



AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, February 5th, 2016

2:30pm VU460

- Members:** *Present:* Hannah Brock (AS VP for Business and Operations, Chair); Mason Hawk (Student-At-Large); 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); Bill Martin (Student-At-Large)
Absent: BreAnn Sherrill (Student-At-Large); Samantha Goldblatt (Student-At-Large); Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative); Kevin Recto (Residence Hall Association Representative)
- Advisors:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director for Student Activities); Casey Hayden (Coordinator of Student Activities)
- Secretary:** Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)

Motions:
No motions were made.

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

I. Information Item

a. Evergreen State College Student Government Structure

Eckroth stated that Evergreen was the only college in the state that did not have an Associated Students. He noted that instead, the college had the Geoduck Student Union. He mentioned the college only had about 4,500-5,000 students each year, and that 21 students were elected to serve as Representatives on the Board of Directors of the student union. He noted there were a few other roles that were filled from the elected pool of Representatives; Chair, Vice Chair, Cluster Coordinators, and Consent Cabinet Officers. He clarified that the Clusters Coordinator position was in charge of marketing and outreach, and that the Consent Cabinet Officer was the primary budget official. He stated the college also had a Government Liaison position that was comparable to the AS VP for Governmental Affairs and the AS Legislative Advocacy Coordinator positions at WWU. He noted the only position with a term limit was the Historian, which had a term limit of two years and created the legacy document for the student union each year and a yearly report. He stated the governance structure had no check and balance systems, and that impeachments or the removal of an officer were nearly impossible because every Representative had to be in agreement to remove someone from office. He stated each Representative was given a stipend of \$400 per quarter, and that poor compensation could have been the cause of low attendance at Board meetings. He stated the constitution of the organization was poorly written, and also served as the election code. Palumbo inquired if all 21 Representatives met at the same time. Eckroth stated they attempted to. Palumbo inquired if the college had a committee system. Eckroth stated there were committees but membership was made up of mostly Representatives, and that internal committees were only open to Representatives. Brock inquired if the Representatives chaired other committees open to the students. Eckroth stated the Representatives did not have control over open committees. Martin inquired if all 21 on positions were filled each year. Eckroth stated the positions were always filled, though the individuals serving did not always attend

meetings as required. He stated there was an attendance policy but it was difficult to enforce. He stated the Board of Directors had weekly meetings that were mandated by the constitution to be on Wednesdays, and that emergency meetings could have been called by one third of the Representatives or by 5% of the student body. Palumbo inquired if students had ever called an emergency meeting. Eckroth stated they hadn't. He stated the structure was somewhat new, noting that the previous organizational structure had failed. Hawk inquired how the students of Evergreen felt about that structure. Eckroth stated his contact had described it as "organized chaos." He stated the campaigning piece of the constitution was interesting, noting that a participation rate of 25% of the student body needed to vote in an election for student fees to change, and that at least two thirds of that 25% needed to vote in favor of the change. Brock stated that was very ambitious. Eckroth also noted that a participation rate of 15% of students needed to vote in order to approve the student legislative agenda, with two thirds approval needed. He stated 10% of students needed to vote in order to change student union policies. He noted that Evergreen also two other campuses, with one or two Representatives from those campuses. Eckroth stated the Board of Directors meetings were structured to begin with an hour for strictly student business, and 30 minutes afterwards for business with other parties. Martin inquired what kind of advising structure the organization had. Eckroth stated the Geoduck Student Union had one advisor, and an additional advisor to oversee budgets. He stated the Chief Budget Officer created the proposed budgets which were then voted on by the Board of Directors before it went on to the Student and Incidental Fees Committee. Hayden stated that Evergreen's structure and WWU's structure were not very compatible. Eckroth stated Evergreen's union was a very representative body and that activities were in a spate department

