



ASI Senate Meeting

Minutes

2011- 2012:12 Thursday, March 8, 2012, 3:00 –5:00 PM, BSC, 2nd Floor, Ursa Minor

I. PRELIMINARIES

A. Call to Order

1. Chair Matthew Stafford called Senate 2011-2012:12 to order at 3:00pm

B. Quorum Check

1. Voting Members:

Matthew Stafford, Vice President
Johnathan Jianu, President – **Excused Tardy**
Gabe Barrios, Agriculture Senator
Evin Coukos, Business Senator
Cristina Aceves, CEIS Senator
Cristina Saca, CLASS Senator
Hae Yeon Kang, CCHM Senator
Rebecca Unitt, ENV Senator
Olaleye Olayinka, Engineering Senator
Pulkit Jain, Science Senator
Alicia Vajid, Senator-At-Large (MCC), Senator Pro Tempore
Alicia Martin, Senator-At-Large (EIC)
Shireen Amin, Senator-At-Large (Greek)
Dylan Devlin, Senator-At Large (IHC)

2. Advisors:

Dr. Rebecca Gutierrez Keeton, Advisor
Cora M. Culla, Executive Director

3. Non-voting Liaisons:

Anthony Juarez, Attorney General
Brian Poirrier, Treasurer
Vacant, Academic Senate Rep.
Rachel Dominguez, Staff Council Rep. – **Excused Absent**
Janeth Rodriguez, Alumni Association Rep.
Brian Crane, Bronco Athletics Association Rep. – **Excused Tardy**

C. Approval of Minutes

1. As there were no objections the minutes for February 23, 2012 were approved as written by the chair

D. Pledge of Allegiance

E. Agenda Changes

1. Matt moved to strike H. Reports due to the length of today's meeting

ASI SENATE MEETING

March 8, 2012

Page - 2

2. Matt moved to have Discussion Items before I. Open Forum due to the time sensitive presentations by student groups requesting money from the NP & A fund
3. Matt stated that the Recommendations from the ASI Finance Committee will actually be Action Items at this meeting because action was taken on them at the last Finance Committee meeting and they were included in Brian's report from the previous senate meeting - he mentioned having a senate bill that allowed for that change if anyone would like to reference it
4. Matt also struck G. Introduction of Guests and stated that anyone who would like to speak during the open forum portion of the meeting would introduce themselves at that time and first line up to the side of the tables
5. Matt made a motion to approve the agenda as amended, seconded by Cristina Saca
6. Matt called the vote: 13/0/0, motion passed

F. Financial Status – Given by Brian Poirrier (attachment)

1. ASI Total Revenue	\$ 5,237,715.00
2. ASI Total Expenses	\$ 3,086,358.00
3. ASI – NP & A Account Balance	\$ 113,535.00
4. ASI – Tutoring Retention Account Balance	\$ 7,864.00
5. ASI Prior Year's I Reserves	\$ 152,640.00
6. ASI Prior Year's II Reserves	\$ 109,169.00
7. ASI Prior Year's III Reserves	\$ 253,698.00

G. Introduction of Guests

1. Struck in agenda changes due to the large size of the gallery

H. Reports (not given verbally at the meeting)

1. ASI Executive Director – Cora M. Culla *(attachment)
 - a. Recreation Center Update
 - b. Midnight Madness
 - c. BSC Space Study
2. ASI Advisor – Dr. Rebecca Gutierrez Keeton – no report
3. Academic Senate Report – vacant
4. Staff Council Rep. – no report
5. Alumni Rep. – Janeth Rodriguiz – no report
6. Athletics Rep. – Brian Crane – no report
7. Senator Pro Tempore – Alicia Vajid *(attachment)
 - a. Outreach Tour
 - b. F & O Committee

MCC

 - a. MCC Quarterly – Night of Colors
 - b. The Students' Bill 11-12
8. Attorney General – Anthony Juarez – no report
9. Treasurer – Brian Poirrier – no report
10. President – Johnathan Jianu – no report
11. Vice President – Matthew Stafford – no report
12. Senate Reports

lower airfare their personal contribution dropped lower than the level of most clubs

- d. A question/answer session took place that included that the extra \$500 would help keep their out of pocket costs lower because food was not included in the expenses, their fundraising should be considered in relation to their personal contribution and that not only was the fundraising effort to be commended but their ability to receive outside sponsorship and that those accomplishments should be rewarded. Their freshmen involvement was also outlined.
- e. Matt made a motion to award the club their original request of \$5,000, seconded by Cristina Saca
- f. Matt called the vote: 11/0/2, motion passed

