



AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, April 1st, 2016

2:30pm

YU567

- Members:** *Present:* Hannah Brock (AS VP for Business and Operations, Chair); 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); Bill Martin (Student-At-Large)
Absent: Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative); Mason Hawk (Student-At-Large)
- Advisors:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director for Student Activities); Eric Alexander (Associate Dean of Students and Director of the Viking Union, Lacilitator)
- Secretary:** Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)
- Guests:** Casey Hayden (Coordinator of Student Activities)

Motions:

SRC-16-S-1 To approve the minutes from March 11th, 2016. **Passed.**

Brock called the meeting to order at 2:35pm.

I. Approval of Minutes

*MOTION SRC-16-S-1 by Palumbo
To approve the minutes from March 11th, 2016.*

Second: Martin Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

II. Discussion Item

a. AS Structure Review Timeline

Brock stated that she and Alexander had created a potential timeline for implementing the changes proposed by the committee. She noted the timeline needed to be finished by May 13th in order to submit it to the AS Board of Directors. She stated the Resource and Outreach Programs had developed different phases of implementation for a restructure of the department, and she expressed her goal of creating a similar system for the Associated Students Restructure. She stated the format would have been modified for the specific changes of the restructure, but that the Resource and Outreach Programs had provided a good template. Alexander asked the committee members if they felt creating a timeline and recommendations proposal was the appropriate next-step for the committee. Palumbo inquired if the recommendations would have included contacting other organizations and departments of WWU, or if the committee could have contacted those places while creating the recommendations. Brock stated that was for the committee to decide. She stated members each could have brought questions to different people and groups on campus to gather feedback. She stated that Faculty Senate had requested to be involved in the structure review process. Alexander stated that it would have been beneficial to research how different student government models affected campuses. Hayden stated he felt more deliberation was needed to ensure that the proposed structure was the best for WWU.

Rosenberg noted that the American Student Government Association may have been a good resource to utilize for the committee. Hayden stated the University of California, Davis had an interesting structure that had a good balance of a Senate and a representative body. He stated it could have been useful to review that structure. Alexander agreed that there was more work to do. Hayden stated it was important to spend enough time consulting with stakeholders on campus to ensure the new structure would have met the campus' needs. There was discussion about how much students-at-large knew about the internal operations of the AS. Brock stated that as long as the organization functioned well and provided students with services, many students were not concerned with internal operations. The committee members suggested questions to ask stakeholders. Hayden brought up the discussion about whether the AS should have represented students in the classroom as a resource for issues that came up with professors or not. The committee chose to discuss that topic at another time. Alexander stated he had spoken with a student that was upset about a facility in the Fine Arts building. He said the student had attempted to speak with multiple offices before they were sent to the Associated Students. Edgel stated that if Student Senators had constituencies they could have served as liaisons between students in their departments and the Associated Students. Brock inquired if the questions that were suggested would have allowed for responses that provided constructive feedback. She stated she was going to bring the suggested questions to the AS Management Council the following Monday to gather some informal feedback about them. Palumbo stated that providing students with context for the questions was important because some questions would have been difficult to answer without it. The committee agreed. Brock stated she would add background information about the structure review process in the survey. Hayden suggested adding information about the differences in programming and representation. Palumbo stated that many internal AS employees did not know exactly what each director on the Board of Directors did. Alexander agreed and inquired whether that mattered. Brock stated it mattered in that the decisions the Board of Directors made affected student employees, but that knowledge wasn't needed to get their own work done. Alexander stated the hopes and fears of the committee were well crafted. He stated the survey was useful for making sure the rest of campus was thinking the same way that the committee was. Palumbo suggested changing the survey to state what the committee had been working on and asking others what they thought of that. The rest of the members agreed. There was discussion on how detailed that information needed to be for the survey. Alexander noted that graduate students needed representation in the student government. Brock stated she was in favor of creating a Student Senate and that graduate student representation on that senate was important. Hayden suggested including links to online AS resources in the survey so students were able to learn more about the organization if they wanted to. Alexander noted the committee had four meetings left before a draft proposal was needed, in order to edit and submit it to the Board of Directors. The committee created a timeline for their work and set goals for when they wanted to have things done. Brock noted that meetings may have needed to extend to an hour and a half per meeting. The committee agreed. Hayden stated that some future meetings needed to focus on production rather than discussion. Palumbo stated an organized list of stakeholders would have been beneficial. Alexander stated the committee could have put that list together at the following meeting. Hayden stated

that the beginning of the draft proposal could have been started right away. Brock stated subcommittees may have been beneficial.

III. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:26pm.