Executive Committee Emergency Meeting for May 29th, 2012

I. Call to Order: President Prado calls meeting to order at 10:00am.

*indicates members present at the start of the meeting

II. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Absent Members</th>
<th>Guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Prado</td>
<td></td>
<td>Randy Saffold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lil Brown Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddharth Menon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Krista Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyla Pehrson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Allen T. Laluan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Hebert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Action Item – Approval of the Agenda
Motion: (Pehrson) to approve the agenda.
Motion Carries.

IV. Action Item – Approval of the May 21st, 2012 Minutes
Motion: (Pehrson) to approve the May 21st, 2012 Minutes.
Motion Carries.

V. Public Comment
Public Comment is intended as a time for any member of the public to address the board on any issues affecting ASI and/or the California State University, East Bay.
No Public Comment.

VI. Emergency Discussion Item – Budget Proposal
ED Saffold will present the three scenarios of the proposed budget. The Executive Committee will advise on the final proposal scenario to forward to the Board.
ED Saffold states that he received input from staff and VP Pehrson and made revisions in the budget to reflect new found savings and positions that did not exist yet. It did a lot to balance us from a perspective of $62,000 that we still had to make up for; most of that was covered by new found savings from Mohammed Salman and VP Pehrson. There was also an adjustment made from what Krista Smith suggested; to cut the whole outdoor program. This altogether, gave us the $62,000 that we needed. Scenario A focuses on maximizing staff retention through program and administrative cost cutting. Scenario B emphasizes better and stronger programming with fewer cuts. It’s more focused on direct student services. It also gives us an attempt to minimize staff loss. Scenario C is better maximization of programming through staffing cuts. Scenario A reflects extreme cuts to programming and scenario C reflects extreme cuts to staff. Scenario B is somewhat a combination of the two.
We will briefly go through each section. **ED Saffold** states the following as brief explanations to emphasize revisions of each scenario:

- **Scenario A:** We’re still looking at cuts towards administration. We looked at cutting all of the board shirts. We’re looking to add another adjustment to club funding which was an increase of the cut to club funding. There is a plan to take club funding back down to $10,000 less than what we did this year. This helps us to make the $62,000 that we were short of. This scenario also assumes that we cut the entire RAW program for $39,000 as opposed to the $28,000 worth of cuts were doing with the game zone, intramurals, sports, etc. Krista Smith suggested leaving in the travel and things along those lines to make an even grander cut to help keeps us at where we need to be, leaving the 50% cut in equipment and the $39,000 in outdoor programming restored. There is a new grand total of $56,900 from Krista Smith. The total of 310,000 includes two FTE from Concord and one from Maintenance. In addition to that we have, the new savings found by VP **Pehrson** and Mohammed Salman found two part-time custodial positions that were proposed, but did not exist as well as the two student assistants that were proposed but don’t exist either. This was a total of $61,000 extra. We also have the Director of Administration position that was also cut that doesn’t exist. We still include an additional FTE that will have to be removed for administration or support.

- **Scenario B:** The entire management team got together to go over the entire budget and proposals and there were new suggestions from them. In supplies, I’m making a decision to look at making us a little more efficient. If we conserve our supplies we may be able to save costs in our office administration. For publicity and printing, we are going to make that full cut as suggested by Cesar Lafarga which is not a major change. We are going to cut $6,000 instead of $11,000 for Concord, anticipating whether or not we get more money from Concord. VP **Pehrson** worked with Jonathan to suggest working on cutting $11,350 from contracts. We can’t actually take out of contracts because they were for security and UPD; those are the two things in which you don’t have an option to do. I transferred that $11,350 into programming which gives Jonathan the choice of where he wants to take that money out of as opposed to some of the more massive cuts we saw. Instead of $94,000 where we previously were, we are only being cut to about $24,000. EVP **Caldwell** states that he would like to see possible cuts in ASI for the shirts budget. They get shirts, polo’s, and sweatshirts. I know t-shirts are important for events, but I think the sweatshirts and the extra apparel can be unnecessary. **ED Saffold** states that in his suspicion, those costs are put into the special events costs and the total of $11,350 is not designated where it should be cut from. If the board wants to give Jonathan a mandate to make specific cuts from areas, I don’t see why there would be a problem with that.
VP Pehrson states that when she spoke with Jonathan Stoll, the $11,350 that was cut from contracts was actually reflected from special events and that's why it was cut. ED Saffold indicates that he liked having UPD designated. $1400.00 was killed from Board retreat travel. Reducing club funding to what was given out this year is about $60,000.00; consisting of $55,000.00 in funding and $5000.00 in seed money. The proposal is to eliminate outdoor programming and to make a little more cuts to funding so we can try to maintain the staff.

