Executive Committee Meeting Minutes for November 14th, 2011

I. Call to Order: Chair Christopher Prado calls meeting to order at 12:01pm

*indicates member is present at the start of meeting

II. Roll Call
Members Present       Absent Members       Guests
*Christopher Prado
*Chris Caldwell
*Siddharth Menon
*Lyla Pehrson
*Randy Saffold
*Stan Hebert

III. Consent Calendar
Approval of the Agenda.
Motion: (Menon) to approve the Agenda.
Amendment 1: (Hebert) to amend the Agenda by including an Action Item titled “Approval of June 30, 2011 Minutes.”
Amendment I Carries.
Motion Carries as Amended.

IV. Action Item – Approval of the October 19, 2011 Minutes
Motion: (Caldwell) to approve the October 19, 2011 Minutes.
Motion Carries.

V. Action Item – Approval of the June 30, 2011 Minutes
Motion: (Hebert) to approve the June 30, 2011 Minutes.
Motion Carries.

VI. Public Comment - none
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.

VII. Information Item – The ASI VP of Finance will discuss a potential structural change to the funding process for the student clubs & orgs.
Chair Prado yields the floor to VP of Finance Menon who highlights the following:

- This is second part from what we heard about at the president’s meeting.
- We are going to talk about proposing a structural change to how our Finance or funding procedure for clubs & orgs on campus could look like.
- Quickly goes over what was covered at the President’s Meeting.
Essentially the new proposal is going to help us move closer to what the intended purpose for students fund is which is to help student in the best possible way to get their events running as efficiently as possible.

The current process is a stop and go process; the club approaches the Finance Committee within certain deadline, and then they submit their requests which are then evaluated in real time. During the Finance Committee, the requests are reviewed and maybe approved or not.

Instead of that we are proposing another structure. The problem with the existing structure is that majority of our clubs are not able to meet the deadline. The problem with evaluating the proposals in real time is that in the past we have had instances in which incomplete documents were being presented at the meeting. The problem with that is that it stalls the entire meeting and students have to run across to get the right signatures and then come back in. The committees within those 10-15 minutes that they have per funding request, what they are trying to do is look at the policy and see if anything is missing and then say yes or no. It is not really fair to the students, if the documents submitted is not complete and or incorrectly filled out we then have to deny the students and they have to come back again and redo the whole procedure one more time.

The new system is such that we will ask them to submit their requests with a certain deadline and the deadline has a potential to be three times as large as what we have right now. The current deadline is to submit their requests three weeks before the Finance Committee meets. The proposed change is to let them turn in their requests as early as three months ahead of time.

The good thing with that is if the event is held in Winter quarter, their funding request would need to be submitted in Fall. It gives us enough time to work internally and inform them if they are missing any paperwork so that we can go ahead with the request. The bottom line in having the extra time is that when we are going to have Finance Committee meeting in the new quarter all we are doing is saying who got approved and who did not get approved. And if a club does not get approved they will get to know exactly why they were not approved maybe because the price of the quote was too high or maybe because they did not turn in a document within the time that they had. Also it gives the clubs more time to budget. If a club wants $1000.00 for food and we only give out $600.00 and they have enough time to fund raise to come up with the additional $400.00. They have enough time to plan and budget their event and gives us more time too internally to work with them so that we can help them. It is more of partnership as opposed to granting them.

Because the existing structure was not thought out well, at various points of time the previous VPs of Finance have added a lot of additional stuff to it like the three weeks deadline and it has to be submitted so many days before the Finance Committee meeting which is another deadline. The policy document just got bigger. With this new structure, we have enough time to turn in all the documents essentially three months and it cuts out a lot of deadlines that they have to keep track of and all they have to know is that they have to
turn in their requests before the end of the quarter. It is easier to work with and understand. It reduces our Policy footprint.

- The third point is that it strengthens the partnership and right now we are working with them as opposed to looking at what is wrong in the document and the last point is increased transparency. Now at the start of the quarter we are able to share with the whole student body and share on our website that these are the events that have been funded with student funds for this quarter. That way the entire student body knows where their money is going and they know what events are going to happen this quarter. This gives the clubs enough time to advertise or publicize their event and everything is ready. As opposed to right now we are not using the student funds in the best possible manner because students are doing events at the last minute. There is not much advertising and not many of the students get to know about the events. If all the information is there at the start of the quarter, they can use facebook, marquee and spread the word of mouth and students can know about the event from Day 1.

- A different version of the proposed structure is being used at San Francisco state and we have just tweaked it a little bit. What we are proposing now is feasible with our structure within our capability. The last system was not really working with what we are capable of. Now that we are partnering with the University in terms of accounting purposes as well, we have an additional component that we have to factor; how soon do we have to send them checks in the first place. All those different things will be taken care of by the new structure where they have enough time.

