



# AS Management Council

Friday, November 20th, 2015

4:00 p.m.

YU567

- 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); Walter Lutsch (AS Club Coordinator); Jordan Van Hoozer (AS KUGS Program Director); Shiffite Awel (AS Publicity Center Account Executive 1)  
*Absent:* Dreya Williams (AS Resource and Outreach Programs Director); Patricia Pacheco (AS Ethnic Student Center Coordinator); Spencer Pickell (AS Outdoor Center Equipment and Bike Shop Coordinator); Kelly Mason (AS Communications Director); Emma J. Opsal (AS Assessment Coordinator, Non-Voting)
- Advisor:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director of Student Activities)
- Secretary:** Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)

**Motions:** *No Motions were made.*

*Brock called the meeting to order at 4:07pm.*

## I. Information Item

### a. Employee and Supervisor Evaluations

Rybalka explained the process of evaluation and noted that the templates were outdated. Brock noted that minor changes had been made the previous years. Rybalka noted that no information collected about how effective the evaluations were. Awel entered at 4:09pm. Brock noted that in the event of personnel concerns, occasionally evaluations have been brought to Personnel Committee. Rosenberg noted that if employees were consistently failing to meet expectations, evaluations could have been reviewed to assess how to move forward. She noted that most employees in the AS were in a supervisory role for the first time. She also expressed the hope that if concerns arose that they were addressed before formal evaluations. Rybalka stated that she hoped to improve the evaluation process to make it more effective. Crisp inquired if the evaluations were kept anonymous between supervisors and employees. Rybalka stated that the employment policy required individuals to communicate with individuals that they had disagreements with. Brock stated that she had thought about the situation of employees and supervisors not getting along well, and that individuals may not have felt comfortable writing certain things. She suggested creating an anonymous system for employees to submit concerns about their supervisors to the Personnel Office. Rybalka stated that was something that the Personnel Office would look into. She expressed concern of how the feedback was going to be followed up with. Rosenberg stated that non-student staff members went through a separate evaluation process. Olivera noted that most student supervisors only supervised a few people, so anonymous feedback may not have remained anonymous. He also inquired how employees could have submitted anonymous feedback about problematic behavior exhibited by other student employees. Brock stated that an anonymous submission system for feedback was needed. Lutsch stated that some questions on the evaluation templates were not applicable to certain positions because they were created to serve the entire AS. He suggested developing office specific evaluation forms to make them more applicable to employees. Olivera suggested allowing the offices to design their own evaluation template rather than the Personnel Office. Rosenberg suggested combining specific

office templates with the general template for the upcoming evaluations. Kemper inquired if the evaluations applied to work study positions as well. Rybalka stated that work study positions were evaluated the same way that other student staff positions were. Lutsch inquired how the AS Employee Self Evaluation and the AS Supervisor to Employee Evaluation templates were different. There was discussion about changing the self-evaluation format from a number based rating to a more open ended prompt for how employees feel they could improve in their positions. Rybalka stated she was unsure of the question: “Do you feel like there is camaraderie and teamwork within your group and/or office? What activities have you initiated, or actively participated in, in effort to encourage this atmosphere?” because she felt the language implied that student employees needed to become close friends with their co workers. Schultz stated that while friendship was not required among co workers, it was important that coworkers were able to work together and promote teamwork within their office. Rosenberg suggested removing the word “camaraderie” from the language to make that distinction. Kemper inquired if the forms could have been submitted online in order to save paper. Lutsch stated it may have been a possibility through OrgSync. Rosenberg noted that may have been too much work for the Personnel Office to establish. Olivera inquired what happened after the evaluations had been submitted. Rybalka noted they were kept by the Personnel Office and referred to if needed. Brock stated the primary reason the evaluation process existed was to make employees participate in a one-on-one conversation with their supervisors, and reflect on how they could improve. Rybalka stated that the evaluation process had to have been completed before further personnel action could have been taken. Rosenberg noted that evaluations were an important way to reflect on how things were going, and to give positive feedback as well as suggestions for improvement. She noted that for non-student staff members submitted the same evaluation form as their supervisors and inquired if it would have been beneficial for student staff members and student supervisors to submit the same evaluation form. Brock noted that there had been a movement to replace the term “dead week” with “silent week” or “quiet week” because the former term could have been triggering. Crisp recommended that the council wait to edit the documents until all they had completed evaluations the following quarter. Awel inquired how often evaluations were done. Rybalka noted they were completed once during the middle of winter quarter. Schultz suggested adding a second evaluation at the end of spring quarter to serve as a reflection on students’ experiences as employees of the AS, and how they would apply the knowledge and skills gained in their future endeavors. Lutsch stated that reflections on how employees felt about being a part of the AS as an organization would have been very useful. Brock stated that would have been useful to evaluate and improve the organization. Crisp noted that he felt unsure if it was necessary to require students to submit a self-reflection. Rybalka suggested an optional OrgSync form for end of the year reflections. Falk stated that an email sent at the end of the year could have been used to encourage employees to have dialogues with their supervisors. Olivera inquired what the end of the year evaluation would consist of. Rybalka stated that it could have been open ended. Olivera stated if the evaluation was optional, the answers submitted may not have been completely serious. Rybalka stated that it was not something the council was voting on, but was meant to be a discussion.

#### b. Office Updates

Rybalka stated that the end of quarter appreciation event was happening two weeks after the meeting. Olivera stated that individuals had concerns about budget authority changes, they were free to email him or speak with him after the meeting. Brock stated that the discussion could have been added to the following meeting’s agenda. Olivera noted that budget proposals and decision packages were shortly being released. Schultz noted that the AS Board of Directors Office was hiring two new Board Assistant positions. Falk noted that the “Last

Comic Standing” event was that night following the meeting, and there was a concert the following Sunday with Robert DeLong. Van Hoozer noted that KUGS had recently done an interview with DeLong. Gliński noted that KVIK had recorded the interview and was going to be recording the concert as well. Rosenberg noted that though there were no classes the following Wednesday, the Viking Union was still open.

## **II. Adjourn**

*Brock adjourned the Meeting at 5:00pm.*