- Scenario C: Much of programming is restored, but there are higher cuts in administration. We’re looking at the removal of uniforms and moving to name badges for the board. This was cut by $5,000.00. VP Pehrson indicates that we have set a really high standard when it comes to programming; we are still fulfilling our mission statement if we decide to cut programming a little bit deeper that what is proposed. Hebert states by examining the downturn that we have in our incoming students is something that is not expected to be permanent. VP Laluan states that ASI exists to the program in which they are our public face. The cuts should be focused on the things that generate revenue. ED Saffold indicates that everything has returned to this model; scholarships travel etc.

The committee discusses the proposed three budgets at hand and states the following:

President Prado states that he is in favor of scenario C based on his suggestions and recommendations.

VP Pehrson states that as a committee, we should come to a resolution that would be favorable for what we think the board will be able to. In the past we’ve talked about cutting things that we can easily bring back, especially if we are looking at staying the same for next year.

VP Laluan states that he would like to go towards a solution of reducing redundancies and supporting programming as well pick a budget that puts us in the best sanding for the future.

ED Saffold states that scenario B and C can work to protect our core functions. Scenario C would be better for maximization, but scenario B does a better job of not taking away things that can be restored.

Hebert states the scenario B seems as if it satisfies so much of what he executive committee members are suggesting. It best represents what Randy and his staff have pulled together and it sounds like it has the elements that address the requirements this board has placed before this particular budget. I’m encouraging the board to take a strong look at scenario B the way it’s presented and to get a clear understanding of what it is. If there is something within scenario B that you would like to change, please tell Randy now so that he can bring something to the board for tomorrow’s meeting.

VP Menon addresses ED Saffold and states that he understands that scenario A hits programming the hardest, while B and C includes travel and food components.
Is it possible to have some of that travel and food component included in scenario A. If travel in-state and out-of-state were taken out, that would be and extra $5,000. Would it be possible to merge those two? 

ED Saffold states that if we cut travel instead of programming, that only leaves us with $5,000 and some change, whereas the items you want to restore are approximately $15,000 plus $2,000. Bringing $5,000 back doesn’t help as much. 

VP Menon states that he understands that scenario A hits programming really hard but thinks it should be considered. 

VP Laluan states that the priorities stated by President Prado are in support for programming. Many of us support that. 

VP Pehrson states that being able to sell scenario A to the board would be a little harder. Just because we are cutting money, does not mean that we are cutting engagement of the students, which I don’t think has been clearly understood. Through ASI Presents, we can still get the same levels of engagement, maybe even better. Those are things that can also be restored and we can get more money back. It shouldn’t be looked at as a step backwards; we should look at it as an opportunity to be more creative with what we already have. I don’t think scenario A is off the table, but the reason that we are looking at scenario B is somewhat of a compromise between A and C. 

EVP Caldwell states that he has seen the amount of money that we’ve added towards our ASI Programming budget in the last two or three years. I think that we can still provide that same level of engagement and enthusiasm on campus with slight adjustments. Scenario A is something we should still look at. As for scenario B, I am in favor of that as well since it is a combination of the two. There is a lot of uncertainty in our budget and for the future, but for the small portion that we can restore; I think that’s a very small place to look at for making cuts. 

VP Menon clarifies with ED Saffold that the three budget scenarios bring ASI to cash neutrals. We are going to break even after we pass this budget, and if the projections are right, we will have some positive money over the next two to three years. Hypothetically, if we go with scenario A which hits programming the hardest; it is still going to bring us to cash positive. Is it possible to say that when we have a cash positive, we would give the money to restoring programs or something in that nature; first preference would be given there. 