2. Pre Vet Club \$3,458.00 NP & A

Brian explained that the ASI Finance Committee did recommend funding the full amount of this club's request

- a. A representative of the Pre Vet Club explained the details of the 2012 American Pre-Veterinary Medical Association Symposium (APVMA) being held in North Carolina in March and included the benefits from attending the lectures and labs and also learning the strenuous application process as well as the networking and leadership opportunities
- b. She reviewed the cost breakdown, mentioned that their fundraising was not as high and stated that their high personal contributions hopefully compensated and she explained their system called Paw Points that gave points for fundraising in relation to cutting personal contribution
- c. A question/answer session took place that included what they would bring back to Cal Poly after the conference a wealth of notes, information and the credit to Cal Poly as one of two West Coast schools to be represented amongst primarily East Coast schools
- d. Alicia Vajid made a motion to approve the request of \$3,458.00, seconded by Pulkit
- e. Matt called the vote: 12/0/1, motion passed

3. Structural Engineers Association CPP (SEACCP) \$4,500.00 NP & A

Brian explained that the ASI Finance Committee had chosen to recommend \$4,500 to the senate rather than the original \$5,000 that SEACCP requested due to the \$1,080 that was per diem for food and was adjusted to \$580

- a. Joel Savage, SEACPP Seismic Design Team Captain, explained the details of the ninth annual Seismic Design Competition (SDC) being held in Tennessee in April and included the purpose, the details of the seismic design competition and this year's design which was a prototype of a balsa wood skyscraper
- b. He reviewed the costs which included airfare on the red eye as the trip will be during the week and everyone will already miss classes so they were trying to minimize how many. He added details regarding their fundraising efforts, which due to the extreme design time hours, was a challenge

however they were at \$1,200 of their goal of \$2,000 and they were also working on corporate sponsorships of \$3,000 that they hoped to have completed by the trip. He noted that after their club sponsorship of \$1,500 they would have a funding gap of \$8,227 and added that they hoped that ASI could help them.

- c. A question/answer session took place that included several recommendations to allot the entire amount requested as this team is a great concept and makes Cal Poly proud by participating in such a rigorous competition and how they work with their freshmen students and provide them with a special undergraduate opportunity as this is actually at graduate level
- d. Matt made a motion to fund the club their original request of \$5,000, seconded by Olaleye
- e. Matt called the vote: 7/4/1, motion passed

I. PRELIMINARIES – REOPENED

Matt asked that anyone in the gallery, who would like to speak on a topic, please form a single file line on his right so that everyone at the senate table would be able to hear them speak. He asked everyone to please state their name first and he gave a two minute speaking limit.

I. Open Forum

1. **Ed Sparks** - stated that he was one of the fundraisers for the Motor Sports Club and was worried about club budgets being cut. It would hurt the branding of the Cal Poly name because clubs brand out and ASI brands in and he knows this because the clubs are out in the community, just as he is when he does presentations to local Chamber of Commerce organizations. So our leverage is in our branding and our branding is in our clubs. Secondly, part of the budget deals with the Children's Center and he feels that people with kids have the hardest time, many are single, and they often have no other support – so to take any money from that section of the school should be crossed off. He stands with the future of Cal Poly, the people in preschool, so no funding should be cut to anyone who cares for children. In closing, don't cut the club contributions as it will hurt Cal Poly's image.
2. **Ali Elachkar** - stated that he was the Political Science Club President and handed out a list of some of the thoughts that he had regarding the Students' ASI Bill. He noted that he had spoken to his council and some of the clubs and they were not opposed to a dramatic increase to BEAT, however they would like to see club funding restored to the 2005-06 levels as they believe that was the year of the major cut. Also, the budget given to BEAT should be tied to something, possibly event attendance. He explained that he had worked for the math and science tutoring two years ago and made some suggestions as to a funding increase from \$3.77 to \$5.00 for the students that are served by them as the budget cuts have impacted them now that state funding is gone.
3. **Elizabeth** - stated that she was the President of the Economics club and she agreed with the previous comments. She added the point that currently the budget mandates a certain percentage to go to clubs and this bill would eliminate this requirement and only guarantee the money that is supposed to go to ASI. A long

time ago, students voted to have money deducted from their dues on the condition that they would be guaranteed to receive some of it back through allocations. She commented that she thinks that it is wrong not to provide that guarantee that the money will come back to the students.

