ASI Board of Directors Special Meeting Minutes of February 12, 2014

I. CALL TO ORDER: EVP Pinlac calls meeting to order at 12:07PM.

II. ROLL CALL
   Members Present                        Absent Members        Guests
   Michelle C. Xiong                      Wilson Tran            
   Erik Pinlac                             Stan Hebert           
   Thamer Fahad Alhathal                   Kenrick Ali           
   Marie Alexandra R. Ibarra               Sara Judd             
   Katrina-Mari Mayol                      D. McKinney           
   Gaozong Yang                           
   Edward Andreini                        
   Shuaib Amiri                           
   Kathy Cutting                          
   Landon Patton                          
   Jordan S. Leopold                      
   Chris Gallagher                        
   Raymund Cruz                           
   Ellen Griffith                         
   Randy Saffold                          
   Marguerite Hinrichs                    
   Mitch Watnik                           
   Chandra Kohler                         

III. ACTION ITEM - Approval of the Agenda
   Amendment I: (Xiong) to change the Action Item: Elections Committee Code, under Action Items, to a Discussion item and move it under New Business. To table Action Item B: Confirmation of Elections Committee under Action Items. Lastly, to add a Discussion Item on Board Accountability under New Business as Item B.
   Motion Carries as Amended and Agenda is approved with Amendments.

IV. ACTION ITEM- Approval of the January 29, 2014 Minutes
   EVP Pinlac approves the January 29, 2014 Minutes.

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. REPORTS

A. VP of Finance – Thamer Alhathal

VP Alhathal addresses the following:

- Will be giving the assets and audits of ASI for 2012-13 which went until the end of June 2013:
  - The asset/documenated position were 1.4 in 2012 and 3.5 in 2013. This is because the current/total asset in 2012 was 2.5 in 2012 and 3.6 in 2013 and this was due to the onetime adjustment in 2012.
  - The expenses/revenue dropped from 2012 to 2013.
    - ED Saffold mentions that there is a difference due to the transfer of money from the University Union bucket to the ASI bucket and ASI also used some of their reserve to satisfy Other Post-Employment Benefits Other than Pensions (OPEB) as well.
    - ED Saffold further explains the reasoning behind OPEB and states the importance of it for retired employees.
    - Explains that the equipment assets went from $16,000 in 2012 and depreciated to $10,000 in 2013 and this covers furniture and other small items that aren’t considered university assets.
    - The current investment is currently 1.1 million
    - ED Saffold further mentions that part of this investment/adjustment was to OPEB and the auditors did not find any fraud or suspicious activity from their budget, and they are expecting another strong audit from the Chancellor’s Office this year. ED Saffold asks the Board to look over the unqualified letter from the auditors which gives them details on what was found from the budget.
    - Mentions that they have about $13,000 left for this quarter for club funding.

13:43

B. VP of Legislative Affairs – Jordan Leopold

VP Leopold addresses the following:

- Updates from the Legislate Affairs/Lobby Corp Committee:
  - They’ve had 2 district visits and their main objective for these visits is to introduce themselves and build a relationship with the legislators. The two assembly members that they have met with are Bill Quirk and Rob Bonta.
  - Current Efforts: advocacy, district visits, capitol visits to CSSA’s CHESS Conference, legislation tracking, event organizing, Mayoral & Congressional Debate (Mid-May), Immigration Reform, collaboration w/ Pi Sigma Alpha, voter registration, and Senator Corbett Event: Women of the Year Recognition.

- Legislative Update; Bills that have passed:
  - AB 386 (Levine) Cross-enrollment: online education at the CSU
By the beginning of the 2015-16 academic year students enrolled in the CSU must be provided the opportunity to enroll in online courses available at other CSU campuses.

- **AB 447 (Williams) California State University: student trustees**
  - Non-voting Student Trustee may vote at the CSU Board of Trustees meeting if the voting member is absent.

- **SB 141 (Correa) Children of deported or voluntarily departed parents.**
  - Students who have moved abroad as a result of his/her parent's deportation students are exempt from non-resident tuition charges, under specified circumstances, at the CSU, CCC, and UC level when applying for enrollment.

