

From: [Erik Paulson](#)

To: [Tyler Junger](#)

Date: Tue, 14 Jul 2009 01:30:45 -0500

Subject: grumpiness about the 128 process

Attachment(s): 0

So, I've already grouched to Kurt about this, but I wanted to express my unhappiness about the 128 raid response.

Before I get too far into it, I do want to be clear that I appreciate the effort that the three of you, along with Brandon and Carl and whoever else might have been involved, put into it. It was a lot of work, and the good work outweighs the problem areas. However, there were some serious failures that I wanted to make known I am unhappy about.

First, council members were seriously neglected in this process. A cryptic "meet about the 128 situation" email to council at the beginning of the process is a start, but not sufficient. There was no followup to the message from Katrina asking for more information on the subject of the meeting. Furthermore, through much of this process I personally felt left-out. I was sometimes CCed or forwarded email, and I talked on the phone with from time to time with all of you, but on more than one occasion I found out about followup meetings an hour or two before hand. I would have liked to have participated more, and I suspect I'm not the only council member who feels that way.

Second, there has been a complete failure of evidence collection or dissemination. This entire process has been hamstrung by working from incomplete or incorrect information. (I'm just as guilty of it as anyone.) Why has there been no written documentation shared with anyone, other than the one-page spreadsheet from the very first meeting? We were dangerously shooting from the hip the entire time. We used imprecise terms like "auxiliary sweep" and "fund 128", sometimes conflating multiple concepts. As the process unfolded, our entire understanding continually changed. The collection of documentation was identified as an important step at the first meeting on the 26th of June - why did it never happen? Getting updated figures from Darrell Bazzell's office was something we talked about very early on - is it not terrifying that we were apparently "saved" a few hours before the

Regent meeting because Tom follows the right people on Twitter, or the right person follow him? Relying on Twitter for me is the 2nd-surest sign that I should kiss my ass goodbye (Number one is if it ever comes down to Madonna and Justin Timberlake, and they only got 4 minutes to save the whole world)

Third, we did not use our staff effectively during this process. I suspect that some meetings did not take place because we did not have the manpower in Madison to hold the meetings. Considering that we employ multiple professional staff members, all of whom should be developing relationships with colleagues in Bascom Hall, Van Hise, 21 N Park, and other administrative power centers on campus, this is disappointing. We should not have had as many questions as late into the process as we had. Our staff generated fantastic questions during their initial brainstorming session. We should have used them to collect the answers to those questions. If they were not asked to do so, that was a mistake. If our staff is incapable of collecting those answers, we need to have frank discussions about what changes students need to make to ensure that the ASM professional staff can serve student interests.

Fourth, why did the issue not become urgent enough for attention until nearly the last possible moment? This was on SSFC's radar in February, which was admittedly a bumpy time in ASM with SSFC leadership changes and the constitution effort, and conflicting information was given during the course of the spring, but why did it suddenly become urgent on June 26th?

Fifth, where has United Council been on this? I'm willing to forgive ASM Legislative Affairs for missing this, but UC has professional staff members dedicated to tracking legislative issues, correct? What are they doing?

In the end, the outcome is incredibly unsatisfying. Student allocable segfees, which are essentially the exclusive purview of students both under the spirit of shared governance and as codified in UW policy and law, were taken by the state. That we didn't have to raise our segfee levy to cover this raid is hardly a victory.

I'm usually annoyed when ASM staff wants to "debrief" or "reflect"

about something, but in this case I don't think it's a waste of time.

-Erik