4. **Rana Abuershaid** – stated that she was a programming chair in BEAT and that she was in support of the bill for the reason that their budget was cut the last year by possibly as much as half and BEAT has had students approach them and ask why events like Broncofusion are not as great. She added that was because they do not have the funds to provide the show or performer that these students want to see. BEAT would have much higher attendance at events if they could bring in the performers that students want to see. She stated that clubs are not getting their money cut, it is just a better way of spending the money. BEAT is an organization with people that are volunteering their time and effort to put on these programs and they try to spend the money as efficiently as possible and do not waste any. By getting these new funds, BEAT would be able to put on new programs that would draw more people into our campus, especially since we are labeled as a commuter school, and we would like to be more diverse and yet united. So it would be great if we got these funds.
5. **Esther Gonzalez** – stated that she was a student parent who had a child at age 16 and made the choice to attend Cal Poly just because of the Children’s Center, not because of BEAT’s events or her major, but because she needed a campus that could provide what she needed for her child. She believes that only parents know how hard it really is to look for locations for child care and she has looked all the way from El Monte to Pomona for quality child care that will work with her school schedule. She explained that she entered CPP as a freshman and her GPA dropped from 3.7 to 2.7 in half a year because she was not able to attend all of her classes as the Children’s Center did not offer programs for infants or toddlers. She believes that ASI, rather than cutting funding from the center, they should support them so that they can enlarge and offer these important programs to assist student parents and become self-sustainable from there. Please reconsider this bill as there are many student parents, both men and women, who all need the support of a center to be able to continue their education.
6. **Yvonne Trujillo** – stated that she was a Business major and a student parent who has attended a number of colleges, both at community college level and UC. She feels that there are not enough resources for student parents and has met with many departments on this campus to advocate for this. Some of them include: Dr. Keeton, Dora Lee, Yvonne Bailey, Johnathan Jianu, Disability Center, Women’s Center and currently she has an appointment scheduled to meet with President Ortiz. It is difficult because it is more challenging for a student parent to balance student life and family life. She noted that in addition to students, both faculty and staff use the center and some of those are also students as well. She stated that she is against the bill and the budget should not be cut to the center because more rather than less resources are needed for student parents. The money is taken out of her tuition by ASI and so she says don’t cut the Children’s Center and provide more resources for future student parents.

7. **Rebecca Gomez** – stated that she was a co-chair for Mecha, a club under the Multicultural Council, and also a part of Gender, Ethnic and Multicultural Studies which is part of the CEIS Council as well. She does not believe that allocating most of the funds to ASI BEAT is going to do anything for students like herself, as she came from a high school that did not prepare her for college. She stated that the cultural centers provide her with a place and feeling to call home on campus, as well as these other cultural clubs. She does not feel that giving money to ASI BEAT will keep up with these needs to welcome someone from her type of background. The cultural centers keep up with providing for the future by having youth events, which the Native American Center and the Cesar Chavez Center just held which bring people together that might not have had the same opportunities that everyone else has had. She does not feel that this bill should be passed.
8. **Monique Chavez** – stated that she was a student parent and a veteran and her funding ran out this year so she does not have any money left so the money that the school provides for the Children’s Center really helps people in her case who don’t work and dedicate themselves to full time school. It is very hard to balance time between the priorities of your child and the 16 units that she has. She does not think that ASI should cut any funding from them because they really help.

Matt explained to the gallery that they will address the concerns that were mentioned when Action Item C. is covered in the meeting

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS – REOPENED

B. Financial Plan for the Recreation Center

1. Cora explained that they had just gotten word from the University Chancellor’s office that ASI may need to plan on the May Board of Trustees meeting rather than the July meeting which is usually a compressed meeting for only one day. If we were to miss the agenda of the July meeting, it would cause a set back of the schedule for construction of the Recreation Center.
2. She stated that this meant everything that has to be accomplished needs to be done about two months earlier and so this will affect the workload of the staff and all of the coordination that needs to be done in terms of senate and university approval
3. She pointed out that the spreadsheet on the overhead reflected the projections for the financial plan from today through 2021, as it is about a ten year span that is expected. Included were several important notes so that everyone could understand the assumptions for the line items. These were available in the senate presentation folder on the SAN if anyone wanted to review it after the meeting. The Recreation Center would eventually be folded into the BSC but for now a distinction had been made to show revenue and expenses separately.
4. She made some broad assumptions:
 - a. The revenue projection equals the enrollment projections for the university, as a fee based organization, so the projections for the next two years were plugged into the model and she had already shared with the senate that the Chancellor’s office was planning on a 3% reduction in FTE enrollment for the

2013-14 year. Terri Belli was in the process of checking enrollment for future years to establish a solid projection for revenue.

