



AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, February 12th, 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); Daniel Edgel (Student-At-Large); Hannah van Amen (Student-At-Large); Samantha Goldblatt (Student-At-Large)
Absent: BreAnn Sherrill (Student-At-Large); Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative); Bill Martin (Student-At-Large)
- Advisors:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director for Student Activities); Eric Alexander (Associate Dean of Students and Director of the Viking Union, Lacilitator); Casey Hayden (Coordinator of Student Activities)
- Secretary:** Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)
- Guests:**

Motions: No motions were made.

Brock called the meeting to order at 2:34pm.

I. Information Item

a. Louisiana State University Student Government Structure

van Amen stated she had spoken to a member of the student government at Louisiana State University. She noted the organization consisted of executive, judicial, and legislative branches. She noted that candidates for President and Vice President ran on the same ticket along with eight senators. She also noted there was a committee designated for first-year students, led by upperclassmen, that met with the executive board weekly to allow first-year students to be involved in the student government. She also noted many students involved in that committee continued on to run as senators. She stated the participation rate for voting in student elections was about 30%. She stated members of the judicial branch met weekly. She noted that each college of the university had a committee that met with the Dean of that specific college. She stated only the President and Vice President positions were paid, and received a stipend of \$150 per semester. She noted the committees from each college consisted of senators. Hayden noted the system of electing the entire executive branch on one ticket created the potential for political parties to develop on campus, he stated that may have led to increased voter participation, van Amen stated

b. San Diego State University Student Government Structure

Recto stated noted the executive branch consisted of a President, and executive Vice President, and other specialized Vice Presidents. He noted the Vice President of External Relations was responsible for communicating with other universities and outside organizations. He stated the Vice President for Einaņčiai Affairs handled budgets and finance items, and that the Vice President for University Affairs worked with departments and groups on campus to represent students. He stated there was also an AS Council that consisted of the Board of Directors. He noted the Board of Directors was the primary governing body for students and consisted of the executive

members as well as students-at-large. He noted there was also a student union Board of Directors. He noted the Associated Students had a close relationship with the Union similar to ASWWU's relationship with the Viking Union. He noted there were multiple committees pertaining to different departments and areas on campus. He stated faculty members were eligible to apply for seats on the Senate. He noted the Senate was representative of the entire university. Alexander inquired if there was a separate Faculty Senate. Recto stated there was not.

c. Colorado State University Student Government Structure

Brock noted that the student government consisted of executive, judicial, and legislative branches. She noted the Senate had the power to create and enact policy changes, and delegate authority. She stated the Senators were elected by each college of the university. She stated there were at least two Senators from each college. She noted the Senators sought advisement from designated representatives from each college. She stated the Speaker of the Senate was the Vice President of the AS. She noted the President was able to veto anything passed by the Senate, but the Senate could also veto anything presented by the President. She noted there were also Director positions similar to the Vice Presidents of the ASWWU. She noted a small number of positions were paid, but that the AS of WWU would continue to pay its members. She stated the judicial branch of Colorado State University consisted of a supreme court made of seven members. She noted each college of the university had a council, and that Presidential candidates and candidates for Vice President ran on the same ticket in pairs. She stated she liked the model of the Senate at Colorado State University.

II. Discussion Item

a. Discussion of Likes and Dislikes

Edgel stated he preferred the structures that separated the administrative and governance based departments. Brock agreed, and stated she did not like and part of the structure of Evergreen State College. Hawk stated WWU definitely needed a Student Senate or more than one branch. Palumbo stated some form of a check and balance to the Board of Directors was needed. Recto stated he preferred the model of candidates for President and Vice Presidents running in pairs together. There was discussion about the importance of not electing too many representatives in groups, noting that lowered the opportunity for a diverse student government and created a "popularity contest" rather than a true election. Palumbo stated she liked the intentionality of Louisiana State University and University of Wisconsin in involving first-year students. Edgel stated he didn't like that many universities really tried to emulate the federal government model. Some of the members agreed. Recto inquired if any structures included multi-year terms for positions. Brock stated that one of them did, and that she had mixed feelings about establishing multi-year terms. She stated a high turnover rate was hard on an organization but was beneficial for serving more students. Edgel stated that if the AS structure had separated programming and representation; higher retention in the programming side of the organization would have been beneficial. He noted it was important to offer governmental leadership opportunities to as many students as possible. Alexander stated that a President-Elect position may have been beneficial. Palumbo agreed, noting that a majority of the beginning of the Board of Directors' term was spent learning about the organization

and positions. Brock agreed, noting that a 15-hour internship was not enough to learn the positions. Alexander noted that some institutions offered classes to learn about the university's governmental structure, van Amen stated that at the University of Utah, first-year students had the opportunity to attend a class and connect with the Associated Students. There was discussion about the need for leadership development in the AS. Edgel stated he slightly preferred allocating representation based on colleges, clubs, and campus communities. Rosenberg noted that it was important to consider the purpose of the elected group, stating that impacted how representation should have been allocated. She also stated she had concerns about the institutions that appointed students to positions that held a lot of power or authority. Edgel stated he did not like that the Board of Directors at the University of Wisconsin was elected by the previous year's members. The committee agreed. Alexander stated he didn't feel the need to have a judicial branch in a student government structure. He noted there wasn't much of a purpose to have a judicial branch. Brock stated the AS Personnel Office was responsible for similar duties that a judicial branch would have handled. Edgel noted that the AS of WWU had a large committee system that eliminated the need for a judicial branch. Hayden stated the AS Management Council could have been a Union Board to balance the Board of Directors if the council had more authority and responsibilities. Alexander noted that once a desired structure had been decided upon, the advising and financial structures needed to be considered. There was discussion about the importance of student-at-large involvement and representation in the budgeting process of the AS and student input when deciding upon student fees. Hayden noted that student fees were similar to taxes that citizens paid to state and federal government, and that taxation without representation was unconstitutional. He also noted that students-at-large did not have many opportunities to challenge the Board of Directors and get involved in the spending of student dollars. He stated it was important to assess the strengths and challenges of the AS at the time.

III. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:34pm.