- The last point is that for the Winter, requests will be submitted in prior Fall. For spring it goes back to prior Winter. For Summer and fall, it goes back to Spring. What this means is that if a club officer is getting out of office by the end of spring because of graduation, when the new leadership comes in at Fall if no request is turned in there is nothing for them to do and how it works now is that we have $30,000 available for this quarter. Activity is really low because a lot of the club leaders are new and they don’t really know what to do. When you instead tell the outgoing leadership that to get your events done in the Fall or Summer, you have to turn in your requests in Spring. That way people who have done events they will budget and plan for everything so that when the new leaders come in Fall all they have to do is advertise and make sure that there is enough people for it. We have taken care of its funding and approval. In this way the new leaders will know what events they are going to have in Fall.

- VP Pehrson inquires what happens to a new club or if my club was inactive last year will I not be able to get any funding. VP Menon replies that the way it works right now is that if you are a brand new club that was not recognized in the former quarter, you will have to go through renewal. What we have right now to help such clubs is annual seed allocation. This is additional money to help a club. ED Saffold states that VP Menon talked about not giving out the whole money. For example in you have $25,000 for Fall, ED Saffold thought that he was proposing instead of a seed allocation we were pro-
posing holding some money aside for emergency things that do happen. Most of the clubs that did not form should not probably be doing more than advertising to build membership with that seed. But if we have a club coming back that didn’t form but has leadership they would need something to possibly do an event. VP Pehrson inquires if her club that was inactive last year can receive seed allocation. ED Saffold clarifies that a club has to be recognized first in order to get seed allocation. Seed funding was for brand new clubs & orgs and not for existing clubs and so seed money would be going away at the end of this year but we would do seed money all the way through Spring quarter for this quarter. After that they would have to understand that we don’t give that any more. The goal would be to apply for regular funding process.

- VP Pehrson raises the question if it is mandatory to do a quarter before and is it for all funding. What about if we need pens and pencils, should we have requested for it a quarter before? Chair Prado replies by stating that this pertinent only to funding for clubs and orgs. VP Menon states that seed allocation money can be used for that but not sure if a funding request can be turned for just pens because the funding request is essentially a request for an event. You will be able to justify for how the pens can be used towards an event. If it is part of an event, it is funded and if it is not part of an event it is not funded with the exception of a seed event. ED Saffold states that if you have money in your account, all clubs in the spring should leave the next club $100.00 to get their pens, pencils and things like that. They don’t have to request their money one quarter advance; they just have to do a request to withdraw money from their club account.

- Chair Prado asks Hebert if Hinrichs is aware how the clubs & orgs are able to adjust to the new system if attempted to implement. Hebert replies by stating that in the transition year no club is penalized for not having a spring advance planned but going forward with good communication everybody has the opportunity to plan. In the case of Pehrson’s example they are just getting started again, if they don’t have any money in their account maybe they can plan for Winter but doesn’t preclude them from having any advantage does not allow ASI funds according to the current system to be one of the resources. ED Saffold states that one concern that was brought up by Hinrichs is that now by allowing clubs to request money two weeks in advance. If there is an emergency, we do not allow them to produce we are using student funds to do events that may not have the draw that they could. In ASI we are not good in turning around those requests in that time period and so we have to make sure that the reason we have those three weeks out is that it is the minimum time that we need to do our jobs efficiently.

- Chair Prado comments that as far as Policies are concerned, it is disconnected from the reality that student clubs & orgs face all the time. Ideally we would like to believe that a student club is able to plan in advance, we might be restricting them a little bit. ED Saffold states that the student clubs & orgs have gone through an event planning workshop that will be followed up by when this policy passes event planning sheets that direct them. We should
not negatively reinforce poor behavior. Something can be planned in a day but we have to take into consideration the dynamics that we have as a student like a student body in the campus community where it is difficult for events that are marketed and planned depending upon the interest level of the specific event. Marketing may need three weeks. VP Menon states that when he presented this at the leadership conference, the overall body language of the students was very positive. Also spoke to a lot of people after the conference and what if I want to do something in Spring that I wanted to do something three weeks in advance or what if I thought of something midway through Spring that I want to do in Spring what happens then; my answer was the problem with that is that is what ASI has at that point and time. The problem with that is that it doesn’t help ASI and it really does not help them because ASI get things in the last minute then they have to rush to try to get everything completed and get their checks ready in time for their event. The current system that was designed is not working. Second, the system that I am proposing is utilized at San Francisco State University in which they have really good events and it is in fact working there. Maybe the Board can agree on a trial system during this current year and if it fundamentally fails then we can scrap it and simply go back to the old system. VP Pehrson asks if there can be a one week grace period for the clubs in order for them to get there stuff together. VP Menon states that possibly for Winter quarter he is looking to give clubs and orgs a 1-2 week grace period and as the academic year progresses and the clubs become familiar with the process they will not need an extensive grace period.

