



AS Management Council

Friday, October 9, 2015

4:00 p.m.

VU567

Members: *Present:* Hannah Brock (VP for Business and Operations, Chair); Osman Olivera (AS Business Director); Kelly Mason (AS Communications Director); Yuliya Rybalka (AS Personnel Director); Jonah Falk (AS Productions Director); Griffin Crisp (AS Representation & Engagement Programs Director); Marina Price (AS Review Editor-in-Chief); Shiffite Awel (AS Publicity Center Account Executive 1); Walter Lutsch (AS Club Coordinator); Emma J. Opsal (AS Assessment Coordinator); Jordan Van Hoozer (AS KUGS Program Director)

Advisor: Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director of Student Activities)

Secretary: Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)

Motions

No motions made.

Brock called the meeting to order at 4:05p.m.

I. Introductions

The members each introduced themselves to the council.

II. Information Item

a. Parliamentary Procedure Overview

Brock gave the council a brief overview of Robert's Rules of Order. She stressed the importance of the review of minutes to assure accuracy. Brock opened the floor for discussion about holding meetings either weekly or biweekly. Falk expressed his preference for biweekly meetings. Brock noted that biweekly meetings were often more productive.

b. Charge and Charter Review

Brock informed the council the Charge and Charter had already been brought up for review and approved by the AS Board of Directors, though Management Council could still propose edits. Brock stated the document was brought to the Board of Directors previously as a requirement for Management Council to have been able to meet. Brock noted that a representative from KVIK was added to the council, as the office did not have representation prior. The council did not suggest additional edits.

c. Supplemental Funding Policy Review

Brock stated the policy had not been updated since 2010, and stressed that changes to the document were needed. She noted that edits could have been suggested at the time, or emailed to her to be approved at the following meeting. Lutsch inquired if the AS Supplemental Event Fund was similar to the AS Large Event Opportunity Fund. Brock stated the two funds were very different, noting that the Supplemental Event Fund was a smaller fund and used to fund smaller events, or provide additional funding if any event went over budget or incurred an unexpected cost. The Large Event Opportunity Fund was designated to supply a majority or all of the funding for large events. Olivera stated that members could speak to him if they wanted more information about the Large Event Opportunity Fund. Brock noticed the policy of the Supplemental Event Fund did not list the amount of in the fund. Rosenberg stated the amount could be found in the Management Council Rules of Operation document. Brock

mentioned the Rules of Operation also needed to be updated. Olivera stated the Supplemental Event Fund contained \$3,000. Brock noted the amount was the budget for the entire fiscal year. She stated that any AS office could submit requests for funding from the account. Crisp stated that having the funding be allocated by the AS Productions Director, the AS Resource and Outreach Programs Director, or the AS Environmental and Sustainability Programs Associate Director could have led to a conflict of interest, particularly if all three offices were requesting funding from the account. Brock agreed. Rosenberg confirmed that was a result of the policy being out of date. She informed the council that the fiind was much larger when it was originally created. She mentioned there had been a decision in years prior to make the amount allocated by Management Council smaller, and allocate the rest of the fiind equally between the three offices that most frequently used the fiind: AS Productions, AS Resource and Outreach Programs, and AS Environment and Sustainability Programs. She noted that the procedures and budgets had changed again after that, but were reflected in the Management Council Rules of Operation, not in the Supplemental Event Fund policy. Olivera expressed his thought that the funding should have been allocated solely by Management Council voting, and the wording changed to make the fund more accessible. He noted that the amount of the fund had been significantly decreasing due to lack of use, and speculated the cause to be a lack of accessibility and visibility of the fund. Brock noted that was important for the AS Budget Committee to consider how much should have been in the fund and how it was being used. She stated she would send the Supplemental Event Fund Policy and Management Council Rules of Operation to the members so they could vote on changes at the following meeting. Rybalka stressed to the members the importance of including wording as to what the fund could and could not be used for. Lutsch asked about how emergency funding could be approved in-between Management Council meetings. Brock mentioned the subject was a topic of discussion the previous year, stating system in place meant Management Council could call an emergency meeting to vote on a request, or, in the event that Management Council could not convene, the three previously listed office directors could approve or deny requests. Falk suggested giving the AS Business Office authority to decide on time sensitive requests. Olivera agreed, stating that the responsibilities of his position, AS Business Director, were changing to involve emergency funding. Brock stated she was working with the AS Business Office to create a form to request access to reserve funds, and would bring it before the council to review. She mentioned she could create a similar form to request access from the AS Supplemental Event Fund as well. The council confirmed their approval.

