



AS Structural Review Committee

Friday, May 27th, 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); Bill Martin (Student-At-Large)

Absent: Hannah van Amen (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 (Incoming AS VP for Governmental Affairs)

Motions:

SRC-16-S-5 To approve the minutes from May 20th, 2016. **Passed.**

SRC-16-S-6 To approve the AS Structure Review Proposal 2015-2016 with amendments as discussed. **Passed.**

SRC-16-S-7 To adjourn the meeting. **Passed.**

Brock called the meeting to order at 2:46pm.

I. Approval of Minutes

*MOTION SRC-16-S-5 By Palumbo
To approve the minutes from May 20th, 2016.*

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

II. Discussion Item

a. AS Structure Review Proposal Draft

Brock noted that the order of the circles in the visual document would have been rearranged. Alexander noted that the Legislative Branch was edited to reflect the necessity for representation of marginalized students on campus. Hayden noted that he appreciated that the proposed Legislative Branch spread the work of the AS VP for Academic Affairs out to more people, and noted a similar support system could have been created for the AS VP for Diversity and AS VP for Student Life. Edgel noted that Senators would have had the authority to enact policy and democratize some of the responsibilities of the two latter positions, but that there had been concern about overworking Senators and underpaying them. Brock noted the current AS VP for Academic Affairs, Zach Dove, had felt more comfortable with the direction the structure was going. She noted that the AS Board of Directors had expressed they had more understanding of the proposed structure after it had been edited. Alexander noted there had been language added in the portion about the Executive Branch to further explain why the AS VP for Student Life position was changed to the AS VP for Student Services. Edgel noted the AS Board of Directors had concerns about the

Executive Director for Business and Operations being a hired position that had voting power on the Executive Board. Brock noted there had been concerns from the Board that the position would have been exclusive if it were hired. She pointed out that a majority of AS positions were hired and had the potential to be exclusive. Rosenberg suggested using a hybrid election/hiring process for the position. She suggested interviewing individuals that were interested in running for the position, and having students vote on the selected finalists. Alexander stated there was concern that because the position would have been hired for a specific skill set, their opinion would have been weighed more heavily in discussions. Brock agreed that was problematic. Edgel stated that may not have been an issue, because the Board of Directors may have seen the position as a separate entity because they were not a voted representative. Hammer pointed out that the position seemed more like an advisor than a voting member on the Board. She brought up the concern about who would serve on the hiring committee for the position. Eckroth noted that the Washington Student Association had their Board of Directors hire the Executive Director for the following year. He noted the AS Executive Board could have hired the Executive Director for Business and Operations in collaboration with the Student Senate. Edgel noted there would have been an advisor on the hiring committee for the position. He expressed his concern that by having the Senate and Executive Board it took away from the effectiveness of having the position hired. Hammer strongly expressed that she felt the position did not need a voting seat on the Executive Board. Hayden noted that when students self-select to run for office, they often take the time to learn the position and decide if they're qualified. He noted that in previous years, electing the AS VP for Business and Operations had not been a problem. Recto expressed his concern that the position would not have been selected by students. Alexander suggested electing the Viking Union Board Chair, and having that position also serve as the Executive Director for Business and Operations. He noted the position's primary responsibility would have been overseeing the operations of the Viking Union Board. Edgel noted the position of Executive Director for Business and Operations was meant to be separate from programming and activities. Hayden noted it seemed that some of the responsibilities of the current AS VP for Business and Operations were being passed on to the Student Senate. Hammer inquired if there would have been time for the Senate to begin the budget process, pass it on to the other Boards, and review it a final time before it was passed on to the Services and Activities Fee Committee. Brock noted that was at the discretion of the AS Business Director, and that it was possible to begin the budget process earlier than previous years. Edgel noted certain processes and structures should have been decided on with more detail at a later date. Eckroth noted he would add a few more years to the Senate History portion of the document. Brock noted she would review the document for typos and small errors. Edgel noted that the restructure process was set to take three years, and that the proposal was to gather feedback from the AS Board of Directors about the direction the committee was headed in. He compared the vote to a "red light, green light, yellow light" system, and noted that if the Board of Directors did not approve of the proposal the Structure Review Committee the following year would have needed to rework the structure. Brock noted she wanted to include the purpose of the restructure in the preamble to the document. Eckroth noted that it was important to address the failures of the current shared governance system. Brock suggested adding language about the different stages of the review process. Alexander suggested including language about the research that was done with other

university structures or the articles the committee had referenced. Hayden suggested adding language about addressing the need for more democratized representation and the ability to do more advocacy and representation work. Palumbo suggested addressing the fact that almost all employees in the organization were overworked, not just the Board of Directors. Eckroth noted there had been a lot of resignations that year. Alexander suggested adding language about the need for more support for programming and services, along with representation. He noted language about transparency and accountability of the organization should have been added. Rosenberg suggested including the Charge and Charter for the AS Structure Review Committee in the proposal document. Eckroth suggested adding points about the edits made to the Charge and Charter over the course of the year.

MOTION SRC-16-S-6 By Palumbo

To approve the AS Structure Review Proposal 2015-2016 with amendments as discussed.

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

MOTION SRC-16-S-7 By Edgel

To adjourn the meeting.

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

III. Adjourn

Brock adjourned the Meeting at 3:45pm.

*As this was the last meeting of the quarter these minutes were approved by the Chair, Hannah Brock on 6/8/16.