EVP Caldwell states that he likes where he’s going with the system but definitely agrees with VP Pehrson on the grace period states that there should be two windows of time in which the club can get everything together in order for them to receive their funding.

ED Saffold states that he notices that VP Menon left Summer in there but it was told to students that Summer would be taken out and increasing the amount of funding for Fall, Winter, and Spring quarter. Want to make sure that you are not confusing this Board because you are implying that you increased the amount of money a club can receive annually. VP Menon states that the idea was if there was money left over after Spring quarter can go towards Summer quarter funding. Has a pie chart that breaks down the funding for the year which includes $30,000.00 for Fall quarter, $25,000.00 for Winter, and $35,000.00 for Spring quarter.

Hebert states that because the policy is new continued communication with the clubs/orgs is necessary to make sure that the details can get out and are clear. It will be better for all clubs so they can have more thoughtful plans.

ED Saffold states that with a simplified process we can simplify on what the clubs/orgs are requesting money for and a mastered deadline will inform committees that they will need to have all their requests in by a specific date. Even if that’s up to a week between quarters then the committee still has to process two things if you’re only giving out $30,000.00 and the requests amount to $35,000.00 the committee then has to make weighed decision,
which club/org had their request in first, are they going to do merit on a request. It gives the committee time to have these kinds of debates.

President Prado states that these recommendations are well intentioned but the critique of policies in general they kind of take the approach of making processes easier for us as an organization to have the funding in time and helps as far as the books and paperwork being done.

VP Menon states that this is something that he was going to be taking a look at once his committee is formed, looking at ideas that include having caps on different funding requests or picking requests based on merit.

ED Saffold states that how much funding is going to each club/org is based on us saying what we think we will make a good event. I think honestly the funding limit for food was really to discourage groups to use Aramark. Since clubs/orgs are not limited to using Aramark that is something the committee just has to think about.

VP Menon states that a lot of clubs/orgs are okay with the amounts unless they are truly a big event and those clubs that have the vast events typically have external funding. I like the idea of looking at restrictions that can be ruled out for example the funding for T-shirts are there yet there are so many restrictions when it comes to getting the T-shirts made. Instead just bump up other essential things like speaker fees, food, and registration and clubs/orgs can simply use their personal funds to get T-shirts done. The committee is going to be looking at cutting things that are too complicated and bump-up other items that are more essential. We will have less confusion on the clubs/orgs.

VIII. Information Item – The Committee will discuss the funding request for Omulu Capoeira. President Prado yield the floor to VP Menon who highlights the following:

VP Menon mentions that this is a club that performs a specific type of martial arts and they have been on-campus for about a year and a few months and last year they were approved by the previous Board for the funding request in the amount of $6,000.00 with their original request being $15,000.00-$19,000.00. The majority of their cost is shared with the instructor. This year they are eligible to get $4,000.00 like all the rest of clubs. But is martial arts an actual event and should the finance committee continue to fund them after this year, looking to get the Board’s thoughts on this specific idea.

EVP Caldwell states that he believes for the previous year they needed the funding for the event but they still wanted to charge a fee for students to participate and the Finance Committee informed them that if ASI is funding them that they can’t charge students for their specific event.

VP Menon states that they will not be charging students this year for that specific event. But he did ask the president of the club if it was possible to get another instructor for the martial arts because that’s where a lot of their funding is going to. And the president of the club stated that it is not possible due to the type of instructor that is needed. The cost structure cannot be changed. He is looking to get their feedback before this is presented to the Board. This funding for this club happens over a course of ten weeks it is not just a one day event.
President Prado states that if we pay for their instructor will they at least compromise with performing on campus for the students providing a show for the greater community on campus.

VP Menon mentions that we do not have that right now and the club mentions that they are bringing Omulu Capoeira instructor to campus. This is not in the light of the campus community. They have first started this in 2010 and at that point they were supposed to be partnering up with the RAW but this did not happen and this is when they came to the Board and they gave them the funding for the $6,000.00.

ED Saffold states that the previous Board did things including funding clubs/orgs without any concept of how much money they had available for student clubs/orgs. The Board is functionally not aware of how much money is tied up with, Pioneer Bhangra, Pep Band, and Electric Pulse. Is it fair that all the other clubs/orgs don’t get access to additional funds like these groups were? Pep band is aware that ASI is no longer funding their food for their events; Athletics has picked that up.

