



# AS Management Council

Monday, April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016

4:00pm

YU567

**Members:** *Present:* Hannah Brock (VP for Business and Operations, Chair); Spencer Pickell (AS Outdoor Center Equipment Shop Coordinator); Marina Price (AS Review Editor-in-Chief); Griffin Crisp (AS Representation & Engagement Programs Director); Osman Olivera (AS Business Director); Shiffite Awel (AS Publicity Center Account Executive 1); Anna Kemper (AS Environmental and Sustainability Programs Director); Jordan Van Hoozer (KUGS Program Director); Brian Gliński (AS KVIK Coordinator); Sophie Ranis (AS Womxn's Center Assistant Coordinator); Kelly Mason (AS Communications Director)

*Absent:* Emma J. Opsal (AS Assessment Coordinator); Yuliya Rybalka (AS Personnel Director); Jonah Falk (AS Productions Director); Gabriel Ibanez (AS Ethnic Student Center Internal Coordinator); Walter Lutsch (AS Clubs Coordinator)

**Advisor:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director of Student Activities)

**Secretary:** Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)

## Motions:

**MC-16-S-1** To approve the minutes from March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016. **Passed.**

*Brock called the meeting to order at 4:03pm.*

## I. Approval of Minutes

*MOTION MC-16-S-1 By Crisp*

*To approve the minutes from March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016.*

Second: Van Hoozer Vote: 9 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

## II. Discussion Item

### a. Structure Review Committee Update

Brock stated her goal was to create a Structure Review Timeline by the end of spring quarter to move forward with the committee. Ranis entered. Brock gave the council a brief overview of the current AS structure. Rosenberg noted that every office and department of the organization reported to the AS Board of Directors. She expressed that the Board of Directors positions were overworked. Brock stated she hoped to create a check and balance for the Board of Directors. She noted the previous Student Senate had been unsuccessful because the Board of Directors had not given the Senate any power or purpose. She stated Senators were not incentivized and that the positions did not have much to work on. She stated the AS Structure Review Committee had evaluated other college's student government structures. Mason entered. Brock noted that there were elements of other structures that the committee really liked, and that a new proposed structure had been put together using elements from other structures and current elements of the ASWWU. She stated the timing of implementing change was difficult to decide upon. She stated the staff of the Resource and Outreach Programs had created a timeline with different phases of transition for the restructure of the Resource and Outreach Programs. She asked the council for suggestions about what could have changed about the AS. Olivera stated there wasn't enough accountability for the Board of Directors and that student Senators needed to be incentivized. Awel stated that the AS

Management Council could have been a group that held the Board of Directors accountable. Brock stated the original intent for the creation of Management Council may have been to balance the Board of Directors but that was not how the council had developed. Olivera stated he agreed with Awel that Management Council would have been a good check and balance body for the Board of Directors. Gliński stated student-at-large representation was needed in a separate body. Price stated it would have been beneficial to have as many governing bodies as possible, noting that AS employees and students-at-large would have offered different perspectives. Ranis noted that the Resource and Outreach Programs was somewhat separated from the Board of Directors and that they were personally unaware of what the Board was doing. They suggested a more horizontal distribution of power. Mason stated that having students-at-large on a Student Senate was a good way to inform other students about what the Board of Directors was doing. Price stated there was not a lot of structure to the communication between the Board of Directors and the rest of the AS. She suggested expanding the AS Communications Office. Van Hoozer stated a PowerPoint during Fall Staff Development that overviewed the overall structure of the AS would have been very helpful. There was discussion about creating a map or flowchart of how the AS was structured. Ranis suggested including functions of offices and departments on the chart. Mason stated that would have helped collaboration efforts as well. Awel suggested including an office directory to with the chart. Van Hoozer suggested posting the flowchart to other areas of campus to inform students-at-large. She stated it was difficult to restructure an organization when a majority of people were not aware of what the current structure was. Mason stated it was frustrating because there was not enough time to implement all the ideas people had. Brock agreed and brought up the idea of allowing employees to return to their positions without reapplying but noted that may not have been completely accessible to new students. Van Hoozer noted that not every AS employee did great in their positions and some of them should not have returned. Mason stated that hiring was not the problem, but that processes in the organization moved so slowly. Brock noted that a more federal structure would have moved more slowly than the current corporate model. Pickell noted that the supervisor of the Outdoor Center was keeping track of long-term goals and ensuring that the yearly student coordinators were involved in achieving those goals. Brock noted that professional staff supervisors were helpful for programs and offices, and that may have been the direction the Resource and Outreach Programs was heading. Ranis agreed that even small changes took a long time to implement. Van Hoozer noted student autonomy depended on the individual in the professional staff position. Awel stated there needed to be an anonymous way to hold professional staff supervisors accountable in case students were uncomfortable approaching them directly. Brock stated that had been a problem in the past. She stated students needed to be involved in the hiring process for professional staff members. Rosenberg agreed. Crisp suggested creating a body similar to the Academic Honesty Board to hold professional staff members accountable by collaborating with administrators. Ranis stated there needed to be a student office similarly to the Equal Opportunity Office that focused on internal AS issues. They stressed it was important not to involve the person who made the complaint but the person who was complained about. Schultz suggested creating a set of guidelines for what truly needed to be approved by the Board of Directors and what could have been approved by AS committees. Price and Mason strongly agreed. Brock stated she appreciated the council's feedback and noted that some ideas had been new and others were congruent with what the AS Structure Review Committee had brought up. She stated she was also going to send a survey to various parts of the campus community to assess what AS was missing or needed. There was discussion about how to distribute that survey. Social media, incentivized raffles, Red Square tabling, and Web4U were suggested.

### **III. Adjourn**

*Brock adjourned the Meeting at 4:58pm.*