Emergency External Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for February 28th, 2012

I. Call to order: VP Laluan calls meeting to order at 11:17am

*indicated 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>Mark Allen T. Laluan</td>
<td>Jesseca Stone</td>
<td>Randy Saffold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Anderson</td>
<td>Derek Volk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Sutrathada</td>
<td>Stan Hebert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinna Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Lafarga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Action Item - Approval of the Agenda

Motion: (Sutrathada) to approve the agenda.
Motion Carries.

IV. Action Item - Approval of January 27th, 2012 Minutes

Motion: (Lafarga) to approve the January 27th, 2012 Minutes.
Motion Carries.

*VP Laluan states that he has recently met last Monday with the Board of Directors in regards to responsibilities that each foundations Board member has. As well as general updates of grant funding that's approaching. One thing that I think I took home from the meeting is a good portion of the meeting was acclimating people to what their responsibilities are. Specifically on how do you vote as a member of the foundations; do you vote for your own interests or do you vote for the foundation itself. A point was brought by the CFO that was very salient. Although, we have the University President, the AVP's, and a Provost. The representation is for the foundations and their interest and not necessarily the University's. I think what we can take home from this, is when we are going about our business as ASI Directors we have to look out for the best interests of the organization; finding the best practices to adopt. If there are any questions or comments please let me know.

The committee discusses the agenda positioning that's located near the Library.

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 members of the public present.
VI. Emergency Action Item – Resolution against the implementation of a CSSA Stability Fee; a $1 to $2 per levied on all CSU students to support CSSA activities.  

VP Laluan states that he will be giving the committee a brief update about this item: in which he highlights the following:  
- At CSSA Chico the previous weekend there was a discussion by the Executive Committee in regards to the California State Student Association about the need to support their activities; they want to do so by creating a student fee and lobbying the chancellor’s office for his implementation. There were some concerns brought to the table by various campuses (ours included) in regards to rather this was an intelligent idea. Why was the Executive Committee refusing to bring this to a campus by campus referendum? VP Laluan indicates that he has a copy of the resolution for the committee to review. VP Laluan reads the resolution to the committee members.

- Resolution:

WHEREAS, the primary responsibility of the Associated Students, Inc. of Cal State East Bay (ASI) is to represent and safeguard the legitimate interests of the student body at Cal State East Bay (CSUEB); and

WHEREAS, this organization stands in firm opposition to any unwarranted fees levied on the student body of CSUEB; and

WHEREAS, the attempt by certain members of the executive board of the California State Student Association (CSSA), in lobbying the CSU Chancellor’s Office to levy a $1 to $2 “Stability Fee” on the over 450,000 students of the California State University (CSU) represents an unwarranted fee, as it neither advances student learning outcomes nor adheres to principles of fairness and nonpartisanship, and thus sets a dangerous precedent; and

WHEREAS, a report presented to the CSSA Board of Directors at the February 7th 2012 plenary session, on the current status of the “Stability Plan” failed to satisfy concerns raised by the ASI of CSUEB, as well as those of other CSSA member student governments, such as but not limited to;

- The attempt by certain interests within the CSSA to stifle free and open debate on this issue.
- The attempt by certain interests within the CSSA to bypass student opinion by refusing to allow a campus-by-campus referendum to approve or disapprove said fee.
- The proposal that certain monies collected by this fee may go towards funding a potentially partisan Political Action Committee (PAC).
- The transformation of the CSSA through this fee, from a non-partisan forum for discourse between the student governments of the CSU system, into an entity far removed from its original mandate as envisioned when first it was created in 1958 as the Student Presidents Association; and

"Students working for Students!"
WHEREAS, the ASI of CSUEB would in dereliction of its duty to fight on behalf of the legitimate interests of the students of CSUEB, if it did not take a firm stand against the "Stability Fee" component of the 2015 Stability Plan: Now, therefore let it be,

RESOLVED, that the ASI of CSUEB absolutely condemns the implementation of a CSSA "Stability Fee" without such a fee being voted upon by the student bodies of each individual campus of the CSU in a free and fair referendum.

SEC 2. The ASI of CSUEB shall take all steps both necessary and proper, including withdrawal from CSSA if need be, to fight against the implementation of this fee. The ASI of CSUEB regards the defeat of this fee as vital to the fulfillment of its mandate to protect legitimate student interests and for the furtherance of peace, order and good governance amongst all student body organizations within the CSU system.

