**Executive Committee Meeting Minutes for January 13th, 2012**

1. Call to Order: Chair **Christopher Prado** calls meeting to order at **12:00 pm**

**\*indicates member is present at the start of meeting**

1. **Roll Call**

Members Present Absent Members Guests

\*Christopher Prado Randy Saffold

\*Chris Caldwell

\*Siddharth Menon

\*Mark Allen T. Laluan

\*Lyla Pehrson

\*Stan Hebert

1. **Consent Calendar**

Approval of the Agenda.

**Motion: (Caldwell) to approve the Agenda.**

**Motion Carries.**

1. **Action Item – Approval of the December 2nd, 2011 Minutes**

**Motion: (Caldwell) to approve the December 2nd, 2011 Minutes.**

**1 Abstention by Lyla Pehrson.**

**Motion Carries.**

1. **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, Eastbay.*

1. **Emergency Information Item – ASI By-Laws Referendum Election**

ASI President **Prado** will give a little background on the ASI By-Laws Referendum.

* Last year Board Members approved some changes to the ASI By-Laws Referendum and just general regulations that the board will have to campaign and notify the campus community. And also a referendum election will be held so that the Bylaws are formally approved.
* President **Prado** yields the floor to ED Randy Saffold who will highlight the following:
* The Board will have to get signatures from students; there are a certain number of signatures the Board will need in order to take the Bylaws into Referendum. And this can be done by holding information sessions to

inform the students on the things that the Board is interested in changing and why? Then if the Board get the amount of signatures that are needed to hold the Referendum, then it will be passed over to the elections committee to ratify those proposed changes to the Bylaws. As the Board moves forward there should be awareness of the Bylaws and the changes you all have sent to the Bylaws.

* Proposed changes to the Bylaws are:

-Looking at eliminating the role of Legislative Affairs

-Debated about the PR Position- the Board decided to keep that position

-AB1233 was sent to the Chancellors Office

-we made special advisors non-voting

* The Board reviews the changes of the Bylaws which will be highlighted in red and purple.

-Change in Directors to senators

-Last Board didn’t move to remove the position of Legislative Affairs

-Other CSU Campuses does not have the Director of Legislative Affairs-ultimately this can fall under the responsibilities of External Affairs

Still need to make sure that the changes are exposed to students, all the strategic initiatives set by the previous Board can be overturned by the current Board, however there is a three to five year plan how do you ever get there if each Board re-does things. The initiatives of the last Board were put in place due to the forums that were held by ASI. Recognize that every year things are redone nothing will ever be completed.