d. Fall Staff Development Debrief

Mason inquired as to whether the council was critiquing the sessions of Fall Staff Development. Rybalka confirmed that she wanted the members' opinions on how to improve Fall Staff Development for the following years. Mason mentioned that the Group Activity with Casey Hayden seemed very ableist to her. She noted that the activity put individuals "on the spot" and made some people feel uncomfortable. Van Hoozer mentioned there was not enough gluten free food provided during meals, and the gluten free options ran out quickly before every gluten free individual was able to get food. Lutsch expressed that they felt the tone of the Pronouns and Inclusive Language in the Workplace session was "aggressive and accusatory". Crisp disagreed and stated that discussions about inclusive language were essential because of the system of oppression that was in place. Price expressed that she wanted more ongoing training on inclusive language and pronouns. Brock agreed and stated that she wanted additional workshops to include more topics on diversity that weren't included in the Fall Staff Development, including a session on mental illness. Mason noted that ableism was a topic that needed discussion. Van Hoozer suggested that trainings contain

multiple workshops over multiple days to help those that were struggling to use more inclusive language and “change their mindsets.” Rybalka stated she had received a variety of feedback about the Pronoun and Inclusive Language in the Workplace session, and that because AS employees came to trainings having various levels of experience with those topics, that introductory sessions could be beneficial in the following years. Van Hoozer stated that the diversity workshop was the most helpful and impactful for them. Olivera suggested adding a short workshop to explain what racism and discrimination were. Awel stated the diversity workshop should have been titled more specifically according to subject matter, noting that it was primarily about topics of race and ethnicity than other forms of diversity. Rybalka opened the floor for the members to give feedback that they had heard from other employees in their respective offices. Falk stated that the staff of the AS Productions office voiced feeling challenged by the Diversity Workshop, which Falk celebrated as personal reflection. Van Hoozer agreed, stating that they also felt personally challenged by the session, and that the staff members of KUGS all voiced that they enjoyed the workshop. Lutsch stated that the Clubs office had a long discussion after the Diversity Workshop about the usefulness of the session. They stated that some of the staff members expressed frustration that some topics on diversity were not addressed. Rybalka stated she had received a variety of feedback about the session as well. She noted that she appreciated that the session was hosted by AS employees. J. Opsal noted that the Office of Assessment needed a full half hour presentation in order to make the assessment process more accessible and visible. Rybalka stated that the initial reason for removing the assessment session was based on the Assessment Coordinator position being a three quarter position and not having enough prior knowledge to present in years prior. J. Opsal stated that the Assessment Coordinator position did have forty planning hours during the summer prior to Fall Staff Development to prepare for the presentation, and that many documents were available to the position as reference. Falk inquired as to whether the duration of Fall Staff Development having been sixty hours was for a specific reason, stating his opinion that some of the sessions could have been condensed to less time. Rybalka stated that thirty of the hours incorporated were for departmental training and office preparation, and that training sessions only totaled thirty hours themselves. She stated that the hours were consistent with previous years in order to present all relevant information. Rosenberg stated that the hours for trainings were included in each AS job description as well. She noted that the hours could be evaluated and adjusted if needed. Olivera suggested the sessions presented by the Business Office could have been shorter but in smaller groups, so employees could have asked more questions specific to their own office, “which are the questions that make the difference.” He noted that he did not feel the presentation to the entire organization was as beneficial as presentations to small groups would have been. Rybalka noted that she agreed. Falk expressed the desire to discuss ways in which to cover the needed information during Fall Staff Development in a more time sensitive manner, noting the weeks just before Fall Quarter began were crucial to some operations and more time was needed to spend working on other things. Rybalka mentioned that Fall Staff Development for the year was largely based on the model from the previous year, and that changes would be made and applied for the following year. Crisp noted that for returning employees, the general session titled AS Business Office/Budgets/Finance Office was not beneficial, and that time would have been better spent in their respective offices, reviewing budgets and budget trackers specific to their positions. Lutsch also mentioned that holding the session in one larger group, instead of two small groups as planned, led to many people unable to hear or understand the speakers, as well as a lack of computers for everyone to use. They suggested holding the same session in two smaller groups offset at different times, so that presenters were able to speak to everyone in a more accessible environment. Brock noted that there was going to be one more large training session that year during the mid-quarter staff development due to a lot of changes that