SEC 3. The ASI of CSUEB empowers the External Affairs committee and its Chairman to form a select committee, to be comprised of members of the ASI of CSUEB Board of Directors and/or students-at-large, which shall be tasked with monitoring this issue and is enjoined to take appropriate action to further the position of the ASI of CSUEB as we out in this resolution. Furthermore, the ASI of CSUEB shall send members of the forenamed select committee, as well as any relevant members of the ASI of CSUEB Board of Directors to present this resolution to the full body of the CSSA at the next calendrical plenary session of the CSSA upon passage of this resolution.

- **Ford** asks considering the task force are you asking for a task force to go against the fee or enabling them to have a referendum.

  VP **Laluan** states that if a referendum was held that would be the tasks of the elections committee. If the CSSA would currently go above the students the remedy proposed for this specific resolution is to form a task force. There would be about three to four students who would primarily focus on the above issue.

  VP **Laluan** gives a bit of background of why I feel strongly about this issue and the reasons for the recommendations.

- This issue has been on the table for the past sixteen months and in front this CSSA Board of Directors for the past six months. The information about the stability fee has been really hard to come by, who ever would attend these meetings I would ask if there can be information provided to me in regards to this fee. Since now we know the context of this fee. There is a PDF file online that outlines this fee. I believe that this deserves some focus, for the past four years that I have been at East Bay we have fought against increasing student fees. Every single time the Chancellor’s Office has suggested a student fee no matter where you stand in regards to your opinion of ASI everyone was against fee raises. This is the role of CSSA and the main role of our advocacy as I envisioned it. Suggesting that we have an organization that would be receiving $850,000, by imposing a two dollar fee allows them to create a political action committee in which we do not have input on what kind of adds they are putting.
out and who they are paying to march. I don’t think that this is fair to California State Universities East Bay students, due to us advocating some of our mandates. At the end of the day, we are not responsible as Board of Directors to the other ASI’s. We are only responsible to the students that are located on this campus. I believe that the only way for CSSA to see how bad of an idea this is to talk to the Presidents of California State University campuses. This is to fulfill the requests of writing resolutions and bringing them to the CSSA Pulmonary Sessions and let’s discuss them there. I have done the resolution, of course there are grammatical and syntax errors but we can polish these errors. I would like to get a move on this as soon as possible. I would really like for this to be presented to the CSSA Board at the upcoming CSSA Meeting and joining the other CSU’s on presenting resolutions, rather if they are for them or against them.

Ford states that she is for the resolution at hand and agrees with ED Saffold that this something that VP Laluan feels very strongly about.

ED Saffold states that he does approve of the specific resolution with the exception of the word furtherance. Can we find another word to replace that one? I’m okay with the resolution but I was wondering if the Board would be looking to completely drop out of CSSA, if it is that strong I would just state to be open on opinions in regards to how the Board feels about this fee.

VP Laluan states to clarify on that, I know that there were discussions in regards to that at the CSSA itself. I believe that the President of Stanislaus stated that this would just be an opt out fee. I believe President Prado clearly stated that if this fee will be an opt out fee I believe California State University East Bay will be opting out entirely. To get the Board up to speed we should be going over the resolution and make this a Board effort rather than an individual person effort.

Sutrathada states that speaking on VP Laluan’s point from earlier I feel that it would be a slap in the face to indicate to the students that there would be a $2 fee imposed on everyone student. I think that by stating that we would be opting out, this would be a strong representation of what the students initially want.

VP Laluan states that he thinks that this is something that can be made a center piece for a town hall meeting just to bring the students up to speed. We need to be looking at ways to regain the student’s trust. They state that it is a $1 to $2 fee as of now but how do we know that this fee would not increase. What I ask from this committee is not to just agree with the resolution but to put on Town Hall meetings and have a plan of action on what is being done to the students by bringing visibility.

Anderson states she is actually curious so if we do decide to opt out of the Stability Fee how would that affect CSUEB when it comes to not being a part of CSSA when other CSU’s are. Would we still be able to receive and give feedback due to us not participating anymore?

