



AS Management Council

Thursday, May 14, 2015

3:00 p.m. VU567

- Members:** *Present:* Chelsea Ghant, Chair (VP for Business and Operations); Osman Olivera (AS Business Director); Josie Ellison (AS Communications Director); Sadie Normoyle (AS Environment & Sustainability Programs Director); Hannah Brock (AS Personnel Director); Camie Herk (AS Productions Director); Patrick Eckroth (AS Representation & Engagement Programs Director); Samantha Goldblatt (AS Resource & Outreach Programs Director); Morgan Haskins (AS Publicity Center Account Executive); Ashlyn Doltar (AS Club Coordinator); Abigail Ramos (AS Review Editor-in-Chief)
- Advisor:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director of Student Activities)
- Secretary:** Emma J. Opsal (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)
- Missing:** Ana Palma Gutierrez (AS Ethnic Student Center Program Support Coordinator); Cooper Anderson (AS KUGS Program Director); Will Jones (AS Outdoor Center Equipment & Bike Shop Coordinator)

MC-15-S-1 *To lump together the previous minutes and approve them all. Passed*

Ghant called the meeting to order at 3:35p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

MOTION MC-15-S-1 by Ellison

To lump together the previous minutes and approve them all.

Second: Brock Vote: 10-0-0 Action: Passed

II. Budget Committee Updates

Olivera stated there were issues in meeting quorum, so the Budget Committee was behind. However, there was one meeting left, and all 22 budgets would be examined by that point. He stated decision packages had not been checked over. He asked those with questions come to him, or the Dean of Students Program Assistant, who had the minutes from the meeting. Ghant reiterated the organization was shooting for a 0% increase, and asked for the budget authorities in the room to cut wherever possible. Ghant also explained a change in the structure of requesting money for events, with the Large Event Loan Fund, formerly the Event Opportunity Fund. She explained it was \$45,000 from reserves for programming offices without the funds in their budgets to bring events to campus people wanted to see. The proposals for the funds would be taken to the Activities Council.

III. Rebranding Timeline and Branding Guide.

Ghant recognized Ellison, who's office was preparing for a Rebranding of the AS. Ellison highlighted the changes to the current branding, such as the possibility to opt out of having gender pronouns at the end of the AS email signature. There was also clarification of the social media guidelines for the offices. It was suggested for specifically board members, who did not have social media to utilize, the option for a page be kept open, so there could be increased transparency.

Haskins asked there be more consultation with someone in the Publicity Center, specifically a graphic designer, as she saw the need for another perspective. She stated the current branding had come from an advertisement, and was not intended to be a lasting image of the AS. Ramos also asked the process of discussing programs and services with the AS Review be more defined, as there were issues in getting interviews within the organization. Ellison then explained the timeline proposed for the rebranding. Everything would be ready and in place for Fall 2017, 2 years from the time of the meeting. This would allow for a sweep of the entire organization, doing each logo in its own time. They also stated although some logos had very recently been changed, it was still possible they would be subject to the rebrand as well. Once changed, Ellison stated, the offices would be able to receive additional funding for promotional items. Ellison stated this was a more realistic timeline than the previous timeline, and had well defined timeframes within it. Additionally there was some wiggle room within in the timeline, to better work with the PC's schedule.

IV. Supplemental Fund Policy

Ghant directed the council to the Supplemental Fund Policy. For the following year, it would be \$3,000. It would be like the previously discussed Large Event Opportunity Fund, only smaller. Questions raised to consider when reworking the policy included whether or not the requests should be taken to Management Council or not. Additionally, there was clarification needed to who was the program's primary sponsor. Ghant had added funds could not be requested for the same project, as it would need to be institutionalized and part of the operational budget for the requesting program. She stated putting this into writing would solidify this. Ghant mentioned the previous funding request, and how she and others had found the small meeting had to approve it was problematic. She stated the caveat within the policy allowing for such a meeting had been more catered to the past structure, and an update to the policy was needed to reflect changes within the AS. Ghant asked the council to consider what changes should be made to the caveat, whether or not more coordinators and office representatives should be added to the small meeting stipulation, or all funding requests should go directly to Management Council. Ghant also mentioned updating the titles of the positions in question, as well as the acronyms. Rosenberg gave context to what was being discussed in this policy, and at the time of writing, the money in the fund had been decentralized, and coordinators had merely gone to their directors to request funding. It was stated this policy should have been deactivated when the change was made, however it was not caught. The sentence stating the process should follow the rules of operation was found to be misleading and inaccurate, so the entire section was removed. It was suggested the policy be reviewed at the end of each year, and that it was more an issue for Budget Committee, especially as the fund changed from year to year, and if the organization was unlucky, it could be cut completely. Olivera agreed the issue could be for the budget committee, however it would need a decision package. Ghant reiterated the council needed to think critically and ethically about the distribution of funds, and was not opposed to striking. She asked if anything needed to be added that had been left out. Rosenberg felt generally the requests should go to the council, however in certain circumstances a small group would be appropriate. Taking the requests to management council would allow for the most transparency. Ellison suggested the fund be allowed for the other offices, in case there was something wrong. Ghant stated she would take the policy, revise it, then send it out for vote via email later that day, so she could take it for approval at the following Board meeting.

V. Hiring Debrief

Ghant asked for the thoughts and feelings following the end of the hiring season. Brock stated she was not yet done, and that the chaos of making and getting calls would be over by the following day, and offer letters would then be sent out. Brock also stated the following Monday would be New Hire Night, and suggested people visit, however those leaving the organization would not need to attend. Ellison suggested the positions be opened and closed earlier, which would be convenient for people running for the Board of Directors. Additionally, this would allow for interviews at a better, earlier point in the quarter. It was also mentioned how many people had had to record their meetings, and how this should have been addressed in the trainings. Brock stated this was something that had rarely happened before, but she and other committee leaders had made the executive decision to respect the time of the applicants and record the meetings. It was stated that some people had just simply not participated in hiring, and in a couple of cases, people had been booted from their hiring committees. It was asked what would happen in the future, if such scenarios occurred. Brock stated it had never been as prevalent as it had been in prevailing years, and it was not okay. She did not want to encourage this behavior and asked for suggestions of how to remedy it. She suggested in the case of recordings, which she did admit had been very helpful for some interviews, only the team leaders and advisors should be told about the option. Ellison wanted people to be held accountable for listening to the recordings, and the process could be them listening, deleting, and intentionally turning in their notes once complete. It was then suggested this be a separate training for each of the team leaders. Brock also asked for feedback on the amount of work, reminders, and other items that came up during the process to be brought to her later, so she could consider them for future hiring cycles.

The Meeting was adjourned at 3:58p.m.