



AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, May 20th, 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); Daniel Edgel (Student-At-Large); Hannah van Amen (Student-At-Large)

Absent: Bill Martin (Student-At-Large)

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; Mary Moeller

Motions:

SRC-16-S-4 To approve the minutes from April 22nd, 29th, and May 13th, 2016. **Passed.**

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

I. Approval of Minutes

*MOTION SRC-16-S-4 By Palumbo
To approve the minutes from April 22nd, 29th, and May 13th, 2016.*

Second: Edgel Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

II. Discussion Item

a. AS Board of Directors Leedback

Brock noted the Board had a lot of questions about the proposal but that they were impressed with the document. She noted Board members asked for more information about the proposed structure and more detailed information on the roles of the Senate. Hayden entered. Brock noted that there was a recommendation of having the AS Assessment Coordinator serve on the committee and remove the AS VP for Diversity position so Board positions that were being reviewed could have gone to the meeting and talked about their position. Eckroth noted the role and makeup of the Senate really needed to be worked on in more detail. Brock noted that Zach Dove, the AS VP for Academic Affairs wanted to be more involved in the review process to work on shared governance. Alexander noted that there could have been a preamble to allow for more information about the challenges that the restructure hoped to address. He noted that Zach Dove had really stressed the concern of achieving shared governance, and how the new structure hoped to enhance that. Alexander suggested including an explanation of the document and its sections in the preamble. Rosenberg noted that there were lists of individuals and positions within the AS Board of Directors dating back to 1966, and that was used in the proposal to give an overview of the changes to the AS Board of Directors structure throughout the years. The committee noted there

had been many small changes between 2000 and 2009. Brock noted that Board of Directors meeting topics had been included. Rosenberg noted she attempted to include topics that centered on representation rather than internal and programming matters. Edgel stated that there had not been any language added in the document about representation for first-year students. Hayden inquired how comfortable the committee felt about the proposed makeup of the Senate. Alexander stated his subcommittee felt that there needed to be ways to represent students that had not declared their majors, and brought up the discussion about graduate representation and the possibility of a graduate Senate. Rosenberg noted that it was important to think about what kind of topic the Senate would have addressed and what the goals for representation were. Hayden noted that the Senate makeup should have been more blended than by just academic colleges, and recommended selecting constituencies from multiple places. Edgel stated there needed to be a mechanism to provide representation for marginalized and underrepresented students. He noted that establishing constituencies was a difficult process that required further detail work. Alexander noted that that the Senate may have taken the place of the AS VP for Academic Affairs and give students an outlet for addressing concerns and gathering feedback. He noted that in a mixed Senate makeup there was a challenge of making sure that constituencies were separate enough but still allowed for diversity in membership. Hayden stated he had a concern that the Executive Director for Business and Operations was in too many places. Alexander stated the goal was to create a connection between the AS Board of Directors and the Viking Union Board of Directors. Brock stated she had the concern but suggested having the position be non-voting. Hammer noted that there was a goal to make the AS VP for Activities a non-voting member on Activities Council. Edgel noted that it was common for Chairs to be non-voting members. He noted the weakest part of the proposal was the Viking Union Board of Directors, and that the group had focused more on the governance side of the organization. Brock noted that the document needed improvement and expansion before going to the AS Board of Directors the following week. Alexander suggested including visual aids in the proposal. Edgel stated he was planning on attending the following Board of Directors meeting to give further explanation. Brock stated the AS Board of Directors had wanted more members of the committee to attend the Board meeting to provide information. Alexander noted it was important to keep in mind what the goal was for submitting the proposal to the Board, and pointed out that it the goal was primarily to gather feedback from the Board members to make sure the committee was headed in the right direction. Edgel noted that it may have been advantageous to have any Board members not in favor of the proposal write a letter of opposition for the committee to consider. Alexander inquired if there was any work during the summer that would have been done, or if the committee was on hiatus for the summer. Hayden noted that the new AS Board of Directors needed to be trained during the summer. Hammer inquired what the summer work could have looked like. Alexander noted that a subcommittee could have worked on making the draft more detailed. Hayden stated it may have been more beneficial to have the summer be dedicated to trainings for the Board of Directors. Schultz noted it was important to get meetings started quickly in the fall to educate new members. Edgel suggested using the proposal document as an effective tool for new members to learn about the current structure. Brock noted that any edits to the document needed to be made by the following Wednesday in order to bring it to the AS Board of Directors

again the following week. Edgel brought up discussion about the makeup of the interim Senate, and Hayden noted the interim Senate would have had a similar make up to the eventual elected Senate. Brock noted that the section of the proposal on the new structure needed more detail work.

III. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:28pm.