* VP **Pehrson** states that the previous forums had never addressed Legislative Affairs. Going forward how would we address the community when it comes to the Legislative Affairs position in a forum setting? Is this something that we would be doing or would it being like a survey or something.
* **Hebert** answers by stating that it is recommended that we indicate what the reason is for the change or the proposed bylaws, rather than to make the question in the forum. End up with allowing the students to indicate a vote without actually having a real vote. Because ultimately it comes down to supporting the new bylaws, amend bylaws, or to reject them. One of the things for the timeline includes an opportunity for administrator review, when the referendum is complete the president objected it. Any questions that the president might have will be addressed.
* ED **Saffold** indicates that the blue changes reflect the things that are already done. These are the changes that already had to be done in order for us to be in legal compliance. I didn’t have time to create a new document. I wanted the document to reflect all the changes that were made really ratifying it there was a change for legal purposes which we are allowed to do. But still wanted the Board to be aware of the changes. Wanted this group to see everything that we did from the last year board.
* VP **Menon** asks for legal reasons we can just go ahead and change things?
* ED **Saffold** states that if we are outside of legal compliance we have to change it to operate legally. In the future as we do things like this from legal counsel and recommendations have resolutions and a systemic number a systematic way of numbering things to show that this is the changes that we have made.
* VP **Laluan** states that if we don’t hold town halls again to revisit these things like pay for college directors, if we wanted to change or make a new proposal would we have to go through that same process again.
* President **Prado** states that yes that process would be implemented.
* **Hebert** states that the approach that the board took last year and the year before was to remove many of the operating standings out of the bylaws and place them into an operating document, those items that needed to be address that might have to do the per dium or requirements for certain of types of things do not become a part of the bylaws, due to the bylaws should not be changed but once every so many years. Unless there is a compliance issue there should be closer to the cooperation, the bylaws is how you have to operate.
* **ED Saffold** states that it’s kind of how the committee codes are separated from the bylaws. The committee codes states how the committee operates while the bylaws states how the committee exists. I believe that in one instance we found that the committee codes and the bylaws do not match. That’s our next project; VP Pehrson will be looking into the non-matching things when it comes to the committee codes. Make sure we are addressing issues like this. I was listed as secretary and I cannot be secretary, we had to take my duties and split with Executive Vice President and the Vice President of Finance. What I tried to do was keep everything into blue because it represents my changes, while the red represents Mo Shahid. The final draft that he showed the board like the CSSA is back to him again.
* President **Prado** asks if one of the things that were voted on in the past was to create a public relations committee. Hebert answers that the public relations committee was removed. Specific language should be removed as well.
* The committee discusses the Public Relations position/Committee.
* ED **Saffold** states that the yellow highlighted is something that was specifically highlighted for VP Pehrson or VP Menon. Public relations committee is still listed there so I imagine that was supposed to be there. But the minutes will be looked into in regards to that.
* Legal language was sent by the lawyer, why we were able to have advisory committees and pull the ex-officios off.
* Most of the Executive Directors changes are in Blue but the one tied into the legal compliance piece is in red. First time edit to a document.
* Also any person who is running for ASI President has to have two years’ experience on the Board of Directors and/or ASI committees.
* President Prado states that these are the proposed changes in which we would like to educate the students on. But like VP Menon stated previously, this board does have the authority to make other changes although ED Saffold recommends that we wouldn’t do that because we would have to go into another process again, but if that’s the decision the Board would like to make forward with those efforts.
* EVP **Caldwell** asks ED Saffold if the changes can be moved to the updated letter head.
* ED **Saffold** states that instead of going through the entire document there is a way to do that.
* VP **Pehrson** states there’s a typo of the new letterhead it states University Union Twice.

1. **Emergency Information Item-Board Retreat**

**President Prado** states that initially the Board Retreat was going to be held a week before winter quarter classes but the scheduling has been changed. A few of the Board members along with the ED Saffold thought that it wasn’t a good idea. EVP Caldwell felt that it would be a good idea to just hold it at the end of Winter Quarter beginning Spring Quarter.

EVP **Caldwell** states that thinks that it is good to hold it at another time due to the Two Board members being voted on next week at the Board of Directors Meeting. We do need some additional time to plan the retreat planning to have it on-campus instead of off-campus. Considering that we did cut a portion of our Board Budget. The planning session would be very beneficial. President Prado and I will be conducting one on one meeting with every member from the Board. Looking to see where all the Board members are at and looking to have them turn in board reports.

President **Prado** states that we are going to meet every single Board member to see what initiatives each board member has for the quarter.

EVP **Caldwell** does everybody agree that an on-campus day on like Saturday and Sunday 4 hours each day to hold the retreat. Going over material weeks before, I am going to work with Sneh on reserving the room and come up with the budget for food. And I will be working with Director Quintana and what things we want to accomplish on the planning days. This can be reassessed within a couple of weeks.

1. **Emergency Information Item-ASI Budget Timeline**

President **Prado** states that although we have just recently gotten our budget approved, we now have to start the process hitting all the professional staff and the employees putting together the ASI budget for the following year. Have a Town hall on the Finance Policy so that we are able to get the students input.

