



# AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2016

2:30pm VU460

- Members:** *Present:* Patrick Eckroth (AS VP for Governmental Affairs, Vice Chair) Mason Hawk (Student-At-Large); Kevin Recto (Residence Hall Association Representative); Emma Palumbo (AS VP for Student Life); Hannah van Amen (Student-At-Large); Bill Martin (Student-At-Large)  
*Absent:* Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative); Hannah Brock (AS VP for Business and Operations, Chair); Daniel Edgel (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:** Hannah Spencer (Student-at-Large)

## Motions:

**SRC-16-W-3** To approve the minutes from January 22<sup>nd</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>, and Lebruary 5<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016. **Passed.**

*Eckroth called the meeting to order at 2:34pm.*

## I. Approval of Minutes

*MOTION SRC- 16-W-3 By Palumbo*

*To approve the minutes from January 22<sup>nd</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>, and February 5<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016.*

Second: Martin

Vote: **6 - 0 - 0**

Action: Passed

## II. Discussion Item

### a. Likes and Dislikes

The committee reviewed the list of likes and dislikes. There was discussion about having a separate programming structure that had a more corporate model, van Amen stated it was important to have more training time for incoming Board members. Alexander noted it was important to have representation from across campus and not just within the organization. There as discussion about having a President-Elect position to allow for more experience and knowledge before assuming the position of President. There was discussion about the negative impacts of unilateral appointments to positions. Alexander noted that a system for leadership development needed to involve internal and external groups and individuals.

## III. Information Item

### a. Possible Luture AS Structure

Alexander stated he had been working on a proposed structure for the AS based on previous discussions and reviews of other student government structures. He noted structures could have been split into two sectors of programming and representation. He noted that at the time, the AS incorporated both sectors. He noted the Viking

Union was involved in the programming sector of the AS. He stated that in other models, the programming sector was not involved in the representative part of student government. He speculated based on previous discussions that the committee did not want a complete separation of programming and representation, but that there needed to be more separation than there was at the time. He suggested two branches; one involved in advocacy and governance, and the other focused on programming and providing services. He noted the governance portion of the organization needed some sort of legislative body. He noted the executive piece of the governance half of the organization could have consisted of fewer positions, and multiple task forces centered on advocacy. He noted the programming and services branch was more involved in the Viking Union, and that many student unions at other universities had a Union Board of Directors. He noted the AS VP for Diversity and AS VP for Business and Operations positions could have worked with both sectors of the organization. He noted that at the University of Washington, the resource and advocacy portions of the student government structure were separate. He stated that professional staff offering resources and services may have been more beneficial than having student staff offering peer-counseling services. He noted that with that structure, the AS Board of Directors would have been split into two governing bodies that oversaw two separate departments, creating more of a balanced system. He stated that with that structure, the advising structure would have drastically changed as well. He stated that moving the programming and services portion of the organization to the student union would have been a big change and required the AS to allow professional staff to be more involved. He stated annualized turnover in leadership was important to consider. He noted it was important to consider where it was best for students to lead, and where it was best for professional staff members to lead. He clarified that students would have been most involved in the advocacy and governance portion of the organization, but that they would still have involvement in the programming sector. He noted that KUGS and the Outdoor Center were examples where staff led the programs, but students were heavily involved in leadership positions within those programs. Hayden noted the Ethnic Student Center was the same way.

b. Comments and Recommendations on the Proposed Structure

Hayden pointed out that the proposed structure made it apparent that the AS was missing some important elements in the representative structure. Rosenberg noted that a legislative body was needed along with a check and balance to the Board of Directors. Recto inquired how the proposed structure would have incorporated professional staff members and what the relationship would have been between the student leadership. Alexander noted that professional staff members trained were responsible for offering advice, advising, and direction. He noted direction was needed for large and risky endeavors. Rosenberg noted that budgets were another area where direction was sometimes needed from professional staff. He noted the advising portion of professional staff members' roles was very important. He noted that in the governance portion of the structure staff members would have been in advising roles, and that in the programming sector the professional staff members would have been in more directive roles where necessary. Hayden noted there could have been more variation within that model as well. He noted there was a need for intentionality about hiring student positions and empowering them. He stated student empowerment was at the core of the AS and Viking Union. He clarified that the addition of professional

staff members did not remove student autonomy and authority. Alexander agreed. Eckroth stated he felt the proposed structure would have worked really well. Martin stated he had concerns about professional staff members being in directive roles. Palumbo noted that there were certain parts of the organization that needed the consistency of permanent staff members, particularly in offices that offered peer-counseling and advising. She stated having clear direction in programming and advocacy was very important. Alexander noted that there were dual roles within the current structure, and that the proposed structure would have eliminated that. Rosenberg stated that the committee structure made up a large portion of the current AS that would have equated to the proposed task forces of the new structure. Hayden inquired whether the proposed structure helped give the committee a sense of direction. Schultz stated it was important to consider why the structure needed to change and whether the proposed structure would have eliminated challenges within the current organization, van Amen stated a checklist of challenges and strengths of the organization would have been helpful for the members who did not have much experience in the AS. Alexander noted that in the proposed structure, executive members would have helped organize and give direction to task forces, but would not have been required to be at every meeting. He stated he felt the committee seemed comfortable with the proposed structure but that details were needed and that the purpose of the restructure needed to be considered. Hayden stated the committee could have gathered feedback from other parts of the organization beyond the committee to assess the organization's structure and challenges. Eckroth suggested a forum or survey to gather that feedback. It was discussed that the forum would have been anonymous. Alexander noted that after the survey was conducted more follow up was required.

#### **IV. Adjourn**

***Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:29pm.***