- b. The expense projections include financial transfers, that are required by the Chancellor's office and the CSU system, to be made every year. For example, the spreadsheet shows the principal and interest of the bond obligations, repair and replacement costs and overhead expenses.
 - c. On the campus level ASI has to provide for operating expenses, equipment, salaries and wages, any capital equipment and other expenditures
5. Cora concluded that she was encouraging everyone to review the information saved in the SAN Shared folder, she acknowledged the hard work that Terri and Ivonne had put into this document so far as this was a work in progress so there may be revisions to the work that you will see. Please address any questions to Terri or herself.
 6. She added that after senate approval at the next senate meeting on April 5th they would need university approval and the Chancellor's office requires a 1 ½ month lead time so that this can be placed on the Trustee agenda for the May meeting

III. ACTION ITEMS

- A. Proposal to Transition to Online voting/ASI Elections Code (attachments)
 1. Matt recapped that over the last several senate meetings there had been discussion on both the transition to an online voting system and the necessary changes to the ASI Elections Code. He noted that the Rules and Policies Committee had approved the code at their meeting on March 2, 2012 and was now recommending it to the senate for approval. He added that Anthony would project it on the overhead so that they could move through the document, review the substantive changes and if there were any objections to the recommendation from R & P then a vote will be taken to approve that section with a final vote for the entire document at the end. He stated that this was time sensitive as it was a priority to adopt an Elections Code due to elections coming up soon.
 2. Anthony stated that everyone should have been able to review this by now as it was included in their agenda packet. He explained that there was a list of specific areas that R & P wanted the senate to discuss as a body and he would address each one of those areas, however if anyone wished to cover a specific area, please call attention to it.
 - a. **Section -Eligibility of Candidates for ASI General Elections**
 - Slates were removed, candidates will be running individually with the only ticket being the President and Vice President
 - **E.** - R & P Question: Is it sufficient for senators running to have a declared major in that college? Or should it be stated to include "as a major or a minor"?
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt asked if there were any objections to the requirement remaining as a major in the college – no objections
 - **D.** – Question: use and definition of the word "partner" and slates
 - Discussion ensued

- Matt asked if there were any objections to the word partner and the concept of eliminating slates - 1 objection
- Matt called a vote to affirm what was in the document: 12/1/0
- b. Section - Procedures for Filing for Write-In Candidacy for ASI General Elections**
 - Write-in candidates were allowed before because there were stricter timelines for printing the paper ballots. Now that we are moving to an electronic ballot system, not only will it not support this feature, but the removal of this option will encourage better timelines for candidates to know early on if they are choosing to run for office
 - R & P Question: approval to remove this option
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt asked if there were any objections to removing this section – no objections
- c. Section -Voting, B. Voting is by Online Vote**
 - Rebecca suggested an amendment be added here as #5 that would state that: “The method of voting may be changed in the event of an unforeseen problem.”
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt made a motion to add the wording that Rebecca suggested to the document, seconded by Alicia Vajid
 - Matt called the vote: 13/0/0, motion passed
- d. New Section – Special Elections**
 - Amanda explained that all of the areas in the document that reference special elections are being brought together in one area for easy reference
 - Matt established that this was a formatting change only
- e. Section – ASI Violations**
 - Susan Ashe, Elections Advisor, recapped the changes to this section: there was no division between major and minor violations, as that will be up to the discretion of the Elections Chair, possible outcomes of violations were given as examples and that this also applies to volunteers working with a candidate
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt asked if there were any objections to this section – no objections
- f. Section –Voting**
 - Anthony explained that the voting process would be electronic with a process set-up by I & IT for us
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt asked if there were any objections to this section – no objections
- g. Section – Campaign Endorsements for all ASI Elections**
 - Alicia Vajid summarized the last R & P meeting, as Anthony was absent from it, in that they had decided to keep individual endorsements