Pep Band has been strongly encouraged to become a club/org so that they can receive the funding that clubs/orgs can receive. Other clubs and groups is receiving funding for up to $15,000.00 and that is something that ASI cannot afford. Issues that the Board has to deal with or will we continue to fund these different groups for coaches and instructors.

Hebert states that it is good that we are distinguishing between fundings. It’s important to determine if these expenses are sustained if every year someone expects to be funded it will be another world. The goal is to get it at the class point and if it doesn’t get to that point the program should be suspended. It should have a beginning and an end so that it can become ASI’s program.

VP Menon mentions that there is $100,000.00 for programs; he indicates on if we should we work with that amount and would some go to student programs and events or should that amount be reduced. Also for sustainability will Omulu Capoeira continue to be a program to be funded or will we have to come up with policies against those specific types of things being funded.

ED Saffold states that the committees are never supposed to give groups more than 33% of their total operating budget. If they lose a third they don’t necessarily close they just cut back. You do not want to fund 100% of an operation. Because we will tip them and if the money was to go away so will that club?

Laluan states that his only concern is that this is an organization devoted to students and a lot of the primary movers are professors and yes students are involved but there should be language in the policy stating that students are a part of the process and not just the professors. We don’t want to be handing out money infinitely.

IX. Information Item – Report on Academic Senate Meeting on November 8, 2011

President Prado yields the floor to VP Laluan who highlights the following:

VP Laluan states that last Tuesday the second Academic Senate Meeting of this quarter the first one where student representation was attended. He would like to report that the academic senate was pleased with our attendance there as well as special thanks to Chris for giving a lovely recap of what the Board has been doing in ASI and our concerns with faculty. There are two points that I would like to bring up; the first one is the Academic Senate is debating a Freedom of Speech Policy.
Hebert states that there is an Administrative update on the time, place, manner, and freedom of expression when it comes to the University. The concern was rather if it was an Academic Senate Policy or if it is an Administrative Policy because the prior version came out of Academic Senate sub-committee.

Laluan states that the second thing that the Academic Senate conveyed to us was the filling of the committee position.

He hopes to review all the applications and speak with the faculty to see if any students are interested so this process can be done within a month. There were also some concerns about this organization support with CFA but it was brought up to me privately not in the course of my formal duties.

Hebert touches basis on the last point indicating that CFA didn’t ask the same of Academic Senate; it’s curious why they would ask a government body to take a stand on a labor issue even though they didn’t even ask their own government body. I don’t know the full number unions but there are over 15 bargaining unions that represent a variety of workers on the campus. There are also other instructionally related unions that are a part of the family.

EVP Caldwell states that he has updated numbers for committee applications and there are 5 people who applied for the Academic Senate position.

X. Roundtable Remarks

Menon states that he just has a couple of points when it comes to committees; when we are choosing among a pool of students we will filter out the students that we are going to make our committee out of. Asks if Sneh can add language in the email stating that if they are not eligible for the committees that they applied for encourage them to apply for other committees. Also there will be a different approach for the picking of the finance committee members consisting of him getting to know each person, team building exercises, and different funding scenarios.

Laluan states that the Board should be careful of what they post on Facebook. We are public figures and whatever; your personal beliefs are, just being careful on what you are saying online and what you do in person.

Saffold states that there is a possibility of a Cal State University Occupy. There have been various flyers and posters up around the University Union and the ASI team has been working to remove a lot of flyers that has been up in places that are not permitted. Want to make sure that the Board stays out of harm’s way, please be sure that you indicate your personal views and not the views of the entire Board. Just be aware of your surroundings. There is not a specific plan on what ASI is doing but we will be prepared if students need things to do.

Hebert states one of the unknown is the visitors from other campuses, we want to make sure that all of our students and campus community can exercise how they wish but not supporting destructive purposes. For committee appointments there is a residency requirement that currently exists state wide. For quarter campuses there is a two quarter minimum before they are eligible to be on a major committee. I am very interested in preparing a policy to forward to the University President to exercise something that may be a little differently shaped when it comes to students applying for committees. Also states that he will be more than happy to meet with students on an individual basis when it comes to knowing why they are not eligible for a specific committee.
Pehrson states that she has been doing a lot of interviewing lately and it is coming along well.
Prado states the meeting with the president went very well and the Board members got a lot of questions answered but did find it a little bit disheartening that one of the transportation issues wasn’t received the way we would have liked it to be.

XI. Adjournment
Motion: () to adjourn meeting at 1:17pm
Motion Carries.

Minutes Reviewed by:
Executive Committee Chair
Name: Christopher Prado

Minutes Approved on:

______________________________________________
Date