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Phil, Matt, Linda, Trish, Maria, Ann (chair), Melissa, Lisa, Annette (scribe), John, Nick, Jason, ZhiZhang (Did I miss anyone? If so, Please add your name!)

Ann Facilitated

Decided to identify pros and cons of each model

Remember: This is a beginning structure that we will be voting on—We are also developing bylaws that will evolve depending upon the model we choose. This is a transitional model. Once we decide on model, collaborating on the bylaws and voting on them is our next discussion (as well as defining release time for our cluster).

**Model 1** – Cluster Council – formalizes a place for the disciplinary leadership/Officers take on administrative responsibilities

**Model 2** – Collaborative Team Model (regardless of discipline)

**Model 3** – A Task-based/Officer based Model

PLEASE ADD YOUR INPUT OR CLARIFY ANYTHING THAT YOU THINK NEEDS CLARIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Conversation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4-5 committees with at least 3 in committees</strong></td>
<td>Officers by task – THIS IS THE SMALLEST MODEL by people/staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks too much like status quo (Matt disagrees)</td>
<td>SOME ATTENDED FELT THAT: Pros:</td>
<td>SOME ATTENDED FELT THAT: Pros:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has it been decided that those are the disciplines for model 1 (Phil). Doesn’t think art is represented as it is (Matt). Is there flexibility in how things get divided up. Nick says it is too late to change model. Continues with discussion/debate about how disciplines are defined and represented in this model.</td>
<td>-We can be more efficient.</td>
<td>-considers our timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOME ATTENDED FELT THAT:</strong> Pros: small disciplines have a voice at the table</td>
<td>-forces communication among all disciplines.</td>
<td>-we need people who will talk the talk and someone responsible for cluster, this is more realistic and concentrates authority in fewer people to make people work collaboratively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-project heavy participants have more voice at the table</td>
<td>-looks most collaborative/entirely team based</td>
<td>-COULD MAKE FOR A SMOOTHER TRANSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-most disciplinarity collaborative model (for meetings together)</td>
<td>-allows clustering to happen organically</td>
<td>Cons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pseudo bicameral aspect – house of disciplines as a house of reps. With a board of</td>
<td>-a bigger step toward giving the cluster an identity (opposed to being a cluster of these disciplines)</td>
<td>-do the present chairs, doing their present duties, is it feasible to ask can you do this structure too.....? (don’t fall on default – start to make the transition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-disaggregates power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-if there is a cluster major, this model is better equipped to have a coordinator of it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a lot of people</td>
<td>-Workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
directors element to the senate...elected by the body...it does allow for elected officers and committees (Matt)
-doesn’t put everything on the backs of the discipline coordinators.
- we have to make sure that who serves understands the other disciplines (Stewardship)

Cons: a lot of what we are already doing
-too many meetings
-we have to make sure that who serves understands the other disciplines (Stewardship)
-(some attendees felt that: reinforces what we already have....(Annette – not fully disagreed and Melissa agreed and articulated....)
-workload concerns with Model 1
-Could burden small programs (unless we address it)
-depending upon how elections go, the number of disciplines count so that not all leaders come from one major – could exclude smaller disciplines.
-doesn’t feel collaborative enough
-weights the representatives unequally (Phil)
-some disciplines are more or less able to contribute to committee work
-Messy if we develop cluster major.

Needs 4 elected, then min of 9+ others (or one of the four includes the nine)

-Need 15 people

Challenge to find this many people who are willing and able to do the work
-need right people for right jobs (anybody for any job)
-need 15 people to fill this model
- some disciplines are more or less able to contribute to committee work
-no system of checks and balances (Jason) (BUT WE HAVE A POLICY DRAFT THAT INCLUDES CHECKS AND BALANCES AND BEING ABLE TO REMOVE PEOPLE FROM OFFICE IF APPROPRIATE) – SO WE NEED TO REMEMBER AFTER WE DECIDE ON MODEL, WE WILL RETURN TO DEVELOPING OUR BYLAWS. This applies to all models.

-Is this concentrated power? - Are there too few people involved.
-is this too much work for just a couple of people?

Need 5-6 people