- Matt added that this did preserve the opportunity for organizations, clubs and societies on campus to endorse a candidate, as well as individuals
- It was stated that this was a disputed area in the R & P meetings, that required multiple votes, and that if the senate had any opinions to please voice them
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt made a motion to allow individual and campus organization endorsements, but removing the requirement that an organization have to be unanimous
 - Matt revoked his motion after input from Amanda that the 2009 code states this with the exception of the word “unanimous”
 - Matt made a new motion to keep individual and campus organizations in the existing code but strike the addition of the word “unanimous” that was added by R & P, seconded by Alicia Martin
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt kept his motion the same and called the vote: 9/2/1, motion passed
 - Anthony recommended that a voting member motion to make it a 2/3 vote
 - Cristina Saca made a motion to include that a 2/3 vote of an organization would be required for a candidate endorsement, seconded by Alicia Vajid
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt called the vote: 7/4/1, motion passed
 - Pulkit made a motion to strike individual endorsements
 - He deferred to Rebecca in pursuing the motion

Alicia Vajid made a motion to extend the meeting until all business was completed, seconded by Matt

Matt called the vote: 12/0/0, motion passed

- Rebecca pointed out that the code includes the ASI Student Government office as a drop off point for documents throughout the process. She recommended that it be removed throughout and state instead that the location would be determined by the Elections Chair due to the need to keep the process as impartial as possible.
- Rebecca also pointed out the need to address the Appeal Procedure as there was no longer an ASI Judiciary and the code currently calls for an ASI Senate member and an ASI Cabinet member to be chosen by the advisor for the appeal committee. She noted that it was a political process with too much potential for bias to limit the advisor’s choice. She recommended that it state two student leaders at the discretion of the advisor be chosen.

h. Section – Throughout the Elections Code

- Based on Rebecca’s earlier recommendation:
 - Matt made a motion to amend anywhere it said a location in the code for document drop off, it be changed to “decided by the Elections Chair”, seconded by Alicia Vajid
 - Matt called the vote: 11/0/0, motion passed

i. Section - Appeal Procedure

- Based on Rebecca’s earlier recommendation:
 - Matt made a motion to amend the appeal procedure and remove the words: “*Of the two student leaders, one must be from the ASI Cabinet and the other from the ASI Senate.*”, seconded by Alicia Vajid
 - Matt called the vote: 10/1/1, motion passed

j. Section – Campaign Endorsements for all ASI Elections

- The meeting resumed with Pulkit restating his motion that had been tabled until Rebecca’s recommendations were discussed
 - Pulkit made a motion to strike individual endorsements, seconded by Cristina Aceves
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt called the vote: 4/7/1, motion failed

Anthony clarified that there should be no abstaining in the voting process unless there was a clear conflict of interest

k. Section – Campaigning for all ASI Elections

- There was a request to examine the restriction of a current ASI Senator to campaign for a candidate
 - Discussion ensued
 - Alicia Martin made a motion to strike the wording: “*Current senators shall not campaign for any running candidate(s) and shall uphold an unbiased professionalism towards any ASI Elections.*”, seconded by Cristina Saca
 - Discussion ensued
 - Matt called the vote: 9/3/0, motion passed

l. The Elections Code as an entire document

- Matt stated that he believed that the proposed Elections Code had been thoroughly reviewed
 - Alicia Vajid made a motion to approve the Elections Code as amended, seconded by Olaleye
 - Matt called the vote 12/0/0, motion passed

B. Senate Resolution – To provide feedback and guidance to the Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) Advisory Committee

1. Dylan gave a brief recap of the details that had been presented at the last senate meeting, when this was a Discussion Item, regarding the IRA budget not matching

up to the requests for funding . Matt added that this resolution was a non-binding statement of support.

2. Dylan made a motion to approve the resolution, seconded by Cristina Saca
3. Cora stated that she was not present at the last senate meeting and she might recommend that an inflationary factor be added to the resolution. She suggested where the dollar amount was noted that the wording: *“and subsequently, subject to an annual inflationary adjustment”* be added
4. Matt asked if Dylan wanted to amend his motion
5. Dylan yielded his original motion and made a new motion to approve the resolution and amend it by adding the wording suggested by Cora, seconded by Cristina Saca
6. Matt called the vote: 12/0/0, motion passed