VP Laluan states that a centralized move of this sort happened about three or so
prior to this one. Many campuses have left CSSA and now they are barely starting to work their way back. At the end of the day, whenever this organization has gone above its bridges so to speak ASI’s that have realized that their primary responsibilities to the students is not necessarily giving away money to lobby for campaigning for legislatures or what not those schools have left. To address your comment that addresses that we will be losing our ability to give our campus to campus input, I think that this idea and resolution is fighting for the discussion being this is what CSSA is supposed to be, a forum for discussion. If the powers of CSSA choose to ignore that why should any ASI be a part of this, being that they are not following with their prescribed duties.

_Sutrathada_ asks _VP Laluan_ how many other schools he perceives will be conducting something similar and are willing to opt out of CSSA.

_VP Laluan_ states that he has not been able to get a rough head count due to him not going to enough of the meetings. I would say rough estimates close to a third would opt out of the fee not including leaving CSSA. I would personally recommend that this Board of Directors give us as many remedies as possible to allow the CSSA Executive Committee and Staff to change this dangerous course of action. I would not follow the path of Cal State Northridge, I definitely recommend us being civil and being diplomatic.

_Ford_ states that she is not sure if Director Lafarga was present at the last meeting or if he knows about opting out fee and how it really wouldn’t help us at all.

_ED Saffold_ states that we pay CSSA dues, and I honestly would have to say that I would go with the CSSA option of not paying the dues. There are institutions who are not CSSA members so I believe that there isn’t any mandatory piece to this. But I am not sure what the opt out procedure is due to us already paying. We do not have enough data to know if we are able to opt out of the $1 to $2 Stability Fee. President Prado and Frank Quintana in the past have not brought back any paper material on the Stability Fee. Therefore, I can’t give you any more information on this.

_VP Laluan_ states that there is a PDF online and I will be forwarding it to the committee members and also the Stan Hebert. This is the one thing that worries me and this has been hanging over our head for six months. I have to see their point as well they have put in sixteen months of work on this. It has been up for two and a half years. Also it was a team effort to suggest that East Bay will be opting out on that specific fee while many of the other CSU’s were just going along with it. We set the tone for the entire meeting. We need to educate our students on the why we made the choice that was made. Once this is cleared to the committee, we have to make sure that we sell this to the Board of Directors. And selling this means more than just voting yay or nay and having the willingness to go out to the student body and educating them on what we have done and this is why we have done this. I want more than just a yay or nay commitment, I want a real commitment. Because we are building up to
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the CHESS Conference where we really are going to be interacting with a number of people, this goes to show you that we really need to evaluate what value CSSA brings to us as students on CSU campuses. And what values it brings to the organization, being that it is more than just showing up and waving signs. Policiticians see this everyday and our students also see this on different television networks.

VP Laluan asks if he can bring this to a vote and make syntax and grammatical corrections without changing the language of the resolution.

ED Saffold states that you would take a motion to approve the resolution provided that corrections are made before the resolution would be presented to the ASI Board of Directors. You can approve it now subject to the correction of the grammatical errors. This committee is agreeing that you would like to go forward with the resolution, so that the language is being approved but the Board of Directors approves the actual resolution. Or you would be approving the submission of the resolution to the Board.

Motion: (Ford) to approve the language of the resolution against implementation of the CSSA Stability Fee provided that the grammatical errors be corrected before being presented to the Board of Directors.

Motion Carries.

VII. Emergency Action Item – Authorizing the creation of an ad-hoc committee on Bylaws revision to be compromised of the Chairman of this committee plus two or three other ASI Board or Committee members.

VP Laluan states that he would like to go over the Bylaws due to there being some grammatical and syntax errors that need corrections. The AOA representatives, on ED Saffold side of things believe that the language should be tightened up when it comes to the portion of the Bylaws in regards to the Directors. I don’t want to move forward on my own; I want this to be collegial and want everyone to be involved in this process.

Motion: (Sutrathada) to approve the Emergency Action Item-Authorizing the creation of an ad-hoc committee on Bylaws revision to be compromised of the Chairman of this committee plus two or three other ASI Board or Committee members.

Motion Carries.

VIII. Emergency Discussion Item: Process for revising current ASI scholarship regulations. Committee input on how scholars can be distributed equitably among each field of study requested.

