Present: Eric Alexander, Christopher Bianco, Steve Card, Adam Leonard, Tina Loudon, Mary Moeller, Hayden Ramsay, Carrie Rosendahl, Marya Rybalka, Caitlin Sommers, Sara Wilson, Karl Sponberg (recorder)

Absent: Bethany Drake, Nanette Jackson, Ichi Kwon, Rebecca McLean, Steve Vanderstaay, Raquel Wilson

Members Not Yet Appointed: Faculty representative (voting member)

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm by Tina Loudon and began with introductions of committee members for benefit of recorder Sponberg. Agenda items for today are approval of January 25 minutes, election of committee chair and timeline review.

Rosendahl moved to approve the minutes of January 25, 2017. Moeller seconded. Minutes approved unanimously.

Loudon briefly described the role, duties, and responsibilities, of the committee chair, vice chair, and vice president’s designee, and called for thoughts, discussion.

Moeller prompted a general discussion about the overlap of duties between the current chair and incoming chair, and if a student occupies the chair’s role, is the committee required to add a member or members? Loudon said the guidelines don’t specifically speak to the situation, it would definitely be worthy of discussion, and the vice chair role was created to speak to that circumstance. Card concurred with Loudon. Moeller stated that is how UPRC operates. Rosendahl asked for clarification of the vice chair’s role. Loudon reiterated the vice chair role’s and duties. Moeller asked what material difference there is between the chair’s versus the vice chair’s role. Loudon replied a primary item for the committee to consider is whether it wants the chair to be a voting member or not, that there has been worry about bias if the chair was a voting member. Rosendahl asked if a vice chair is then not required. Loudon replied it is correct that having a vice chair is at the committee’s discretion. Creating the administrative coordinator role was in consideration of demands that possibly could fall to a student committee chair. Moeller prompted a general discussion of the benefits of a student in the chair’s role, stating it seems the RCW creates opportunities for significant student leadership that is often not undertaken. Loudon stated that the key is student involvement and leadership opportunity. If student representatives feel like student interests are better represented, leadership opportunities exist. Loudon stated there have been times in the past when committee debate was dominated by non-voting representatives, and the chair’s responsibility is to see that all voices are heard. Bianco stated that whether a student occupies the chair’s or vice chair’s role or not, the student voice is strongly represented by votes. The administrative coordinator role doesn’t diminish students’ voice.

Rosendahl asked if anyone is interested in being chair? Moeller replied she had been thinking of nominating Rosendahl, praising her role and work on other committees. Rosendahl thanked Moeller and asked about the scope of work. Moeller stated fear of workload or responsibility shouldn’t rule whether a student assumes the chair’s role.

Loudon stated one of the largest roles is setting agendas and preparing documents; if a student is chair, that person would have to work closely with the vice president’s designee/administrative coordinator. Another
large part of the process is in detailed budget presentations, deliberations, and projected revenues. When budget recommendations are complete, they are forwarded to the vice presidents and board of trustees, and need to follow the procedures for those bodies.

Wilson asked if the chair’s role is complete when the budget package is forwarded to the vice presidents? What happens if the legislative session gets extended?

Ramsay stated he thought it was better to have a student in the vice chair role, primarily because it’s gone well to date, thanks to Loudon’s leadership, and the onus may be too great, particularly with document production. Moeller stated that because things have gone well this time of transition may present an opportunity to set new precedent with a larger role for student leadership. Wilson asked what the feelings are of the group about the role of chair versus vice chair? Moeller stated she would support work in either role. Loudon stated the advantage of the vice chair role is that it is somewhat negotiable, and can be more involved in some aspects, less involved in others, stating it may be more amenable to a student’s school/work schedule. Moeller stated again this transition may be an opportunity to take the leap and have a student chair, and that it may provide another check on non-voting members/advisors, as Alexander pointed out with their access to information, they can tend to dominate the conversation. Bianco stated that he’d support a student chair but pointed out one challenge to a student chair role is it creates a three-way communication loop between the chair, the past chair, and the VP designee/administrative coordinator. He also stated that he’s never been disappointed in students’ performance in governance.

A general discussion followed regarding timelines and presentations. Card stated the current framework has worked well and sees no reason for it not to continue to work well. Loudon stated the increased minimum wage as a primary consideration all presenting groups will be addressing. Wilson asked about possible changes to the proposed timeline. Alexander stated he recommended not changing the timeline. Loudon stated the schedule will remain as is.

Moeller moved, seconded by Rybalka to nominate Rosendahl as chair. The nomination was supported unanimously and Rosendahl accepted the nomination as chair. Rosendahl moved, seconded by Moeller, to adopt the timeline as written, approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Karl Sponberg
Recorder