b. University of Oklahoma Student Government Structure

Hawk stated the AS of the University of Oklahoma was composed of an executive branch, a judicial branch, and a legislative branch. He noted the executive branch consisted of a President, Vice President, and Cabinet. He explained that the legislative branch had two Houses of Representatives; one for graduate students and one for undergraduate students with Representatives elected by their respective student bodies. He stated it was the responsibility of the Representatives to find issues or topics of discussion from students and present them to the House. He noted for any policy to pass, both Houses had to pass the proposal. He explained that the primary purpose of the Houses was to pass budgetary items. He noted there were 30 undergraduate and 30 graduate students on the Student Senate. It was noted that the university had almost 45,000 at the time. Hawk stated the judicial branch of the student government contained a higher court and a lower court. He stated the higher court dealt with appeals, the organization's constitution, and important policy issues. He noted the lower court dealt with parking appeals and civic issues. He explained that there was a programming branch that consisted of the Campus Activities Council with an elected chair. He noted that each Representative was elected, and that participation rates were relatively high at the university.

c. University of Wisconsin, Madison Student Government Structure

Edgel stated the University of Wisconsin had a similar student government structure to that of Oregon State University, noting that the union was separated from the

Associated Students. He noted the AS did not have an executive branch. He stated the union consisted of 15 positions, 4 of which were elected by union committees the previous year. He noted the union was not a body involved in politics or advocacy, and operated as an administrative body. He noted that two members were selected by the administration, with one member required to be a faculty member. He pointed out that alumni were still considered part of the union membership. He stated the legislative branch consisted of the Student Council and the Student Council Finance Committee. He stated the Student Council was comprised of 23 elected Representatives from each college of the university, and that 4 seats were dedicated to first year students and were elected in the fall of each year. He stated the fall elections had high participation rates. He noted that the previous year 30 first year students had run for the 4 seats on the council. Martin stated that was a great way to get first year students involved on campus. Edgel noted that any vacancy on the council was filled by a two-thirds majority vote of the council members. Brock inquired how many students attended the university. Edgel stated the university was comparable in size to the University of Washington and some universities in California. He noted the Student Council met bi-weekly and that the Representatives did not receive a stipend or pay for their service. He noted the council was constitutionally obligated to a town hall each semester, and hold town halls at each college of the university. He stated there was a dedicated position to lobby the student legislative agenda each year. He noted the Student Financial Services Committee consisted of 6 students elected at large that served 2 year terms, 4 members appointed each year, and 5 members elected by the Student Council. He stated the committee was its own entity but the Student Council served as a check and balance. He noted that any additional spending over the operational budget had to be approved by a two-thirds majority of the Student Council Finance Committee, and stated there was also a Reserves Council. He stated the only members of the student government that were paid were the members of the Student Financial Services Committee, who were paid \$20 per meeting they attended. He noted the Student Council met bi-weekly. He stated the Student Judiciary was composed of 7 members that were appointed by the Student Council, and that once members were elected they did not have to run again to serve the following year, but could not have served more than a 4-year term. Brock inquired if the members of the Student Judiciary were required to have knowledge of law. Edgel stated the Student Judiciary did not, and focused primarily on elections and could have vetoed decisions made by the Student Council. Rosenberg compared that to the AS of WWU's Elections Board and Elections Advisory Committee. Edgel noted the student union had been established in 1937. Brock inquired what kinds of programming the organization did. Edgel stated there was an Activities office and a Clubs office. Rosenberg noted the university had about 43,000 students; about 30,000 of which were undergraduate students and the remainder were graduate students.

d. Central Washington University Student Government Structure

Martin noted that Central Washington University had a similar AS Board of Directors structure to that of WWU. He noted there was also a Student Union Advisory Board that worked closely with the Board of Directors and consisted of 6 members appointed by the Board of Directors. He noted the Student Union Advisory Board had no decision making power, but provided feedback and suggestions to the Board of Directors. Brock inquired how many Vice Presidents were on the Board. Martin stated

there were 6 positions that were all paid. Brock inquired if there was a primary Vice President in addition to the six specialized positions. Martin stated there was. Eckroth stated the student government structure of Central was most similar to WWU of all the universities studied so far. Brock inquired if there was an activities office. Martin noted it was split between the Student Union and the Associated Students. Brock inquired if the Associated Students oversaw a committee system. Martin stated that it did. Brock speculated that the Student Union Advisory Board sounded similar to the previous Student Senate of WWU.

II. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:30pm.