VP Laluan states that the extraneous language for the scholarships will be discarded the committee was implementing in the previous year where you would have to report back every four to six months, I think this is unfair and this is what scholarships are. Scholarships are awarded for the past achievements. I would not want to burden our business side with this issue. So I am requesting to the committee, I want suggestions on what kind of scholarships
we should be giving out. Not necessarily the content about the regulation of the scholarships but there would need to be a two hundred and fifty word essay on why they would be applying for the scholarship and also two letters of recommendation which is pretty standard. So the requirements are there may be a GPA requirement. My recommendation would be for a higher GPA. I think we should hold ourselves to a specific standard on that. What I am requesting from this committee is recommendations on how we would be handing out these specific scholarships.

ED Saffold states that for the sake of information he would be going over past eligibility requirements:

- Applicants Must be current students at CSUEB
- Have earned at least 20 units at CSUEB at the Beginning of the Spring Quarter units in progress will be considered
- Having a minimum cumulative GPA of a 3.0 or better
- Be a full time student to be considered for an award (full time equals 12 academic units for undergraduate and 8 academic units for a graduate student) for the four quarters throughout the academic year
- Graduate students who are fulfilling research requirements will be decided on an individual basis.

VP Laluan states his concerns in regards to the eligibility requirements for the specific scholarship:

- Does this take Transfer Students out of the running
- So what I mean by categories let’s not make this system so complex
- We have awards that are geared to CLASS so if you wrote a quality essay and the professor are willing to recommend you.
- Or if there is like a senior project and they are doing something fancy and they want to write up why they think they should be awarded to further their education.
- This is where I am trying to get at when I refer to categories; I want to broaden these out.

Ford states that she has a few recommendations that she would like to speak upon:

- Photography: tell your story in six photos
- Ethnic Studies: Create a Poll/Survey (What does diversity mean to you)
- Journalism: Making History (Make a scholarship based on that)

VP Laluan states that there are many ways in which we can engage the campus body better. My general experience is dealing with things within the history department, political science, and CLASS. But other members of this committee are in with other colleges. It is my hope this year that we can lay a firm foundation and ground work for enabling awards for the different departments. I really need your input because I would not want to be suggesting the things for the colleges that I am not familiar with.
ED Saffold goes over the scholarships that were available to the students the previous academic year. Made sure that I have emailed the document with the different types of scholarships from the previous year to VP Laluan so that you are aware of what specific types of scholarships were awarded. But I do agree that the $1000.00 scholarships should be broken down so that more funds are given to more students. This would really benefit the students but the categories that will be picked will be in the committee hands. But with the breaking down of the awards they would not need to be giving out on a quarterly basis they can just be distributed. The scholarships were given out based on students past merits and not their current merits and based on the way that we gave out scholarships students who deserved to keep the scholarships couldn’t be based on the way that we gave the scholarships out.

VP Laluan states that ASI manages the Mr. and Mrs. CSUEB scholarship award. We need to build a campaign around this so we cannot change the term on what the scholarship is but we do manage the award. I am unsure how in the past this was done so I would be relying on ED Saffold for that.

ED Saffold states that the Mr. and Mrs. CSUEB awards are not ASI Scholarships and we cannot touch the criteria for those; this is something that we simply administer. But the ASI scholarships are something that ASI can be very creative with.

ED Saffold states that the scholarships were given poorly in the previous year for $1000.00 but there were given.

Lafarga states since the scholarships are looking to be broken down to five hundred dollars the students will only be able to pay for two units with those funds.

VP Laluan states that it is a catch 22, it’s a question about are we trying to help the most people that we can.

Lafarga inquires on about how many applicants applied for the scholarships in the previous year.

ED Saffold states that he does not have that information due to him not knowing what the previous VP of External Affairs Joe Tafoyda did what the information that he gathered. We can get the number for the scholarships that were awarded but the number of applicants that have applied in the previous year would definitely take some time to gather. We did not give anything over $1300 or $1800 in the previous year.

VP Laluan states that he would strongly be against awarding one individual $6,000-8,000 for an award. Other department’s hands out $5000.00 scholarships due to endowments.

ED Saffold states that the scholarships that were for $1800.00 were broken up throughout the quarters being that a student would only receive $600.00 per quarter.

Ford states that she would like to recommend the recession relief scholarship which is a scholarship for students who are struggling with credit card debt and loan debt.