C. Budget Bill – The Students’ ASI Bill (attachments)

1. At Matt’s request, Anthony, Brian and Johnathan responded to each of the questions and concerns that had been expressed earlier in the meeting during Open Forum
2. Brian reviewed the research process that he explained two weeks ago to the senate when this item was a Discussion Item. He explained that the action that would be voted on today would be any amendments to the bill and if it was going to be placed on the Spring election ballot for the student body to take final action and decide how they would like to see their fees utilized.
3. He noted the items from the 2002-03:02 Student Opportunities Initiative, that currently mandates the ASI funding allocations, that were not changing in the proposed Students’ ASI Bill
 - a. The funding will still be available to clubs and programs to request, for example: to travel across country for an event and brand Cal Poly Pomona
 - b. The mid-year budget request process will stay the same in that a club would fill out the budget request packet and submit it to the council, then they would be referred to the ASI Finance Committee
 - c. The amount of funding received and kept by councils will remain the same, as currently the councils keep 25% of their allocation and allocate 75% to clubs. The councils will still receive their 25% allocation while the clubs will request from the ASI Finance Committee for access to the amount allocated to clubs.
 - d. The LRC Tutoring allocation will remain the same and continue to adjust based on inflation
 - e. The Athletics Fee and allocation will remain the same and be adjusted by inflation
4. Brian explained the areas of the 2002-03:02 Student Opportunities Initiative that were proposed changes in the Students’ ASI Bill
 - a. The removal of the annual budget process between councils and clubs
 - b. To move away from funding operational costs such as T-shirts, food and printing costs in order to fund the events that the clubs would like to hold
 - c. Clubs would have access to their annual funding earlier in the year as the earliest that they receive funding with the current system was December to as late as February

- d. An increase of funding to the New Programs and Augmentation Reserve Account (NP & A) as the calculation would be 5% of all ASI fee activity revenue less the BSC and Athletics portions
 - e. An increase of funding to the Bronco Event and Activities Team (BEAT) as there would be a 15% floor level of ASI fee activity revenue to BEAT. An approximation of the numbers would be about \$250,000 to BEAT next year, which to put in perspective could be compared with the proposed request from the Children's Center of about \$247,000 for next year.
 - f. A small change to the method of calculation of the annual inflation to the ASI Fee based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). It is currently based on the most recent month in the prior year and now a small wording change clarifies that it is to be based on an annual average of the CPI. The reasoning is because we operate year-round and not just in one month of the year.
 - g. An annual decrease to the Children's Center which was not to either harm or shut down their program, but to create an incentive to become self-sustainable
 - h. The removal of inflationary increases to Diversity Group months as the 2002-03:02 bill did not actually intend that they receive inflationary increases as the funding was intended for programming, just like the allocations to IHC and University Village. He noted that the first draft of this proposed bill rolled their funding from the current amount of \$7,380 back to the original \$5,000. However, due to the feedback received, the draft of the bill being discussed today included an amendment that allocated \$7,500 to the Diversity Programs each year, which was a small increase, and also clarified that it would not be tied to an annual inflationary increase.
5. Brian concluded that the benefits of the bill included having dedicated funds for events and programs for clubs to request from, the distribution of those funds in a timely manner without biases, increased cohesion between councils and clubs to ease some of the tension between them due to the annual process, to create greater consistency in allocating funds, outreach to more of the student body that were not members of clubs, more resources available to BEAT which would also provide more opportunities at large events for clubs to fundraise and do outreach for new members. He added that there was also a component of raising the level of the college experience at large events that would lead to a stronger alumni network. He also noted that this was in line with the campus master plan, of over the next five to ten years of doubling the population of resident life students to move away from the commuter campus identity.
6. A question and answer session with discussion and a variety of perspectives ensued that included:
- Clubs will be able to request larger amounts through the ASI Finance Committee – higher than the council limits
 - Concern that councils will lose their influence over clubs and attendance at meetings

- Clubs will still approach councils to move forward their request and could be denied by them
 - The impact on the Spring budget process if this bill is passed
 - Once the initial budget process is completed based on the current system, a second process would be completed to reflect the changes that would occur if the bill is passed – this will be verified with the ASI legal counsel
 - How would the lack of inflationary adjustment impact the Heritage month programs in 10 years
 - There is an option to modify that area of the bill with a 2/3 senate approval if programs change significantly
 - Clarify what the alternative funding for the Children’s Center is in relation to being self-sufficient
 - There is a committee that is currently meeting that is working with an architect to define what an expanded center would look like in the future and also is in the process of identifying possible donors for alternate forms of funding for the Children’s Center program if expanded and relocated to become more self-sufficient
 - Clarify the legal responsibility of ASI to the Children’s Center
 - It is not a mandated group, so as an annually budgeted group, their funding is at the discretion of the senate during the ASI annual budget process
 - All CSU campuses have a Children’s Center, each relationship between the center, the ASI and the university is different, however, part of our ASI’s agreement with the CSU Board of Trustees it is to help operate facilities like the Children’s Center on campus
 - As the Diversity Groups are receiving a fixed amount, it was recommended that it be tied to an inflationary adjustment to protect the quality of the programming
 - Concern that as the highest grant funding recipient on campus, the Children’s Center may not be able to raise more alternative funds which could lead to not being able to stay alive as a viable program if not supported by ASI and the university
 - The increase to BEAT’s funding would provide for additional collaborations and partnerships between clubs and BEAT which becomes a benefit to the clubs by increasing their participation in larger events and getting their names out to the campus population
 - Some of the concerns noted regarding club behavior would be solved if the club treasurers received better training, whether the bill passes or not - but it would also lead to understanding how to best access funding from ASI
 - How does the bill address if the Children’s Center’s declining funding formula should be changed if they are in financial jeopardy
 - At a rate of change this slow it should not jeopardize their program
7. Shireen stated that the Greek Council had grown a lot over the time period since 2002-03:02 was passed that set the current mandated annual allocations and she thought that they were now unfair. She made a motion to amend **Article III,**