ED **Saffold** states that the budget process is a lengthy process, what I want to do is giving you my ideally timeline on how we are going to march through these pieces. Start the year prior, I started April 1st, 2011 and about two weeks I kind of chimed in and took over the budget process. In which we were struggling during that time and had significant questions. By mid-February that is when budget planning should be started, so what will happen is at the end of January my expectation is that our accounting would have closed out the books for the first six months. We actually are able to run the expenditure reports for our six month actuals. What we said we were going to spend vs. what we spent. The actuals will be turned over to all management staff to give us the best estimate on where they think they are going to end the year. Zero-based budget assumes that if you start with zero what will it cost you to run the program. If you compare your zero-based budget estimates against what you spent last year that needs to be influenced by strategic goals, influenced by the public forums that we hope to have to know what students are interested in. This will cause management to make adjustments. By mid-February the goal is for managers to begin drafting based on six-month actuals what they plan to spend, there will be a first draft of the budget and this will go to VP Menon by the first week of March. At the same time in March we should be getting from the campus what they are going to charge us for the chancellor’s office, depth service for that period, what fees are going to be for running the facilities and operations. So that’s first week of March assuming that they don’t actually have to us of March we are going that by at least the third week of March we have that, at that time we will revise all of our budgets. We are going to make an assumption that 100% on what they charge year we are going to assume that’s what it will be the following year. Depending on what they actually give this will cause us to go up and down. Each manager will come in with VP Menon and I to defend their budget, then after the budgets are defended to VP Menon they will be opened to the Finance Committee. Then the committee will then defend it to the Board of Directors. Instead of starting the process in April 1st we will be ending the process on April 1st. This will give us several meetings to make decisions with the board deciding on if they would like to send it back to the Finance Committee for adjustments. In our Friday meeting we need to make sure that we have at two Finance Committee and two Board of Directors meetings scheduled in March. I have no problem showing the Board and the Finance Committee the first draft of the Budget before we get the final numbers from the campus because I really want to make sure that we are ahead of this game. That’s how I would approach the budget planning.   
ED **Saffold** asks VP Menon if he has any information on how you are looking at talking to students giving input on programs to influence how we do budgets.

VP **Menon** states that he was thinking on going out with his committee and having at least two at most three workshops at different locations around campus what I want to do is present the strategic goals to them, asking students if this is the direction that they would like to go. I will then come back with that feedback and present it both to my committee and also the Board of Directors. If the student’s expectations are on the lines of what we doing right now, I believe we will not have to change a lot, suppose they say that they want to see ten different things in the RAW, this would change the budget numbers.

ED **Saffold** states that the process needs to be inserted in early February as well because that will color what management brings back. I want to make sure that we are taking into account students input as we build the budget. The other thing that needs to take place is budget assumptions. What I am going to do in the first part of February end of January is working with VP Menon to create budget assumptions, these are things that I need to work on with Stan Hebert as well because there is a huge assumption coming up, what happens if enrollment tanks or we are forced to decrease enrollment. This would have a significant effect on the income for ASI. We should have not just one budget in my opinion but two planned budgets for some percentage of cuts that’s automatic so that we know what to eliminate if certain triggers happen again. For example, in November if we don’t get certain tax, we can be looking at a $200,000,000 cut across the CSU. How that effects ASI directly is not known but if we have a plan on what we are going to do if we all of sudden we look up and we have x percentage of fewer students than we have where are we going to look to make adjustments. I think we can be proactive and have budgets and address those issues. For example, at Stanford when they knew their first cut was coming they actually did a 2%, 5%, and 7% model what happen if we use this money. This is something for us to think about to be prepared, I don’t want to be the guy who cry’s wolf, but I just want us to be prepared.

VP **Menon** states that while I work with ED Saffold he will be coming up with the budget than he will work with me, we don’t want the VP of Finance sitting in the room with the all the managers, the managers know their jobs better; they will be coming up with a plan.

President **Prado** states that he does appreciate the Finance Committee going to the students to get input on the Budget. This is something that has not been done since I have been present at CSUEB.

VP **Menon** states that besides town halls and forums are there other ways to get feedback from the students.

**Hebert** states that in the RAW, they gathered information via surveys on usage on certain types of programs. There are system wide surveys on this campus and others that have a larger amount of information that would be useful in order to make a longer range in financial plans.

