evaluation, as in front of the advisor there was most likely more professionalism than their peers. This was also a good way to evaluate the skills of the employee, which was important especially in his office. Bates cautioned against the evaluations, as there could be some delicate subjects breached. He did however agree about the need to evaluate the skills of the employees, especially for offices like KUGS, the OC, and the Publicity Center, and that was where he saw the efficiency. It was also discussed how many employees would actually stay, especially with graduation growing closer for each staff member. There was also a suggestion to add a student at large to the hiring committee, to give an outside perspective to the process. Burke did mention how it had been discussed the previous year if a student at large could be added to the process, and it had been thought it could work logistically. Brock was thankful for all the points given by council, as there was still a lot of thinking to be done about it. She stated the changes could be added to the hiring process for next year, but most likely not. She stated she wanted all the relative information to make an informed decision. Rosenberg clarified the process would have to be approved by the Board of Directors. Brock wanted to vote on it to get an opinion, then would take it to the personnel committee, then would take it to the board. Brock asked if the next meeting could include a vote on the topic, or the discussion could be continued. Ghant stated that could occur during the next meeting. Burke asked if the council members could ask around their offices for opinions for the next meeting. Ghant said yes, that would be a good idea.

V. Employee Evaluations

VI. Office Update

VII. Next Time

VIII. Adjourn

The Meeting was adjourned at 4:59p.m.