



AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, March 4th, 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); Hannah van Amen (Student-At-Large); Bill Martin (Student-At-Large); Daniel Edgel (Student-At-Large)

Absent: Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative); Patrick Eckroth (AS VP for Governmental Affairs)

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 2:39pm.

I. Discussion Item

a. Hopes and Lears of a New Model

Alexander noted that there would have been hopes and fears about any new model. He stated his role on the committee was to facilitate dialogue. Brock noted that Rosenberg had sent the committee a list of previous Board of Directors agenda items from the previous three years, and noted it would have been helpful for deciding what a Student Senate would have worked on. Alexander reminded the committee that AS Elections had opened and were available to all students. Hayden stated the enormity of restructuring the entire organization was daunting. He stated it would have had a large impact on professional staff members. He noted changing professional staff job descriptions was more difficult than changing AS job descriptions. Brock stated she wasn't concerned about students losing power, but noted that she was concerned about students losing opportunities for real-world experience in their positions. She stated keeping some student administrative roles was important. Hayden agreed, noting that particularly Board of Directors positions offered a lot of experience that was useful for job interviews and opportunities after graduation. He noted that some previous Board members sometimes weren't challenged enough in their positions after graduation. Palumbo stated that in the new model the work that students were doing would have been much more effective. She noted that at the time students were overworked and weren't able to work on things as thoroughly as if they had less to work on. Martin stated the new model would have allowed for more involvement and more offices or committees. Brock agreed, noting that the organization would have created more advocacy programs. Hawk stated he liked that the committee had agreed that a senate or legislative body was needed. Palumbo stated she had a concern that a senate would have been unsuccessful like the previous one. Brock stated that holding senators more accountable would have been important. She suggested working with Laculty Senate

to have student Senators nominated from different university departments. Alexander noted that the Faculty Senate President the previous night at the Board of Trustees meeting had suggested offering credits towards their degrees for serving in certain positions. Palumbo stated it was important to make those credits applicable to students' majors. Brock stated that was a good point, but that it would only have attracted political science majors. She stated more representation was needed. Palumbo suggested allowing each department to offer credits relevant to that department. Martin stated that a credit incentive would have been more appealing for students further along in their majors. Recto stated he wanted more clarity about what the AS was. He stated many students weren't aware of how the AS represented them. Edgel entered. Alexander noted a new model would have allowed for more innovation and creativity if students weren't overworked in their positions. Hayden stated a new model would have allowed for better responsiveness to change. Alexander stated he hoped that people would have been able to think in new ways about the organization, and noted he feared that people would not have been receptive to change. Edgel stated he had the same fear. He noted it would have been difficult to explain the need for a restructure to students who had not been involved in the review process. Schultz noted that the rate of change was important for how change was received. Brock stated a rapid change was not desired if it produced a lack of detail or quality. She noted that people on the committee in the following years would have had to focus on detail work in order to have made progress. Hayden suggested bringing in candidates for the AS Board of Directors to inform them of what the committee was working on. He stated he feared the restructure would have changed too quickly and the organization would have lost its uniqueness. Alexander noted it was important to think about what was so important in the structure that it would have been unrecognizable without it. van Amen stated bringing candidates to meetings would have been beneficial and would have informed students about the need for a Student Senate. Brock stated she would send a personal invitation to each candidate to attend committee meetings. She stated it was important for the longevity of the committee to include potential future members. Palumbo stated that Eckroth had expressed to her a concern that a new structure would have taken student power away. Edgel stated that it was important to make sure that AS employees were students as a priority rather than only an employee. Brock agreed. Edgel suggested separating the administrative and governance functions of the organization. Alexander stated that he had a fear that there was only one definition of student success and leadership. He stated he wanted to support different types of student leadership. He stated he also had concerns about how long the restructure process would take. He stated the process would have been a shift from student autonomy to interdependence. He stated his hope was that different parts of the university became more interdependent. He agreed that allowing students to be students before employees was important. Hayden stated that addressing Eckroth's concern, the advocacy and governance portion of the organization would have been almost entirely student led, and that the programming portion would have involved more interdependence. Edgel stated it was important to consider that Board of Directors positions may not have stayed the same. Alexander noted that the positions were somewhat placeholders to represent their departments in the proposed structure. Brock stated she wanted to discuss details about the Student Senate and what reportage would have looked like. It was noted that it was important to involve people other than just committee members in assessing the strengths and challenges of the

organization. Edgel stated it was important to consider how shared governance would have been achieved with the new structure. Alexander stated that it would have been beneficial to have a group of people to go to different bodies on campus to ask about strengths and challenges of the organization. Brock inquired if that would have been in-person or through surveys. Martin suggested in-person. Brock inquired if the members would have been willing to be involved. Hayden stated that AS Board of Directors candidates would have been beneficial members of the committee. He stated all candidates needed to know of the opportunity. Alexander stated that not all bodies on campus knew enough about the AS to assess the organization. He suggested using the question “What do you expect from your student government?” Brock stated a general survey would have been helpful, but that a human interaction component was important too.

II. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:34pm.