ED **Saffold** states that there’s nothing wrong with doing internal satisfaction surveys. A list we do have access to. I would argue that we should be doing one satisfaction survey annually, as much as the student population that we reach as possible.

1. **Emergency Information Item-Sexual Harassment Training for two newly appointed Board Members and Director, College of Science and/or anybody who was not present during the Fall 2011 Retreat**

President **Prado** states that EVP Caldwell touched on this briefly, the whole reason behind this is because we need to get those board members trained and have that legal competency on the Sexual Harassment Training.

ED **Saffold** states that he knows that HRG are the ones that will be conducting that training. Wanted the law firm to do both but the law firm will do governance compliance and Minga will do Sexual Harassment Training. We have already paid for that but we have to pay our legal counsel and it will be a much smaller bill. I don’t know if you know she already held one session for the staff that didn’t receive it as well as the student staff. So this is will be the longer two hour version she would have to do for the Board of Directors.

1. **Emergency Information Item- Employee Education Benefit Discussion**President **Prado** yields the floor to Executive Director Randy Saffold who highlights the following:

ED **Saffold** states that basically he wants to tell the committee what the current policy is, give them the issues or concerns that I have about it, and then propose to you the information that I would like to bring to the Personnel Committee for later discussion, who would then make a decision and take it back to the larger board. Right now the way the education benefit reads is kind of dubious the question was do we have a full education policy but we made exceptions to the policy. Right now to receive to an education benefit you have to be fully enrolled in CSUEB and be at junior standing. Jonathan Stoll is the only one taking advantage of this to the tune of about $2,500.00. Because he is fully enrolled and engaged, East Bay is not the least expensive school to attend. The whole reason of having an education reimbursement policy is to ensure that you are helping the staff grow and develop as people. That’s fine but the way our policy reads is that you guys are special people and you qualify. If you did a poll of our staff how many of ASI employees would qualify to be a student at CSUEB, how many of them have junior standing. We gave a benefit to staff if you qualify. In my opinion, this is too restricted it’s unfair in my opinion, what I propose is what we’ve had at the previous school I was at. So at SJSU we can take up to six credit hours per semester. Meant that we can take either fall-winter, winter–spring, or spring-summer, taking the equivalent of 6 credit hours. Instead classes were taken at the local Junior Colleges; so that they took the one class

that they are interested in that would help them do their growth and development,

not have to be a full member of the University. Now why the policy would be so restricted maybe to keep cost down. In my opinion, the way that we are doing it now only one employee has taken advantage of the Employee Education Benefit, which in my mind defeats the whole purpose of why we actually have one no one growing and developing to help them do their jobs better.

VP **Pehrson** states that her understanding of why we would start it at junior standing is because you can go ahead and go to Ohloney and Chabot on your own and spend that $300.00 if you wanted. Why would we be paying for them to go to a different college when they can pay for it on their own? Three hundred dollars is a large chunk of money but it is not as much if they decided higher their education here at CSUEB. Why they don’t take it upon themselves to go. I kind of like it the way that it is that they can take it upon themselves to go get an AA degree at a junior college. And if you are an employee here you can go ahead and take advantage of this opportunity that is here.

ED **Saffold** states that he is not sure what the policy is of the campus Employee education policy and is not sure if it matches the one that is the same as ASI. I do know that that a part of a benefits package it should indeed be a benefit, if we give them discounts on if they can rent room, also if they would like to attend the RAW Center for free. The whole point here is that the staff has professional growth and development some of it can be for us but some for them. Just because they can do it they are not doing it. We need some professional growth and development in the staff here in the organization and I don’t know that if we make them go pay for if they are going to go do it.

VP **Pehrson** asks then what is the point of us throwing money at them if they are going to be not worried about it now; I mean I understand that it is an incentive program, if they are not going to do it on their own. ED **Saffold** mentions that what if they cannot afford to do it themselves in regards to paying for school. VP **Pehrson** states that she affords to pay for school herself being that she is a student by working several jobs to do so.

