



# Associated Students of the UNIVERSITY of MISSOURI

Board of Directors, Special Session  
November 10, 2017 | 10:00am – 11:15am

*Called by* Steven Chaffin, Board Chair & Executive Director  
*Recorded by* Jordan Lucas, Board Vice Chair

- 10:00: Welcome – meeting begins
  - Chair opens floor to continue discussion of executive director term length and selection process
    - Adriane Melnychuk suggests that we reach out to the governor's office regarding the potential for provisions in the tax reform proposal to negatively impact graduate students
      - Steven Chaffin agrees and will work with Adriane on this further
    - Chris Dade reiterates his concern that requiring no more than two years for an executive director could lead to a loss in institutional knowledge and that conflicts of interest regarding the outgoing executive director choosing a successor could be resolved easily by replacing the current executive director as the lead in the search for a successor when those conflicts of interest may arise
    - Jordan Lucas suggests that an executive director search committee consisting of one board member from each campus could solve the issue of conflict of interest, but that requiring no more than one two-year term would still be necessary to ensure that an opportunity is made available every two years for all campuses. Jordan suggests that if after a search has been conducted and the committee selects no one, the outgoing executive director could be offered to serve an additional year
    - Chris expresses concern that failing to take advantage of the experience of a possible third year executive director could be particularly detrimental to the legislative program. Chris suggests that the opportunity be given to the current executive director to serve an additional year first and then if they do not accept, begin the search for a new executive director
    - Paul Black supports the idea of a search committee for executive director and suggests that efforts to improve institutional knowledge are already underway



## Associated Students of the UNIVERSITY of MISSOURI

- Jerri Arnold-Cook notes that in similar positions there is a yearly reapplication process. Jerri suggests that the board could suspend the rules at any time with a 2/3 majority without an amendment to the bylaws in order to allow for the executive director to serve a third year if the board finds this necessary
- Chris suggests that frequent turnover could result in an undesirable reset effect every two years
- Jordan suggests that a reset of sorts can be a good thing in order to ensure the organization remains balanced, but that institutional knowledge and continuity can be facilitated in part by the board of directors to ensure best practices are retained
- Natalie Butler suggests that this is a rare occurrence that warrants continued leadership to see the organization through
- Steven Chaffin supports the idea of a search committee for executive director, but would like for the current executive leadership to be involved in some capacity. Steven suggests institutional knowledge will be lost regardless and that an undesirable reset effect is unlikely if the outgoing executive director has done a good job. Steven suggests that prolonging this discussion unnecessarily could be harmful to the organization. Steven supports a hard two-year term for the executive director, noting Jerri's point about the board's ability to suspend the rules with a 2/3 majority at any time in order to extend an executive director for an additional year if the board deems necessary. Steven expressed concern that the organization may still end up with an executive director with little experience. Steven proposes a firm two-year term for the executive director and that a search committee be formed for the selection of future executive directors. Steven reiterates opposition to the campus-specific requirement for successive executive directors, but supports a requirement that one of the three members of the executive leadership team must come from a different campus.
- Paul suggests that the legislative director and assistant legislative director be approved by the board of directors after being appointed by the executive director
- Jerri notes that no one was consulted about these decisions
- Steven likes the idea and suggests that it may already be a requirement in the constitution
- Jordan was under the impression the board of directors voted to approve those positions, but supports amending the constitution to reflect that explicit requirement if it is not already



# **Associated Students of the** **UNIVERSITY** *of* **MISSOURI**

- Steven will begin working on draft language for the changes discussed
- Time has ended for this discussion



## Associated Students of the UNIVERSITY of MISSOURI

- Chair begins discussion about the student advocacy days
  - Student Leader Lobby Day will take place on February 13 2016
  - Student Advocacy Day will take place on March 6 2018
  - Chair would like to see student government leaders and other student group leaders heavily recruited for the event on 2/13
  - Chair opens the floor to discussion about how much guidance should be offered to the advocacy day participants
    - Jordan proposes that we provide significant guidance in order to prevent the event from becoming a negative effort
    - Natalie suggests that last year resulted in a negative effort
    - Steven suggests that students should be allowed to speak their minds, but that we should be mindful of a balance
    - Paul offers to share with the board a list of “do’s and don’ts” that S&T shares with their students on the way to Jefferson City
    - Jerri reiterates the usefulness of this practice, but stresses that some negative encounters are instigated by the public servants and that students are not required to endure violations of their title IX protections
    - Steven suggests forming contingency plans for advisors in case a meeting turns sour
    - Jerri mentions the idea of providing t-shirts for students to wear on advocacy days. Jerri suggests t-shirts can help students stand out, but may also appear unprofessional.
    - Jordan suggests t-shirts do a great job of elevating a group’s presence while in the capital, but agrees it may appear unprofessional
    - Paul proposes name tags for interns on advocacy days
    - Steven agrees these may alleviate some confusion
    - Steven asks for thoughts on whether students should be consulted about what they want to discuss
    - Paul supports student being consulted about what they want to discuss
    - Jerri suggests guidance can be helpful for busy students that aren’t up to speed on current political events
    - Jordan suggests an all-hands approach to guidance that includes campus leadership, campus advisers, interns and executive leadership all reinforcing proper etiquette and appropriate topics for discussion



## **Associated Students of the** **UNIVERSITY of MISSOURI**

- Steven expresses concern that campus leadership selection processes may be similarly ambiguous as the executive director selection process
- Jordan notes that UMSL's selection process is flawed and that the chapter is working on more clearly defining the processes
- Jerri notes that S&T has campus bylaws and can share them
- 11:10am: Meeting is adjourned