



AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, April 15th, 2016

2:30pm VU567

- 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); Patrick Eckroth (AS VP for Governmental Affairs, Vice Chair); Daniel Edgel (Student-At-Large); Hannah van Amen (Student-At-Large); Bill Martin (Student-At-Large)
Absent: Jordan Walley (Athletics Representative)
- 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:** Bryce Hammer (AS Board Assistant for Representation Committees); Lizzy Ramhorst (Lacuity Senate Shared Governance Operations Manager); Molly Ware (Lacuity Senate President)

Motions:

SRC-16-S-2 To approve the minutes from April 1st and April 8th, 2016. **Passed.**

Brock called the meeting to order at 2:33pm.

I. Approval of Minutes

MOTION SRC-16-S-2 by Recto

To approve the minutes from April 1st and April 8th, 2016.

Second: Hawk

Vote: 7 - 0 - 0

Action: Passed

II. Discussion Item

a. Lacuity Senate Collaboration

Ware stated that faculty felt empowered on campus but that students and staff did not feel as empowered with the systems in place. She expressed her hopes that faculty and students could have worked together to make students feel empowered. Ramhorst stated the Lacuity Senate hoped to become more transparent collaborate more with students. Palumbo and Alexander entered. Brock stated the committee was still in the research phase of the review process and gave the guests from Lacuity Senate a brief overview of the work the committee had done. She brought up the proposed stakeholder survey that the committee was planning to send to students and groups on campus. She noted the committee had reviewed the shortcomings of the previous Student Senate and addressed some solutions the committee had come up with for reforming the Senate and incentivizing Senators to serve on the Senate with class credit. Edgel stated he hoped that Senators would have been required to serve on committees so the AS Board of Directors did not have to serve on so many. Ware inquired if the primary reason that the Board of Directors had difficulties being the sole representatives for students on committees because of the number of committees they served on. Brock stated the Board members were expected to know a lot and do a lot without enough support. Alexander stated that it was difficult because Board

members had to retrain committee members each year and update them with the work the committee had done previously. He also noted that it was difficult for Board members to represent all students as just one individual. Ware agreed and stated that an initial training and update session at the beginning of the term was beneficial. Brock asked for a brief explanation of the roles and structure of Faculty Senate. Ware stated that the Faculty Senate was composed of faculty from across campus and that each college had a set number of representatives. She noted the Senate met bi-weekly and also had an executive committee that consisted of chairs of other committees and selected Senators. She stated there were goals to reorganize the university committee system beneath the Faculty Senate. She stated the Social Justice and Equity Committee was new that year. Alexander asked how the Faculty Senate was seated and inquired if that was a good model for a potential Student Senate. Ramhorst noted there were many different ways to seat a Senate and noted that the structure of the Faculty Senate at WWU was somewhat arbitrary. She stated her goal was to operationalize the idea of shared governance. She stated that few, if any, other institutions had done that well. She stressed that adaptability and willingness to change was crucial for making collaboration and shared governance work. Ware inquired how the AS had been planning to seat a Student Senate. Alexander referred to the draft stakeholder survey and noted that the AS was asking students how they wanted a Student Senate created. Ramhorst stated that it was important to consider how many people were appropriate on a Senate in order to have effective communication. She stated the Faculty Senate had a Senator for almost every academic department, and noted that people were more comfortable communicating with Senators they felt connected to. Ware inquired whether the Student Senate would have done the work as a group or delegated work to other committees. She stated that with technology more communication with constituents was possible. Brock agreed that technology should have been more utilized. She stated that students needed incentive to participate. She agreed that too many people on a Senate could have caused problems. She brought up the idea of having task forces led by Senators. Alexander stated it was important to ask why work needed to be done, not only what needed to be done. He noted that students of the AS were asked to do programming and representative work at the same time. Brock noted the review process of the AS structure could have taken up to three years in order to create a quality proposal and do enough research and planning. Ware inquired what the timeframe for the stakeholder survey was. Brock stated she wanted a lot of responses but that she didn't want to wait too long for the committee to move forward with their work. She stated the goal was to have the survey closed after a couple of weeks. She gave a brief overview of the committee's goal for the year. Ware suggested that the committee contact Karen Stout about giving students credit for leadership work done on campus. Brock stated that was a great idea. Alexander stated there could have been a general class for student leaders on campus, and separate smaller classes for specific departments and work environments. Ware compared the system to practicum hours in the secondary education major and stated the system could have been structured the same way. Palumbo stated that structure was tailored more to a leadership minor and noted that there should have been a way for students to incorporate those extra credits into their majors. Hammer noted that older students had less room in their schedules for extra credits outside of their majors but that they had institutional knowledge that would have been valuable for leadership positions. Edgel stated that he was in favor of paying Senators instead of providing

credits, noting that STEM majors also had high credit requirements. Palumbo reminded the committee of the 19 hour per week hour for student employees. Ramhorst stated that it was important to consider whether students were comfortable serving on university committees that were composed mostly by faculty. She stated it was also tokenizing to only have one student on a university committee. She noted a balance was needed between having enough students on committees and incentivizing each student to participate. Brock stated from personal experience that when she was the only student in the room on university committees, she spoke much less when she was the only student in the room. Alexander noted that students were often put into one group when committee membership was considered, whereas faculty were often recognized from different departments and areas of campus. Ramhorst noted that it was important to consider non-traditional student voices on committees as well. There was discussion about further collaborative sessions and working to figure out how to incentivize student Senators and better represent students on university committees. Brock stated again that the student Senators could have been required to serve on certain university committees. Ramhorst stated that ongoing communication was important for truly achieving shared governance.

b. Stakeholder Survey

The committee and guests edited questions 8 and 9 of the survey to make it more clear what the survey was asking. Ware and Ramhorst stated they were available as resources for the committee in the future. Brock stated the collaborative meeting was very helpful and that those types of meetings were very important for the structure review process.

III. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:32pm.