President **Prado** states that just to touch on both of those issues he understands the perspective that both people are coming from we should try not to look at the responsibility of the individual but look at the opportunity for staff to grow. Give employees the opportunity, because we really value their services.

EVP **Caldwell** states that this is an investments of us, if we can get more bang for the buck and have 5 people take a class at Chabot, then have 1 person take a class here. I say I am all for it as long as the theory is that people are taking those courses that will help them with their job at hand. For instance, John taking classes in event planning this is going to benefit him because of what he does, I don’t think the whole perception minus just to give free classes to people.

VP **Pehrson** states that she does value the FTE I just wanted to bring up the other side of the argument.

VP **Menon** states that if he understands the system right you can get your classes paid for around 6 hours once you are at junior status, do we know how many staff or percentage of staff are interested, or lack of interest. Also was it driven by the cost or is it just a general lack of interest.

ED **Saffold** states that I’ll admit I have not done a complete study, but the people that we did speak to were interested in going back to school at Eastbay. But if you want me to conduct a more formalized study and bring my findings back to the group I will do so. I have three people as of now who has asked me. There is another piece that speaks on professional development with supervisor approval. There is opportunity for staff to have professional development; highlighting VP Pehrson points indicating that if there is something that we need them to go to we can just send them. What I was proposing is not necessarily everything they are going to be doing will benefit them when it comes to ASI but what half of what they do does so. One of the two classes they take has to be a direct benefit and if staff will be tasking one course then that must directly benefit them in regards to ASI.

VP **Menon** asks for clarification on if staff can take classes anywhere else or if they are going to be restricted to just to East Bay.

ED **Saffold** states that he does not like that they are restricted just to East Bay and that they must be at Junior Standing before you can take advantage of the educational benefit. This implies that the staff should have gone to so much college before they can take classes here at East Bay. I’m concerned with the benefit distributed equally stating that staff can only get an educational benefit if they have demonstrated the specific status and this does not seem fair. So why should the person who is trying and struggling to get into school does not get to take the advantage but they all got hired by the same cooperation.

The way it works now is that we are paying full for classes for staff, who are at junior standing, but if the policy was changed it would be half for the staff who takes classes. This would negatively be affecting someone like John due to him getting his education paid for by ASI. But the barrier of entry would go down. What are we spending on it now what are we going to set aside for this in the budget. I didn’t see this line item anywhere in last year’s budget. We looked at six months actuals on what we actually spent then we proposed the budget that was hidden somewhere of the administration portion of the budget. But this year we would have to be in tenth where we would put it. And each department would need to put it in as a line item in the budget. If we are making a commitment to professional development growth there has to be professionally development funds set aside for the staff in the budget, which I plan to do any way.

President **Prado** asks if this is just applicable to professional staff members, ED Saffold states that yes it is this is included in the benefit package.

VP **Laluan** asks Stan Hebert if the University has a similar policy of the Education Benefit Policy that’s being proposed.

**Hebert** states that the employees of the University and their children are allowed to get fee waivers for attending CSU’s not for attending any other University. For an employee every quarter their schedule must be approved by their supervisor. There some guidelines that should be in line with some professional area. This is a CSU benefit that is system wide.

ED **Saffold** states that the whole principle goal of ASI was to have their benefit package equal to or a little bit better than the ones of the University. Our Benefits package is very conferrable. It’s a CSU piece that doesn’t occur an additional cost.

VP **Pehrson** asks what if they would want to take a class at St. Maries in which the cost is three times the amount than here.

ED **Saffold** states that we would only pay the amounts that are equivalent to what they would pay if they were attending school here. Which is $2,005.00 is all you can get and it will not be unrestricted.