- Section II Fee Allocations, A. i., ii. and iii.** and change the allocation percentage to one third for each of the At-large Councils, seconded by Johnathan
8. Discussion ensued
9. Matt called the vote: 4/7/1, motion failed
10. Alicia Martin asked that they follow Dr. Keeton's suggestion to move through the document by sections as this system was erratic
11. Matt asked Brian to systematically move through the significant changes
12. **Article III, Section II, Fee Allocations, A and B** - Brian explained that 75% of the annual allocation formerly given to councils to allocate to clubs in the annual budget process has been removed from this section. The same 25% allocation for councils to retain for council events, that they have previously received, remains in this section.
- The full 75% removed from this section did not move to NP & A to be available to clubs through the ASI Finance Committee as some funds were diverted to other areas

Matt announced to the gallery that if anyone would like a copy of this bill it was available in the ASI Student Government office. Also, if you would like to submit your own proposal to the ASI Senate for consideration, that is possible and with the approved amount of signatures you can by-pass the senate and place your own initiative on the ballot as long as you check with the ASI Attorney General to make sure it is consistent with the ASI By-Laws.

- A portion of the 75% will go to ASI BEAT and the significant balance will go to the NP & A account to be accessed by clubs from the ASI Finance Committee – however, ASI BEAT is mandated to partner with organizations to provide programming so it does also come back around to the clubs through ASI BEAT
13. **Article III, Section II, Fee Allocations, D** - Brian explained that in 2002-03 the annual allocation to the Diversity Programs was \$5,000 each with an adjustment for annual inflation. In the new bill the annual amount is \$7,500 to each group without an annual inflation adjustment because that will lead to our fixed costs outspending our allocated costs. The councils do not have this issue because their rate is tied into enrollment.
- It was recommended that the Diversity Groups receive an inflationary increase so that the quality of the programming does not decline due to inflation
 - Mandated groups cannot come to the ASI Finance Committee
14. Cristina Aceves made a motion to add the annual inflationary adjustment to **Article III, Section II, Fee Allocations, D, d.** , seconded by Olaley
15. Discussion ensued
16. Matt called the vote: 7/5/0, motion passed
17. **Article III, Section III, Annually Budgeted Group Limits, A** – Brian and Matt recapped that the annual allocation to ASI BEAT has fluctuated in the past, so this section would ensure that they were allocated a minimum of 15% of the total ASI fee revenue in the annual budget. Matt asked if there were any objections to this section remaining in the bill. There was one objection.
- How is ASI BEAT going to fulfill the mission of the CSU and promote programs for a quality education