VP Laluan indicates to the committee, that we should look at the resources that we have available right now and see what we can do with those. I don’t want ASI to be perceived that

"Students working for Students!"
we have the ability to be bailing out students. We do not have that capacity and that percep-
tion is dangerous. I can go back about two years ago where people were actually campaigning
to liquidate ASI assets. I am not against handing out aid but I don’t want to create a false percep-
tion of what ASI can or can’t do for students.

ED Saffold states that there was a perception that this organization had lots of money, but I
can tell you that for this year we are in a deficit for $500,000.00, that has come in as soon as
we have gotten the first mortgage for the RAW Center. With doing our normal budget we
were 1.2 million in the whole so I had to cut $750,000.00 out of the budget. I did not cut any-
thing or student scholarships and club/org funding. The way we had it budgeted we were liter-
ally not going to be in the black or breaking even for more than ten years. By the time we
would have gotten to the ten year spot our reserves would only have $848,000.00 by the time
we got through dealing with our structural deficit so we are really going to have to try to
tighten our belt. We are really going to have to tighten our belts on CHESS travels, especially
being that last year we took 30 people, this year looking to only take about fifteen. We are not
doing as well as people perceived.

VP Laluan states that one fact is that enrollment will be going down next year in which that
determines the revenue for ASI. Even if ASI fees were to go up and people were enrolling in
the same numbers four or five years ago we will barely be cutting even.

ED Saffold states that it is ASI goal to get back to even within 3-4 years.

VP Laluan states that he believes that ED Saffold is correct and we should be applying the
same litmus test on every dollar we spend coming from ASI. Let’s have some reasonable sug-
gestions and if we have a line item that states that we will be receiving a specific amount of
money for scholarships lets stretch it out as much as we can. Even if it is just a parking pass or
a text book, it is really the thought that counts. So I would like to ask formally for the commit-
tee members to be emailing me their recommendations in regards to the scholarships. This
would allow me to put it in writing.

ED Saffold suggests that VP Laluan shares with the committee what was done in the previ-
ous year, which was just forwarded to me. We will not be conducting the giving away of the
scholarships the same way it was done last year.

Anderson states that even though those criteria’s are a little lengthy, but it should be some
type of thorough criteria due to this being free money. I feel like it should be something that
will be distinguished enough there should be some type of competition, its free money that’s
being applied for.

ED Saffold states that the criteria still will be equally astringent they would not have to just
go back through it each quarter. In the previous year they would have to re-qualify for the
funds that the students were already given.

VP Laluan states that we are not trying to make it hard for students we are trying to make it
much easier than the previous year for students to receive the scholarships. I am not against
awarding an $18000.00 scholarship; we should just make it very special. But I am looking for-
ward to hearing the committee member suggestions.

"Students working for Students!"
ED Saffold states that he will be giving VP Laluan the numbers in regards to the scholarships so that the committee can know what they will be working with. Also, as we get into this budget process talking about the scholarships, if we are really concerned about not giving enough awards and things like that. Then, we can seriously look at taking away from things like CHESS travel especially when we are paying for students to go explore government and decide on if they like it or not. We know we have students with the need to pay for classes and buying books instead. There are some funds that can be shifted around in regards to Board initiatives.

IX. Roundtable Remarks

Lafarga: states that he has gotten CC’d on an email that a student has sent. A student was complaining about his professor. But I think he did everything else; first he went to the department, then he went to talk to him, the last thing he did was email the chairman of the department and CC’d me. ED Saffold suggests that Director Lafarga meets with Stan Hebert to get some advice on the situation. Specifically as your role as an advocate if that student is having a hard time trying to get some resolution to the issue. You would need to go to the department chair or the person who’s in charge in that specific school. Your role is to act like a student advocate to bring information to and from. There is no real action you can take but to act as an advocate and make sure that this specific student has contacted the correct people. You can escalate it to EVP Chris Caldwell who has a relationship with the provost about issues that students are having. If it is multiple issues, find out if there are other students who are having these issues and have them do things like submit their stories to you so that you can compile things. Act as an advocate for that student to try to resolve the situation that even may be an academic situation. Make sure that the awareness is there so that the student can go through the process properly, so that they can take it to the next level.

Lafarga: states that he spoke with the Dean of Science in regards to getting more students to interact with each other. He wants to know how they can promote learning and how the department can grow. He also states that he wants the students to understand the problems that the different schools are having. ED Saffold states that this will not be done at Meet the Deans this would be done during a different event. What I would recommend is to find your science related clubs/orgs and have them band together to put on an event. When three or more clubs get together they qualify for more funds, they can do event for 2,500 and put something’s together and make it work.