1. **Emergency Information Item-Adoption of Travel Policy**

President **Prado** yields the floor to Executive Director Randy Saffold who highlights the following:

ED **Saffold** states that basically the policy stated that we are kind of following and we have a credit card policy we have not formally adopted the travel policy or the credit card policy as ASI’s own policies. We vote to do a slightly modified version of the policies and then we approve them through resolutions. So that we have officially stated that we have a policy on travel and a policy on credit card use so that we do not continue to get audit findings.

VP **Pehrson** states that both policies are some things that I will be bringing up to and it will be really easy to change it into the words of ASI and bring it up and correct the wording.

1. **Emergency Information Item- Adoption of Credit Card Policy**

President **Prado** thanks ED Saffold for briefing the committee on both policies.

1. **Round Table Remarks**

**Caldwell:** states that this week I have contacted our perspective two new board members to let them know our meeting time next week and the whole process of them are being approved.Once the board votes assuming that they vote both onthen they will take their oath of office and they can sit at the table at the Board Meeting. I sent out the agenda stating that the Personnel Committee made a recommendation and this is the process that was taking when picking the two board members and this was the end result. Read over it briefly. Also want to say thank you Stan Hebert for arranging his travel plans. He did write up a report of the travel being that ASI did help sponsor part of my travels.

**Laluan:** states that Browns budget was released for us. I know that Director of Legislative Affairs Frank Quintana will be working hard for advocacy in May.

ED **Saffold** states that in addition to the policies above there need to be an audit committee established and I would ask Lyla to work together as an internal piece. Which board members and committee members would want to sit on this committee? Three administrators and three board members will sit on this committee. I went to AOA this past week. They did a piece on ethics, I thought I was one of the most ethical people ever then again I found out I wasn’t. I want you guys to know that I will do better, encourage the Board to have a discussion on ethics. They talked a lot about the budget the new November triggers. The chancellor stated that we should really think about working efficiently and effectively as possible. We are looking into our budget and what we do. Ask Managers to look at their departments and decide what the waste is going to. CSSA, I decided to become the California AOA regional representative. I have no idea what that means but no one else raised their hand in the room. It was assigned the night before I had dinner with the Executive Director for CSSA. I planned on doing a lot of CSSA work anyway. Hopefully I haven’t gotten myself into a position in which I will cost ASI a lot of money. I really want to support ASI a little bit more and get to know a little bit more about this. CSSA is planning a major trip to Sacramento and this year the focus is different they’re not just trying to take students they are trying to take canvasses. They want presidents, vice presidents, faculty, staff, and students as united front. They want buses of people going to Sacramento to really talk about how we can cut people $750,000,000.00 and expect California to worth anything then have another trigger of $200,000,000.00, it just makes no sense. Want to challenge all of us to be involved and active. Challenged us as administrators to start going out into the community and start telling people about they are doing to hire education and what the impact can be to education itself. Club funding, as you guys know I have given some of you the briefing, some of you may not be as far in the loop. As we move forward this year we have had a bit of an interesting situation happen, one of the clubs has tried to take all of their money out of ASI. The question was can they do that. We didn’t actually have the answer. We now know that with Executive Order 68, the campus is in charge of clubs/orgs recognition and auxiliaries are not supposed to be determining the activities of student organizations. Someone has to be responsible for student orgs; they could not determine who was responsible for the clubs. ASI would not be the banker for student orgs, all of the funds will be kept at the cashier station. It’s their money; if they fundraised it goes into their account. SLLP will work with them to determine how they can get the money out of the account. Almost none of the process change with the exception with the final approval giving from the finance committee it no long will go to Fe it will go to SLLP. What they are proposing is by doing this; they are going to be able to give money a lot