ED Saffold states that if we get the opportunity to push off some of the costs of OPEB onto the University Union, we may be able to go a little cash positive and that can be re-routed into special event programming for the year. That may be an excellent compromise to say that we pass the budget with a caveat that if we do have anything that is more positive or favorable that we weren’t planning on; we can direct those funds towards restoring ASI programs to a more reasonable amount. 

VP Laluan states that there is no guarantee that these monies will go back to programming.
There may be emergencies of mid-year cuts, and that’s the reality of the budget. I personally don’t think scenario A will sell very well. From a management perspective, I think it provides some flexibility where ASI is going to go. Scenario B does satisfies the most of what everybody wants, but it doesn’t necessarily have its perks or lead us anywhere.

ED Saffold states that scenario B has input from the staff and members of the board. The impression of scenario B is finding the best thing to give up, but still keeping the core of your department or organization intact. The only group that did not give more input than the staff would be those more tied to the idea scholarships rather than programming.

VP Pehrson states that people are open to change. It’s important to stay flexible for the things we are open to. We’re all not going to get what we want. Just because the President has his agenda, it does not necessarily mean that it’s reflected on the entire board when this is resented at the next board meeting.

VP Laluan states that he personally is in favor of scenario A and C. Scenario A has a direction, and I see where it’s going. Scenario C preserves programming which some people in the board have made priority.

ED Saffold states that he doesn’t think that scenario C is what the committee wanted. Scenario A and C are equally harsh. My personal recommendation for this board is that somewhere in scenario B we want to land on the possibility of more positive cash. If we get more money we can say that, the money will go towards scholarships, since programs won’t get hit as hard.

VP Laluan states that it looks as if there is a consensus to for keeping scenario A and B.

ED Saffold explains the possibility of combining scenarios A and B and explains what it would be like.

VP Pehrson states that she would like the committee to move to the action item and say that we would entrust ED Saffold to combine scenarios A and B, and then email out the finalized version of the combination of A and B.

Hebert states that he wants the committee to keep in mind that the RAW is the biggest program the campus has than all the ASI programs combined. It’s new and it’s still growing. Event programming like Springfest and others can be replaced the following year fairly easily. Any kind of event related program can be replaced in better times.

VP Pehrson states that every single person who uses the RAW is a student, whereas for Springfest those who attended were a majority of the public rather than students. The RAW is a huge community development. My recommendation is to take that into account. Krista Smith states that the RAW averages 800 students per day.

EVP Caldwell suggests cutting the lobbying efforts to Washington D.C. due to the fact that it does not have an effect on the students of East Bay. In the last two years, no reformation has been brought back.
ED Saffold states that things we can look into cutting are the trip to D.C., banquets, and spending less on scantrons. This saved money can go towards scholarships. When we combine scenario A and B, I would look into cutting a little in other areas as well and ultimately come up with $15,000-$20,000 for scholarships. We can then debate with the board to see where else we can take from.

**Motion:** (Pehrson) to have ED Saffold re-work another budget proposal that combines scenarios A and B which can be presented to the board tomorrow.

**Motion:** (Laluan) to make a friendly amendment.

Amendment I: to authorize ED Saffold to create a new budget that combines scenario A and B with the caveat that this does not represent a recommendation from the Executive Committee; some members from the committee have suggested this, but others have their own opinion about it.

VP Pehrson states that the amendment is not necessary. This is not a recommendation from the Executive Committee; this is a proposal. My motion still stands, and I do not accept the amendment.

**Motion:** (Pehrson) to have ED Saffold re-work a budget proposal of the combination of scenario A and B to present to the board on Wednesday.

Motion Carries. **1:03-1:39:36**

VP Laluan states that Action Item VII and roundtable remarks will be tabled.

VII. **Emergency Action Item – Budget Proposal Approval**

The Executive Committee will approve the budget.

VIII. **Roundtable Remarks**

IX. **Adjournment**

Motion: () to adjourn meeting at **11:58am**.

Motion Carries.

Minutes Reviewed and Approved by:

Executive Committee Chair

Name: Christopher Prado

Minutes Approved on:

**6-15-2012**

Date