- **SB 325 (Block) California State University: Student Trustees**
  - CSU students can now apply as a sophomore and grad students can apply as well.
  - Tuition fees will be waived for student trustees for the duration of their terms.

- **SB 595 (Calderon) Postsecondary Education: Financial Aid.**
  - Prohibits CCC, UC, and CSU campuses from contracting with any banks that requires a student to open an account with them to receive his/her financial aid disbursement.
  - Also, schools must offer students the option of receiving his or her financial aid disbursement via direct deposit into a bank of the student's choosing. Plus, will receive deposit one day from being received.

- **AJR 11 (Wieckowski) Student Bankruptcy Resolution**
  - This resolution urges the Congress and the President of the United States to support and pass legislation that allows private student loan debt to be dischargeable in a bankruptcy case filed under Chapter 7 or Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code (BRC).

- **Bills that have failed:**
  - AB 73, AB 233, AB 303, AB 387, AB 534, AB 1085, AB 1287 (VETOED), SB 65, SB 241, SB 284, SB 285 (VETOED), SB 705 (VETOED)

- **Current Bills:**
  - **AB 330 (Chau) financial aid disclosures**
    - This bill would require the School Performance Fact Sheet to also include certain student loan debt information concerning graduates full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking undergraduate students of the institution who have entered into student loans.
    - At Senate Committee of Higher Education
AB 13 (Chavez) nonresident tuition exemption: veterans
- CCC, CSU, or UC who was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed in this state on active duty for more than one year immediately prior to being discharged have a one-year exemption from payment of nonresident tuition applicable to a student enrolled, or intending to enroll.
- At Senate Committee of Appropriations

AB 1162 (Fraizer) Student financial aid: debit cards
- Ensure that a student does not incur any cost in opening the account or initially receiving the debit card
- Ensure that a student has convenient access to a branch office of the bank or an automated teller machine, as specified;
- Ensure that the debit card, prepaid card, and preloaded card can be widely used; and not marketed as a credit card
- At Senate Banking and Financial Institutions

Gov. Brown’s proposed budget for 2014-2015:
- The California Budget is the state spending plan.
- Prevents overspending within the government.
- Establishes spending priorities within the government.
- The Budget acts to balance public expenditures.
- The proposed Budget allows for departments to continue maintaining current services, given the switch to the new fiscal year (July 1 – June 30).
- The 2014-15 proposed Budget shows a 0.4% increase from the 2012-13 Budget.
- The Budget reflects the expectation of a freeze on UC and CSU resident tuition for 2013-14.
- This represents the second year of a four-year freeze in tuition from 2013-14 to 2016 -17.
- The Budget also establishes the Middle Class Scholarship program to provide scholarships of up to 40% of tuition for UC and CSU students with annual family incomes of up to $150,000.
- The Budget increases the General Fund contributed to each institution’s past years funding base.
- Each segment will receive a 5-percent increase in General Fund appropriations ($125.1 Million each year).
- CSU asked for $334.3 million, allocated $149.1 Million – proposed.
- Second year of a four-year plan in which each segment will receive up to a 20-percent increase in General Fund appropriations ($511 Million total).
- About a 10-percent increase in total operating funds including tuition and fee revenues.

47:37
VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. DISCUSSION ITEM: Travel Fund Request for Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP)

President Xiong addresses the following:
- The student is asking for the Board to help fund him in going to a conference in Hawaii. However, he is not presenting and ASI’s Travel Fund Policy states that they only fund students if they’re presenting so she wanted to get the thoughts of the Board.
  - The Board discusses that this trip seemed to be more of a personal one rather than one that would benefit the entire campus.
  - Hinrichs mentions that she encouraged the student to join the Psychology Club in order to get the money to attend the conference.
- She will be speaking with the student encouraging him to join Psychology the club to try and attain the money that way.