quicker. Once they are approved, the clubs/orgs will not have to wait for checks to be cut the money will come much faster. Marguerite’s team will enable clubs/orgs to go shopping and go to the cashier’s office and get reimbursed the same day. ASI is not able to be so efficient due to the books that are being kept. We were spending all the money up front, now we don’t spend the money up front the University spends the money upfront then we get invoiced back after SLLP have reconciled all receipts. This will make the process on the ASI side a lot better. It makes it more efficient and effective, it’s a great move for ASI and that we will have less processing time and also it will cost us less money. Probably not fantastic for our accounting department who will have less to do, the question becomes what their new role will be because they won’t be doing as much. Maybe they won’t need student assistants because of the professional staff not having so much work; which is good timing due to the student assistant graduating and finding new employment. Finally, unfortunately I want to inform the committee that we have had a little incident somewhere in 2006-2008 where we had a California Education Grant; apparently we were giving more money than what we supposed to have based on some noncompliance issues that we had. We are in the process of being sued for $50,200.00 of which it’s looking like money that we have never paid them back. In 2008 we received an invoice that we never paid back and we are being penalized per year that we did not pay after that. Plus some legal fees that they inquired. All we are fighting for this point is not have to pay the interest and legal fees. If they really did not make effort to receive payment, they only sent out one invoice in 2008. One of thing that came in today, Jacqueline Jennings reverted over to the other counsel Andrew Sumner because he doesn’t really give informed that he only does litigation for personnel reasons this isn’t a personnel reason quite yet. So I am having a little question on which of our legal representative is to answer this within 30 days. Andrew Sumner to assign somebody else on his firm. My goal is to do this as inexpensive as possible. I have to get back with you guys, I thought that Andrew Sumner will be handling this but apparently this is not going to be the case. VP **Menon** asks if there is an actual lawyer for this. ED **Saffold** states that there is a lawyer but there isn’t a lawyer for this specific case. We may have to get someone assigned from his firm and if he does not want to do it, Jacqueline will then have to get someone assigned from her firm but we will need somebody to respond to this within 30 days. Best case scenario is we don’t pay this in a lump sum, also fighting to do this in installments. Worst case scenario is if they ask for all the funds at one time and we have to pay it. The goal is to go for alternative consolation; we want the lawyers to handle the whole thing. In the process of doing staff evaluations, 90% of the staff is doing self-evaluations which would then compare with my evaluations; performances for the upcoming year, with major evaluations beginning May, June, and July.

**Hebert**: states that he thanks the board on agreeing to attend some of the sessions for chief financial officer forums next week, as you all know this is an important one. Good to have that participation. Part of the efforts to decrease the retention for transfer students is that we increased activities including workshops and tables. This last for the first two weeks of the quarter. Thanks again to ED **Saffold** for inviting me to the AOA conference. Basically its be an army of advocacy and not so much to go to Sacramento they see people coming by every day to protest something, people do this every day. Not to diminish the efforts that all of us has made for our advocacy of higher education. Suggestions were a bylaw referendum, where you go and get your own initiatives that basically state public education will be funded this way. We are not asking for someone to please stop increasing fees for students but saying the voters has decided this is how it would be done. You will get the attention of the legislature real quick. Everybody can support they don’t have to go to Sacramento to do it they can just sign the petition. Next Friday January 20th, 2012 is the pack the gym night.

**Pehrson**: states that she wants to make it known that Internal Affairs Committee is meeting 4:00pm to 6:00pm January 19th, 2012. Also I have breakfast for dinner in the works; I have a budget for an outside caterer that is less than the budget used for that the previous year. I think it will be better food cheaper, hopefully if we can find some room to fund that.

**Prado**: states that he is really excited to get this quarter started and executing some objectives, this past week I have met with Valerie who works in the peer mentor program. Discussed how we would have the classroom campaign and awareness campaigns. Allowing us to go into the classroom as well as advertising ASI events and ASI brand to the GS class and putting up posters we made for specific events. We spoke pretty candidly about that also just a reminder, if you have people on the committee make sure you send out the formal notifications to the members that have been approved for the committees. I like that ED Saffold put the emphasis on having people go to Sacramento, the reason most important issue is to try to combat the tuition increase the most serious and significant way as possible. Get students to get onto the busses and go down to the state legislature and protest. He also is looking forward to this quarter this is the single most important quarter of the year.

1. **Adjournment**

**Motion: () to adjourn meeting at 1:29pm**

**Motion Carries.**
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