Anderson: no questions or concerns looking forward to compiling some great scholarship ideas.

Ford: states that the only comments she has is in regards to Bay Fest, the Black Student Union head representative came up to me and stated that she is looking to write a letter to the Board of Directors and would be presented it at the Board of Directors meeting. She stated that a lot of students came up to her and suggested that she write a letter being that she is the
head of Black Student Union because they feel like it's a racial thing. She was stating that
she should do this even though she is not aware of the situation. I feel that ASI should be
more transparent on what is going on so that students are not angry.

**Saffold:** states that the reason of doing this the way we did was because of us not wanting to
throw the students of the program board under the bus. The reason why we did not go into
all the details and specifics at that time was due to us not wanting to accidently identities an-
other. The most successful event that ASI had programmed did not happen. The core of what
happened was that they oversold tickets; they sold 546 tickets for a space that only allowed
343 people in it. So when the attempt was possibly made to move the event outdoors. An
event cannot be moved for time placing manner. As soon as we found this out two days be-
fore the event an emergency task force had gotten together. Ticket sales were immediately
cancelled to see what can be done to immediately fix this. The meeting consisted of me, po-
lice chief, officer for the campus, operations manager Mo, as well as Jonathan Stoll to see
if we can create some plan. The first plan was to see if we can move to the Dining Commons-
couldn’t do the dinning commons. The second thing was can we move it outside couldn’t
move it outside due to time placing manner, lack of planning that wasn’t secure. Also we
found out that we did not have proper insurance for the event. We didn’t have at least a lia-
ability insurance that would cover. Then the thought came up of moving it to the gym. couldn’t
do the gym due to the protection of the floor and a specific stage being needed. All these
things came up and decisions had to be made by a 10:00am deadline. Another thing was we
did not have the proper security; we were planning on about 300 hundred people only attend-
ing the event. I am presenting with a concert that has not enough security, not enough insur-
ance, and no venue with the room capacity. We even came up with what if we just cancel it
for outside people and just host it for CSUEB students but the thing was people would still
then come to the campus. And if they come up to the event that is totally cancelled and
they’ll turn around but if they come to an event and see a concert going on especially when
they bought the ticket they are going to want to be a part of the event. Not enough time, insur-
ance, and security to implement the event the concert had to be cancelled. There was a
core misperception that the room was seating capacity and not standing capacity but it was
the whole capacity that was being looked at. **Ford** asks did the comment come up about hav-
ing the event on a different day.

**ED Saffold** states that the performers are contracted and the funds have already been spent
the money that you were using to conduct the event due to the performers still having to be
paid. Anderson asks why ASI anticipated that only 300 people would show up to the event,
**ED Saffold** states that can be asked in the hallway.

**VP Laluan** states that when we present proposals we assume that there will be a long time
available to conduct this, now I noticed when I looked on the Board of Directors meeting
agenda we will be talking about the March 5th Rally. Now I am not going to speak on the
merits of the rally and the march. I want us to look at talking about reserving busses for an
event
that is less than five days away. Why? We don’t have signup sheets or materials to put on a successful event. ED Saffold states that from his personal understanding, this was supposed to be coordinated by the Board of Directors. We have been waiting on bus quotes and things on those lines. Deciding, ex-comm. did have a minor conversation in regards to this and did discuss bus quotes last week. The Board is trying to make a final decision on if they are going to go or not. I recommend that one bus would be the safer route than to have many of busses. This will be discussed in the Board of Directors tomorrow.

VP Laluan states that he is putting a moral value on the march; we have to leave here by four in the morning to be in line, ED Saffold states that we estimated 6:30 to 7:00pm. VP Laluan states that 6:30am is when they will be starting, I can forward you the flyer that I have.

ED Saffold mentions that it’s the arranging of the order of the march that ends at ten. You can arrive by 8:30am and arrange yourself in the march before the march starts. Sign up and other pieces would have been important to have to inform students. VP Laluan is looking forward to the scholarship proposals from everyone.

X. Adjournment
Motion: adjourn meeting at 12:34pm
Motion Carries.

Minutes Reviewed by:
External Affairs Committee Chair
Name: VP Stephanie Flowers

Minutes approved on:

11-19-12
Date: