



AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, January 8th, 2016

2:30pm

VU460

- 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); Hannah van Amen (Student-At-Large)
Absent: Luciane DeAlmeida (AS Queer Resource Center Assistant Coordinator); BreAnn Sherrill (Student-At-Large); Daniel Edgel (Student-At-Large); Samantha Goldblatt (Student-At-Large); Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative)
- Advisors:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director for Student Activities); Eric Alexander (Associate Dean of Students and Director of the Viking Union, Lacilitator)
- Secretary:** Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)
- Guests:** Casey Hayden (Coordinator of Student Activities)

Motions:

SRC-16-W-1 To approve the minutes from November 10th and 17th, 2015. **Passed.**

Brock called the meeting to order at 2:37pm.

I. Approval of Minutes

MOTION SRC- 16-W-1 by Brock

To approve the minutes from November 10th and 17^h, 2015.

Second: Palumbo

Vote: 6 - 0 - 0

Action: Passed

II. Information Item

- a. The members introduced themselves. Alexander reviewed some of the topics the committee had discussed the previous quarter, re-iterating that the Viking Union was an organization that supported the Associated Students. He showed the committee a presentation that explained the structure of the Viking Union, noting the organization had been created to enhance the student experience. The presentation listed the areas of support the Viking Union provided; facilities and services, outdoor recreation, and events and activities resources. He noted that the organization supported the Associate Students in providing services to students through those areas or support. He stated the two individuals previously leading the Viking Union had recently retired, and the procedures and models in use were created by those individuals. He noted the legacy of those individuals was important to consider when reviewing the structure of the organization. He stated the building of the Viking Union had been last renovated in 2001, and consisted of interesting and unusual spaces. He stated the Ethnic Student Center at the time did not have a large enough space in its location on the fourth floor of the Viking Union, and that a renovation was being considered. He emphasized that physical space was an important factor in the success of services and programing. He noted the Associated Students and the Viking Union organization were intertwined and

both depended on each other. He stated it was important to consider not only what the committee was tasked to do, but why it was important and what purpose student government served for a university. He noted the primary focuses of the Viking Union were attainment and promotion of student success, as well as accountability, ensuring a high quality of education, and keeping up with evolving technology and student needs. He stated the task of the committee to review the structure of the Associated Students was a lot of work, but was crucial to the success of the organization and its effectiveness. He presented a dichotomy of ways to change the organization; transformation and structural change, and noted changes could have been made rapidly or gradually. He stated it was important to be mindful that there were political implications of the restructuring of the AS. He also stated it may have been beneficial to split the review process into smaller and more manageable pieces.

III. Discussion

- a. Alexander began creating a list on the whiteboard to breakdown the areas and departments to review as: governance and representation, operations and services, programs and resources, advising, and financial. Brock encouraged the committee members to think of questions or further information they needed before moving forward with the review process. Hayden suggested using the AS website as a visual tool to put specific offices and programs into the categories listed above. Schultz noted that the Representation and Engagement Programs Office fit into both the governance and representation category, and the programs and resources category. Brock agreed that many offices fit into multiple categories. The committee agreed to leave the Child Development Center, AS Recycle Center, and AS Bookstore out of the review process because the nature of oversight to those programs was vastly different than that of other programs. Alexander noted that the Structure and Program Advisory Committee assessed each office of the Associated Students and was responsible for ensuring the effectiveness and relevancy of those offices. He stated the role of the AS Structure Review Committee was to assess the larger areas of the Associated Students. He presented an article to the committee that addressed students government structures at various universities. He stated the article noted two primary structures of student government, stating a structure similar to that of the US federal government was the most common. He encouraged the committee to become familiar with the student government structures of comparable universities. He cited the lack of a student senate as the key factor in beginning the review process. Brock stated she was most interested in assessing the governance structure of the Associated Students, noting the full review process would take multiple years. She noted that the AS Personnel Office was the closest check and balance system for the AS Board of Directors. Alexander noted the primary areas of focus for the committee would be governance and representation, operation and services, and programs and resources. Hayden inquired if the committee would have been ongoing even after the review process had been finished. Alexander stated it was unclear at the time. He stated subcommittees may have been applicable for certain areas of the review process. Hayden suggested reviewing corporate governance structures as well as federal and university structures. Brock and Alexander agreed. Brock stated it was difficult to have students participate in a student senate, and that was the primary

reason the student senate of the university had been unsuccessful. She noted that reviewing other governance structures was important, but it was not required to use elements of other structures reviewed if they were not applicable to the organization. There was discussion about moving the scheduled times of meetings. Hayden suggested reviewing the shortcomings of the student senate at the following meeting.

IV. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:40pm.