



# Structure and Program Advisory Committee

Thursday, November 5th, 2015

5:00 p.m. VU460

**Members:** *Present:* Emma J. Opsal (AS Assessment Coordinator, Chair); Luciane DeAlmeida (AS Queer Resource Center Assistant Coordinator); A Blyth (AS Sexual Awareness Center Assistant Coordinator); Hannah Brock (AS VP for Business and Operations)

**Advisors:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director for Student Activities)

**Secretary:** Octavia Schultz (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)

**Motions:** *No motions were made.*

*Opsal called the meeting to order at 5:04pm.*

## I. Introductions

- a. The members introduced themselves and answered an ice breaker question.

## II. Information Items

- a. Assessment Process Overview

Opsal gave the committee an overview of the history of the assessment program, noting that the program was created in 2009 by the AS Board of Directors. She mentioned that the AS Business Office and the AS Club Activities Office had not previously been through the assessment process, and were being reviewed that year. She presented examples of previous office changes attributed to the assessment process. She noted that the assessment program was essential for the AS to have been an accountable organization. She mentioned that the schedule of assessment for the Representation and Engagement programs Office had been shifted to avoid coinciding with the United States presidential election years, as those were the busiest years for that office. Blyth asked Opsal to clarify if offices were assessed every four years. Opsal noted that each office was assessed every four years, with a couple exceptions due to the shift in the Representation and Engagement Programs Office schedule. Opsal then read aloud the Mission Statement of the AS Assessment Office. She noted that the timeline for the budget review process was potentially subject to change, which would have opened the possibility for the timeline of the assessment process to change as well. DeAlmeida inquired which offices were going through the assessment process for the first time that year. Opsal stated that the Club Activities Office and the Business Office were new to the process that year. She noted that the Assessment Office was also being reviewed by a third party that year. She stated that because the assessment process had originally been created to review the identity and event based offices, some of the documents required were not very applicable to the internal offices that had been added to the assessment process. She noted that changes to the documents were being considered to make the process more accessible to internal offices. She mentioned that there had been changes to the membership of the committee that year. A maximum limit of three AS employees was set to encourage more student-at-large participation. She noted that the documents presented by the different offices were available on the (Q:) drive. DeAlmeida asked specifically where to find them. Opsal demonstrated on the screen. She went on to introduce the SCOT analysis technique that was used to

create recommendations. She noted that the method directed focus to the key issues of each office, and that though many small things could have been improved, the larger issues needed to be addressed first. She also noted that the method gave an overall analysis, allowing offices to look at internal components and external components.

b. Charge and Charter Review

Schultz noted that the Structure and Program Advisory Committee Charge and Charter had been uploaded to the AS website. Blyth inquired if the names of the committee members were also listed on the website. Schultz stated that only the document was online, which did not include specific names of the members. Blyth inquired if the committee could have acquired more members as the year progressed. Opsal stated that students could have joined the committee at any time, but noted there were no meetings during spring quarter. She then noted that some language had been removed from the Charge and Charter that did not apply to the committee.

c. AS Strategic Plan Review

Opsal noted that the AS Strategic Plan had been written around the time that the Structure and Program Advisory Committee had been created. She asked Brock if the document was being assessed by the AS Structural Review Committee. Brock stated that the AS Structure Review Committee was concerned with reviewing the hierarchical AS structure, not policies. Rosenberg entered at 5:52pm. DeAlmeida asked for clarification that the assessment program was designed to ensure that offices were acting in line with the AS Strategic Plan. Opsal confirmed that it was. Blyth inquired if recommendations could have been made based on a potential remodel of the Viking Union. Rosenberg stated that the remodel was not guaranteed, though it was important to consider physical space when creating recommendations. Blyth asked if recommendations could have included suggestions for the physical set up of offices. DeAlmeida supported what they had said, adding that where offices were within the building was important to consider. Blyth cited the example that the Club Activities Office and the Resource and Outreach Programs may have collaborated more frequently if the offices were on the same floor. Brock noted the assessment process was important in addressing the problem of inaccessible office spaces for students. She suggested that if the Structure and Program Advisory Committee had focused on the needs of offices, the architects of the potential remodel could have considered those needs when designing the layout of the building. Opsal noted that the AS Ethnic Student Center had included its need for expansion in previous recommendations. She noted that including the needs in recommendations put them in official record. Rosenberg noted that neither the committee nor the Board of Directors had the authority to move offices, but could include language that expressed a great need for changes in physical space. Opsal noted that the changes proposed by the Ethnic Student Center had taken a great amount of work beyond the assessment process, though the Structure and Program Advisory Committee was there to support the changes. Rosenberg stated the challenge with assessment was that there were multiple ways the AS could have assessed itself. She noted that the process at the time of reviewing a selection of offices each year had a benefit of keeping the workload manageable, but was difficult for addressing systemic issues across departments.

d. Expectations Review

Opsal noted that the members were allowed to bring food to meetings, and confirmed that there were no food allergies among the present members. She stated that the committee was using conversational parliamentary procedures because the committee was smaller and more intimate than most other committees. Rosenberg stated that most voting for the committee occurred in winter quarter. Blyth inquired if the information discussed by the committee was confidential, and asked if executive sessions were needed. Opsal stated that she did not believe there was a need for executive sessions. Brock noted that most information discussed by the committee was public record. Opsal stated the committee would determine if information was confidential on a case-by-case basis. Brock noted that if guests or presenters had shared information that was sensitive or personal, it was not to be shared with individuals outside of the committee. She also noted that if specific names of individuals were used in examples or anecdotes which could reflect negatively on those individuals, that information was to be kept confidential as well. Opsal stated that she would allocate time for debriefing at the end of each meeting, during which she would note if something was to be kept confidential.

e. Committee Process Timeline Review

Opsal noted that meetings were two hours long each week, and that documents and the agenda would have been sent out on Mondays before meetings, unless she had noted otherwise. She mentioned that at the following meeting the AS Club Activities Office and the AS Challenge Course were presenting their first set of documents. Rosenberg noted that in previous years, because the committee reviewed more significant documents during winter quarter, fifteen minutes had been allotted at the beginning of each meeting to allow the committee to read through and discuss the documents before guests or presenters entered. Opsal stressed that members notify her if they could not attend a particular meeting because at the time, if two or more members were absent at a meeting the committee did not have quorum and could not meet. Rosenberg mentioned that it was difficult to schedule offices to present at meetings, and if a meeting was cancelled it affected more than just the committee members. DeAlmeida asked for clarification that the AS Challenge Course was part of the AS Outdoor Center. Opsal confirmed that it was. Blyth asked if the committee meetings were open to the public. Opsal stated that they were.

### **III. Adjourn**

***Opsal adjourned the Meeting at 6:22pm.***