53:10

B. DISCUSSION ITEM: Discount Program Phase 2 – Marie Ibarra

VP Ibarra addresses the following:
- Thanks them for attending the in service training last Friday and states that she has made packets for them. The packets are missing the introduction letter which she will email them once she discusses it with ED Saffold.
  - Explains what’s inside the packet: business cards, poster, sticker, program benefits and requirements for participation for the businesses, and the letter of agreement.
  - They are asking businesses to sign up on the spot and the letter of agreement is what they would sign.
    - The minimum is at least a 10% discount.
  - She has updated the Google Doc.
  - ED Saffold mentions that the businesses don’t get/or shouldn’t post the sticker until their discount has been approved.
  - The Board discusses changing the stickers to make them stand out more and they will be following up with the businesses regarding whether they want to continue being a part of the discount program since it is quarterly.
  - The due date to have this completed is the 24th.
  - Hinrichs mentions that they can expand this more than just downtown Hayward because students live throughout the entire bay area.

1:05:29

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. INFORMATION ITEM: Professor Evaluation – Dr. Linda Dobb (time certain 1PM)

Dr. Linda Dobb addresses the following:
- They are trying to transition from paper evaluations in class to online evaluations and they can use more of a response from students.
- The evaluations are delivered to the students from a secured system so they never know who answers them.
- They only see the results of the evaluation and the comments.
- Watnik mentions that the faculty does take the student evaluations very seriously and he recommends that students write comments. He further mentions that he knows of a faculty member that is in the process of being fired due to continuously poor evaluations – this is rare but it does happen.
- The faculty member gets the score after they put in the student’s final grades to ensure that the evaluation scores have no effect on the student’s grades. The faculty member, chair of department, associate dean(s), and she receives copies of the evaluations.
- It really is the duty of the chair to address any comments that come up in the evaluation.
- 90% of this school’s evaluations are positive.
- Giving your voice through student evaluations is not the only way students can be heard. They can also talk with the professor about getting help and doing better or they can go see the chair of the department.
- The student voice and evaluations are important.
- Hinrichs states that faculty can be held more accountable if students complete the evaluations when asked to so that they can be heard.
- Leopold asks how long does it take for a professor to get a certain amount of evaluations to get fired.
- Watnik responds by saying he is not too familiar with evaluations program to correctly answer Leopold, he is just aware from the experience through his other colleagues.
- Hinrichs states that with any human resource position there has to be an employment improvement plan in place to help get the professor on track, and then it will depend on how good their improvement is in terms of job termination. The process can take a couple of weeks to a couple of years it just depends on the severity.
- Leopold mentions that he knows a couple of professors with years of bad reviews but yet they’re still here teaching.
- Watnik mentions that they don’t know if a professor has uniformly years of bad reviews unless they are his supervisor.
- Amiri suggests that if they are interested in getting more reviews then maybe they should still have written evaluations in the class.
- Watnik states that the evaluations have mostly been moved online because the departments do not hand back the original evaluations to the faculty member. They
type them up in fear of the faculty recognizing a student’s handwriting. It is suggested that the professors give students about 10 minutes in class to go on their phones or use the computer in the class to fill out the online evaluations, the same as they would paper evaluations. Part of the proposal that is currently in front of the academic senate is a mechanism that allows a faculty member to request to have two of their classes, per academic year, evaluated on paper. This suggested mechanism came about due to the response rate issue.

- **Xiong** asks how the online evaluations response rate is compared to the paper ones.
- **Dr. Linda Dobb** states that there was a 75% response rate for paper evaluations and 55% for online evaluations.

- **Xiong** mentions that some professors don’t stress to students how important these evaluations are. If the professors put more emphasis on doing evaluations, it would make students understand how important it is to do them. A report of what the evaluations were should come out at the end of the year for students to see. If students were able to see these reports they would be more inclined to fill them out.

- **Dr. Linda Dobb** mentions that the school needs to have the response rate for these evaluations to go up and they need to have every professor fairly evaluated. She further mentions that if a report at the end of the year does come out then it would be very general and would be global instead of specific for individual faculty members, but they could do this.

- **Hinrichs** suggests that the questions asked of the students should be changed. The questions should be like, “What did I do right?” and “How can I do better?” instead of “What I did wrong?” because sometimes it’s hard for professors to ask for constructive feedback.

- **Mayol** asks for the questions on the evaluations to be changed to questions that are more centered on the quality of the professor instead of the logistics.