occurred within the AS. She noted that during the mid-quarter training, there was a goal to have small group sessions with the Business Office in order to cover things specific to each office. Mason suggested to have the AS Business Director, AS Communications Director, and the AS Assessment Coordinator positions involved in the planning of Fall Staff Development to plan time to meet with small groups. Mason also mentioned that she enjoyed the Equal Opportunity Office/Sexual Harassment/Bullying Training session, presented by Laura Langley. She noted that she would like to see Langley present in future trainings, specifically about transgender issues. Lutsch added that the staff in the Clubs Office had mentioned they enjoyed that session more than others. Lutsch then noted that the Self Care session presented by Lindsay Gabeau was not as professional as they had been expecting, and that though they appreciated some of the content, felt it could have been presented in different forms. He mentioned that they had received varied feedback from others. J. Opsal stated that she felt as though the presentation was coming from a place of privilege that is not afforded to many people in the AS, and that the presentation felt condescending to her. Mason noted that self-care training was not needed, as self-care was very personal and unique to each person. Van Hoozer expressed that they agreed with J. Opsal, noting that there were parts of the presentation that should have included trigger warnings. They stated that they also agreed with Mason, stating that one session on self-care could not have been beneficial enough to each individual who practiced self-care differently. They suggested allowing time for everyone to reflect on their own individual self-care plan as it pertained to them personally, as opposed to a presentation on the topic. Crisp suggested a shorter presentation on how to practice self-care in one's own individual way and how stress can affect one's life, as opposed to a presentation containing examples of how one individual practices their own self-care. J. Opsal mentioned that during the presentation there was a lot of generalizing mental health concerns, when in reality mental health was a spectrum with variation. She noted that was something that should have been screened for in the presentation. Brock noted that she had meetings with Gabeau prior to the presentation, mentioning that the AS was a complex and diverse organization with many different needs and that it was hard for presenters from outside the organization to understand and be prepared for those needs. Brock also noted that the presentation that was shown to her prior to the session was vastly different than the presentation that was given during Fall Staff Development. She noted that the experience was a learning opportunity for her. She suggested instead of a self-care session, including a mental health session. Mason stated that the self-care session the year prior was not successful either. Brock noted that Mason was working on a presenters' packet containing policies and the AS mission statement to clearly lay out expectations guidelines for presenters beyond the screening process. Olivera agreed with Mason that each individual practices self-care differently, and expressed that each office also had specific needs for budgets, and sessions in smaller settings would have been beneficial. Falk suggested making time to include budget training and self-care in the departmental training sessions. Rybalka asked for the members' opinions on the snacks provided. Brock mentioned that she enjoyed the snacks. Van Hoozer noted that the staff in their office noted they would have appreciated more substantial snacks and less sugary ones. Mason mentioned that the Students of Color Caucus space was a great idea, and she would have liked to see more caucus spaces in the AS. Rybalka stated the Board of Directors was in the process of making caucus spaces more accessible. Mason expressed that she personally did not enjoy the speaker at the Update on Carver Gym session. She stated she felt the speaker was rude and dismissive and would have liked the information presented by someone else. Falk noted there was some misunderstanding on the purpose of the session. He noted that the architect of the project was simply relaying information that had already been decided upon, and that the attendees had wanted to be included in that decision making. He speculated that the miscommunication was the cause of some tension. Van Hoozer agreed

that the attendees had wanted to give feedback, specifically about gender neutral locker rooms. Mason stated the Environmental/Sustainability session was informative, though inaccessible to some. Lutsch expressed that the staff of the Clubs Office felt there were topics they would have liked to see discussed in the session that were not, and that the session seemed too generalized and did not provide enough detailed information. Lutsch then mentioned they felt that the Event Services Training was very helpful, particularly the visual aspect of the session. Van Hoozer noted they enjoyed the setting of Park Day but that the staff of the KUGS office would have preferred to have been outdoors more, rather than in the conference hall. Brock agreed that she would have enjoyed more outdoor activity, though she noted that from her experience as AS Personnel Director the previous year, she understood that it was difficult to plan activities that would be appealing and accessible to everyone. She noted that if anyone had ideas for accessible activities that would appeal to everyone during trainings, she welcomed the suggestions. Rybalka mentioned that the park was reserved the entire day for the staff to use after the training sessions, though that could have been made more clear. She also noted that she had received feedback that renting the space was not a good use of student funds because the outdoor space wasn't used adequately. Brock mentioned that the space was very affordable to rent. She noted that having trainings off campus was a nice change of pace, and that she was open to having training sessions off campus in following years. She mentioned that the AS Challenge Course was not very accessible but the space at Lakewood could be used as an indoor and outdoor space for future trainings. Mason expressed that she was opposed to staff t-shirts, noting they set an "us vs. them" tone for students, and that sizing was not accessible to everyone. She mentioned that requiring individuals to wear a specific shirt was also limiting and inaccessible. Brock noted that t-shirts were a great advertising tool, but other options could have been discussed. Mason suggested lanyards or badges, as they were more accessible. Rybalka noted that she had received mixed feedback about t-shirts, but suggested a design in future years that could be handed out to students. Price expressed that she personally liked the suggestion of nametags and that they would have been very useful. Van Hoozer agreed with Price. Mason suggested also suggested hats. Van Hoozer noted that hats were very accessible and easy to distribute. Brock noted that any feedback about the Board of Directors session could have been emailed to her. She mentioned that the Board of Directors was very interested in feedback about the session. Rybalka also noted that any addition feedback regarding departmental training times could have been brought to her. Lutsch expressed that they found the department training time essential for their office. Mason expressed that Rybalka had done a great job facilitating the trainings as AS Personnel Director, especially having been in the position a short amount of time before trainings began. The members of the council enthusiastically agreed.

III. Action Item

a. Election of Personnel Committee Representative and Management Council Vice Chair
Brock noted that there was not enough time to elect both a Personnel Committee Representative and a Vice Chair for Management Council. She stated the Vice Chair would be elected at the following meeting. She opened the floor for members to announce if they would have liked to run for Personnel Committee Representative. Rybalka inquired how members were able to run if they were not present at the meeting. Brock stated that members could have emailed her to express interest in running, and the poll could have been facilitated online. Rosenberg noted that candidates should have written a statement explaining their interest in running and why they were qualified. Lutsch noted that Orgsync had a poll function that allowed for anonymous voting as well as text boxes for candidates to include statements. Rybalka noted that Outlook may have had a similar function. Mason expressed that she was

interested in running but did not want to speak in front of the council. Brock noted the online poll would have been more accessible for those that did not want to speak publicly. She set a deadline for the following Wednesday, October 21st, at 5:00pm for members to have submitted their statements for either position online. She noted that if members preferred to speak publicly, they could have done so at the following meeting. Rosenberg suggested including a short statement on the description and responsibilities of each position. Brock stated that the roll of Vice Chair would have been to lead the council as Chair in the absence of the ASVP for Business and Operations, including communicating with the AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees to create agendas and distribute documents. Rosenberg added that the Vice Chair would also have acted as Chair in the event of a conflict of interest, for example if Brock herself were proposing something to the council. Rybalka noted that the Personnel Committee Representative would have had a voting seat on the Personnel Committee. Brock also noted that Personnel Committee dealt with very sensitive and confidential information. She also noted that candidates needed to be unbiased.

IV. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 5:30pm.