



# AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2016

2:30pm

YU543

- 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:* Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative); Kevin Recto (Residence Hall Association Representative)
- 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:** Bryce Hammer (AS Board Assistant for Representation Committees)

**Motions:** No motions were made.

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

## I. Discussion Item

### a. AS Structure Review Stakeholder Survey

Brock brought up the draft of the stakeholder survey and noted that if students selected the answer “Yes” to the question “Do you know what the Associated Students is?” then they would have been brought to a question asking about what offices or programs of the AS they were familiar with. Palumbo suggested allowing every student to answer the second question, reasoning that they may have been involved with AS programs or departments without realizing those services were part of the Associated Students. Edgel suggested changing the first question to a scale where students selected out of 1-10 how familiar they were with the AS. Brock updated the survey to reflect those suggestions. She presented the rest of the survey to the committee. The members discussed whether to include each academic department or each college of the university under the question regarding Student Senate representation. Edgel stated that Senate representation should have been proportional to the size of the college or departments. Martin inquired how students who had not selected or declared a major would have been represented. The committee agreed upon an “undeclared” department for senators. There was discussion about the fact that many first-year students would not have been represented because a majority of students did not declare a major until after their first year. Hammer suggested selecting senators by “area of interest” rather than declared major or colleges. Edgel suggested having first-year students elect their own senators in the fall of each year. Alexander stated that the students should have been able to select how many student senators they wanted. The members also discussed the option of interest or identity based representation. Alexander noted that representatives could have been from various non-academic parts of campus, van Amen stated that senators could have been involved in subcommittees or task forces that were more specialized. Alexander inquired which kind of identity aspects the survey asked about, noting that some aspects of identity were protected by law and others were not. He also suggested

adding an option to allow students to note if they wanted representation to include a combination of options. Rosenberg inquired if the “other” option should have been ranked on the preferential scale. Brock stated she would further consider the logistics of the survey. There was discussion about how to word the description of what the senators would have done. Palumbo suggested including examples like “setting agendas for student lobbying efforts.” Brock stated she would have added questions about demographic information to the end of the survey. Alexander stated the survey heavily focused on the creation of a Student Senate, but that there were other options that students may have wanted. There was discussion about whether or not to include a write-in option about how students felt the AS served them. Rosenberg noted that AS service and AS representation were different. She stated that students may have felt the AS provided services well enough but still may have felt that their representation was lacking. Alexander noted it was important to remember that students may not have known how to contact or get involved with the AS. Hawk noted that the survey needed to require ten minutes or less to take, otherwise students may have become disinterested. Alexander inquired whether the survey was meant to focus on student representation and advocacy, or programming. Brock stated she felt that many students were not aware that the AS served as a representative and programming body simultaneously. Alexander suggested shaping the survey to focus on representation and advocacy. He noted a separate survey about programming could have been created later. Palumbo suggested changing the language of the question “How familiar are you with the AS?” to include wording about the governance structure. Alexander noted that the survey could have been an educational experience for students, and noted that a question about how familiar students were with AS programs could have been included, van Amen suggested including things like Viking Lobby Day and Western Votes! in the list of programs and offices. Alexander asked the committee if they felt the survey should have focused on the representation and governance part of the AS. The committee agreed. Alexander noted that there were other ways to assess the programming portion of the organization such as the Structure and Program Advisory Committee, but that no such process existed for the governance aspects of the AS.

b. Management Council Feedback for Structure Review Committee

Brock stated she had asked the AS Management Council what they felt the needed improvement on. She noted the members of Management Council had expressed that the AS Board of Directors needed more accountability, suggested that Management Council serve as a check and balance to the Board of Directors, Senators needed to be incentivized, many people didn’t know what the Board of Directors was doing, and that AS committees needed more power. She stated the council had requested a map and flow chart of the AS structure with roles of each office and information on each department. She noted the council also requested that long term goals for departments were looked after by professional staff members. She also briefed the committee on the discussion that Management Council had about creating a board to handle grievances that students had with professional staff members.

## **II. Adjourn**

***Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:30pm.***