- **Dr. Linda Dobb** explains that a committee is looking at the questions; they have been working on the questions for quite some time.
  - **Xiong** asks if there are any student representatives on this committee.
  - **Watnik** mentions that he could ask FAC about getting a student to sit on this committee.

- **Watnik** further mentions that there have been pushes a few years ago to change the questions to make them more substantive but they were met with tremendous opposition within the senate. **Watnik** also states that when he was an undergraduate student at UC San Diego, the professor’s evaluations were managed by the Associated Students of UC San Diego and they were compiled, distributed and collected by the students. They then were published by the student government. There were very few classes that weren’t evaluated because if the professor didn’t agree to have their class evaluated then a red flag would go up. At the end of the evaluations, they gave the professor’s averages and a quick summary of the comments. The publication that included these evaluations also had a “best
comment’ section which encouraged students to write in the comment section in hopes of getting on that page.

Watnik states that he floated this at one of the student evaluation teaching subcommittee meetings and they were almost open to this. He further mentions that the message has to go out that the students can make a difference on these evaluations.

- Griffith states that she knows that there are some professors that she has had that are an embarrassment to the school, and even though she doesn’t know exactly what students say in their evaluations about those professors she knows they can’t be good. By those professors still teaching at East Bay it makes the students not trust the evaluation system because they feel like their voices aren’t being heard. She asks why is it rare and difficult to fire a faculty member that doesn’t receive good evaluations.

- Watnik states it is only rare for a tenured faculty member to be fired.

1:43:22

B. DISCUSSION ITEM: Elections Committee Code
   President Xiong addresses the following:
   - Asks everyone to please take the time to look at the Elections Committee Code when it gets emailed out, because she reformatted and retyped everything. Everyone is welcome to come to the next Executive Committee meeting, the most important things that should be focused on is Article 4 Section A, number 3, which is the eligibility of officers for the Executive Committee. Also under the declaration of slates Article 4 Section C #4, only the president and the executive vice president will have their designated slate to appear on the ballot. This was discussed in the Executive Committee meeting and they are not sure if this will be kept so Xiong wants feedback from the Board of Directors and Marguerite Hinrichs. Also the voting days will be changed to 3 days. The number of voting days is being reduced because the voter turnout is very low. Since voters had a week to vote they kept putting it off thinking they had a few more days, which would actually lead them to forget. This 3 day vote will create a sense of urgency and voters can vote 24/hr. in the day on blackboard.

1:47:35

C. DISCUSSION ITEM: Board Accountability
   Motion (Xiong) to table Board Accountability to the next meeting.
   Motion Carries.

1:48:54

D. DISCUSSION ITEM: Issues with International Advising
   VP of Finance Alhathal discusses the following:
• **Alhathal** received an email that one of his upper division classes won’t count because at the time he took that class he only had less than 90 units, which was not true. When he responded to the email there was no reply. Went to the GE office to get an appointment with an advisor, she wasn’t very cooperative. **Alhathal** repeatedly asked the advisor to speak to her supervisor for her to double checked and when she finally did, it was proved that he was right and their information was wrong. Even though the situation got cleared up the GE advisor refused to email a confirmation on what they discussed.

• **Xiong** states that this issue is common and has been happening for years and nobody has fixed it. This negatively affects the international students. It is also a hassle that the international students cannot go to AACE they can only go to GE.

• **Watnik** is going to write the Director of AACE and will find out what he can do.

---

**1:54:50**

IX. **ROUNDTABLE REMARKS**

- **Patton**: Eight people are interested in joining the university committee.
- **Hinrichs**: On Friday February 28, there will be the Winter Quarter Symposium and emails will be sent for registration.
- **Saffold**: It is audit time so auditors maybe approaching people in the office. If approached by an auditor and they ask questions answer them truthfully and if you don’t know the just say, “I don’t know.” Also, if an auditor asks you for any documents do not give it to them, tell them to get it from Doris.
- **Ibarra**: Wants to expand the discount program to where students are so discounts can be in other places than Hayward.

X. **ADJOURNMENT #**

Meeting adjourned at **2:05 PM.**

Minutes Reviewed By:

**Executive VP/Chief-of-Staff:**

Name: Erik Pinlac

Minutes Approved On:

**2-26-14**

**Date:**