



# AS Structural Review Committee

Tuesday, November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015

4:00 p.m. VU567

- Members:** *Present:* Hannah Brock (AS VP for Business and Operations, Chair); Mason Hawk (Student-At-Large); Kevin Recto (Residence Hall Association Representative); Emma Palumbo (AS VP for Student Life); Patrick Eckroth (AS VP for Governmental Affairs); Daniel Edgel (Student-At-Large); Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative); Hannah van Amen (Student-At-Large); Samantha Goldblatt (Student-At-Large)  
*Absent:* Luciane DeAlmeida (AS Queer Resource Center Assistant Coordinator); BreAnn Sherrill (Student-At-Large)
- Advisors:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director for Student Activities); Eric Alexander (Associate Dean of Students and Director of the Viking Union, Laciator)
- Secretary:** Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)

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

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

## I. Introductions

- a. The members introduced themselves with their names, positions, and pronouns.

## II. Discussion Items

- a. Community Guidelines

Alexander explained the purpose of community guidelines and opened the floor for suggestions from the members. Recto stated that he needed more information about the committee before he could have suggested any guidelines. Brock stated that the guidelines were not specific to the committee but were primarily for working together as a group and the group dynamic. Edgel suggested setting an expectation that all members be decent to each other. Palumbo suggested setting an expectation of honest and open conversation. Brock stated she was comfortable allowing members to bring food. She also asked that the members speak clearly in order to be heard by everyone. Goldblatt suggested being aware of the space that one takes up when speaking, and allowing others to speak as well. Recto stated that “speaking one’s own truth” was important. Hawk stressed the importance of keeping in mind that the members were working towards common goals, van Amen stated that it was important to remember that everyone had good intentions when offering advice or criticism. Eckroth noted it was important for individuals to take ownership of what they said. Rosenberg suggested giving “constructive criticism with care”, noting that criticism could have been difficult to hear and that it was important to be mindful of how it was given. Brock noted that ditto cards were a great way to show support for something someone else had said, without taking up space. Alexander noted that intent and impact were separate and that it was important to accept responsibility if one accidentally offend someone. Brock stressed the importance of not using gendered language, and respecting pronouns. Rosenberg exited.

- b. Small Group Discussion

Brock separated the committee into small groups to discuss the questions: “What do you think the Associated Students does?”, “What do you think the Associated Students do for students?”, and the prompt: “If you can, name the various components/offices of the Associated Students and what they do.” The groups then shared their answers with the larger committee. Walley stated that her group answered that the AS held events for students, and allocated funding for clubs on campus. Edgel stated his group mentioned that the AS provided resources for students that weren’t provided elsewhere, and that the AS attempted to serve students’ interests and needs. Eckroth stated his group noted that the AS advocated for student representation on and off campus, and provided resources for students. Walley stated that the AS needed to do more for transfer students to make their transition to campus easier, and needed more involvement for athletics. Goldblatt stated that the AS needed to serve more average students, not just those that were underserved by the institution. Edgel noted that nothing in the AS should have existed just to exist, and that each department should have had a purpose and should have served students. Eckroth noted that the AS needed to provide more resources, opportunities and support for students. Brock noted that the AS provided over one-hundred paid positions for students, but needed to advertise them more to diversify the applicant pool. Brock stated the purpose of the committee was to review and assess the structure and programs of the AS. She noted that the AS Structure Review Committee was created by the previous AS VP for Governmental Affairs, Sarah Kahout, due to the lack of an active Student Senate at the university. She noted that the committee would break into two subcommittees; one to review the governmental structure of the AS, and one to review the programmatic structure of the organization. Alexander noted that there had been an advisor that worked to serve the AS for thirty-six years, noting that person inevitably had an influence on shaping the organization. He challenged the members to think of other ways the AS could have been structured. Brock noted that Rosenberg had a lot of knowledge on previous AS procedures due to a number of years working for the organization. She informed the committee that the Structure and Program Advisory Committee was responsible for assessing program and office structures, but there had not previously been a committee to review the AS as an entire organization.

### **III. Information Item**

#### **a. Charge and Charter Review**

The members took turn reading parts of the document aloud. Alexander noted that the goal for the composition of the membership of the committee was to encourage the AS to interact and hold dialogue with outside organizations. Brock noted that guests were also welcome at all AS committee meetings aside from Personnel Committee. She noted that any recommendations created by the committee would have been brought to the AS Board of Directors. Edgel inquired what would have happened if the Board of Directors had not approved the recommendations the committee presented. Walley noted that there were three Board members on the committee. Brock stated it was unlikely that the Board of Directors would not have passed the recommendations. Eckroth noted that if the Board of Directors were to have not approved recommendations, individual committee members could have brought edited recommendations to the Board of Directors again. Brock noted that the AS Board of Directors would have been informed of what the committee was working on and could have voiced any concerns before a formal vote. Alexander noted that if

the changes proposed were substantial enough, they could have been brought to the student population as a vote, and that large changes may have taken a year or more to implement. He noted that learning more about how other Associated Students were structured within other universities would have been helpful in reviewing the Associated Students of Western Washington University. Brock noted that at the following meeting she was going to give a presentation of how the AS was structured at the time. Hawk stated he felt unclear on what recommendations were being brought to the Board of Directors. Brock stated there was no precedent and the committee was responsible for creating suggestions and evaluating the AS structure. Alexander noted that Kahout's original intention for creating the committee was to create a way to balance the power of the AS Board of Directors.

#### **IV. Adjourn**

*Brock adjourned the Meeting at 5:06pm.*