- It is ASI's responsibility to provide the programs and services to the students of Cal Poly that the university is not providing and this floor percentage would ensure that programming could reach out to the entire fee paying population on campus and help establish the identity of ASI and involve a larger number of students in the activities
 - A portion of BEAT's responsibility is to recognize and establish what creative programs and events the campus would like to see organized each year and to reach out to clubs that would like to partner with their event ideas
 - BEAT works hard for the entire campus and the more funding that they have, the higher the quality of their events will be for everyone and they will be able to reach a larger population of students
 - Due to the size of the budget cuts to BEAT last year, they reduced the number of BEAT Chairs from 12 to 8 and also had to change their focus to include less variety
 - Bringing back a Diversity BEAT Chair is a good idea to explore for next year's administration
 - The titles for the BEAT Chairs do not prohibit having specific events such as Diversity, sometimes the titles are not utilized by the Secretary of Programs and Services to form the programming team for the year
18. Gabe made a motion to keep **Article III, Section III, A** in the bill, seconded by Cristina Saca
19. Discussion ensued and it was established that, as this was an entirely new bill and not an amendment to 2002-03:02, that it was not necessary to vote to approve sections that would remain in the bill as they would be voted on as a whole with the final senate vote. The motion on the table was no longer valid.
20. **Article III, Section III, Annually Budgeted Group Limits, B** – Matt recapped that this section stated that the Children's Center can be allocated a maximum of 12% of the total ASI fee revenue in the annual budget, to decrease 1% every year for eleven years unless a change is mandated by a student referendum
- What is the current allocation
 - The current year's allocation is at 13.8%
 - Consistency was encouraged in choosing how to modify this document, and all of the groups included in it across the board, by either choosing a 2/3 vote of the seated senate or a student referendum – discussion took place that weighed the pros and cons of empowering the senate to govern this document
 - It was pointed out that **Article IV Financial Stipulations & Guidelines, E** already applied the authority of 2/3 of the seated senate to change all of the mandatory dollar allocations and rates established for all organizations in the bill
 - Further discussion took place on the intent and the wording of **Article III, Section III, B,a** with regards to the removal of the mandate of the student wide referendum with a motion being made by Cristina Aceves, but no second was given

- Further discussion took place regarding how the change from 13.8% this year to a maximum of 12% funding allocation next year would change the services of the Children's Center
 - It was clarified that the Children's Center Alternative Funding Committee was organized for one year to identify alternative funding sources to promote self-sustainability for the program. They concluded their task and per the study that was completed the consultants, recommended that a new and larger center be built as there was a legal state maximum that the current center could not service more than 71 students, which put them close to their capacity with 64 students currently. Then a second committee was formed, the Child Care Center Planning Committee, that has been meeting this year and working with architects to identify state land where a larger center could be built.
 - The Children's Center also provides services to hundreds of students by satisfying observation hours and community service hours
21. Johnathan made a motion to remove from **Article III, Section III, B,a** the words: *"The percent of fee revenue maximum cap ceiling will be decreased each year until reaching 1% of total ASI fee revenue in eleven years, or"* which left *"Unless a change is mandated by a student wide referendum."*, seconded by Olaleye
- Discussion ensued
22. Alicia Vajid made a motion to **amend the motion on the floor** by changing the words *"student wide referendum"* to *"2/3 vote of the seated senate"*, seconded by Hae Yeon
- Discussion ensued
23. Matt called the vote: 9/3/0, motion passed
- Discussion ensued regarding the authority of future changes to **Article III, Section III, B, a** residing with the senate, as just amended in the last vote, as opposed to moving the authority back to a student referendum again
 - Several people clarified that this has been a very intense topic for the senate for the last several years and that it would be appropriate to now move it to the student body
24. Pulkit made a motion to amend the vote that was just taken and move back to giving the student body the authority to change this area rather than the senate due to the additional discussion that had just taken place, no second was given
- Further discussion ensued
 - It was pointed out that the ASI By-Laws state that the ASI Senate is responsible for voting on an annual budget and recommending the budget to the university president - the amendment to go back to a student referendum as the authority on this matter is inconsistent with the ASI By-Laws and creating a new structure that gives the student body authority to vote on an annual budget matter. Concern was also expressed over the timeline to have an approved ASI budget back from the university president by June 30th if this bill is passed with the future authority over this section in the hands of the student body.
 - It was pointed out that the 2002-03:02 Student Opportunities Initiative currently hampers the annual budget process as it allocates a

significant amount of fees to groups that the senate does not have authority over in the annual budget process – the new bill would redefine the guidelines for how ASI is governed in allocating resources, but the situation would be the same in that the ASI Senate does not make all of the decisions currently regarding the annual budgets when a bill is in place that takes precedence – the senate would continue to decide the annual budget for these two groups, BEAT and the Children’s Center, but would need to stay within the guidelines of the new bill rather than the old bill

- This section was not intended to remove the annual budget process for BEAT and the Children’s Center from the ASI senate, only to give the student body the authority to change the floor or the ceiling option/percentage with a referendum
 - It was clarified that it is in compliance with the ASI By-Laws to have the student body decide the guidelines in the bill through a referendum and that it does not dictate that a referendum decide these parameters every year but rather as long as the student body wants this bill to guide the senate
 - Several people gave the perspective that the student body elected the senators to represent them, be knowledgeable about these topics and do their job, so the authority in this bill should remain with the senate and not the student body
 - This bill is defining new parameters for the ASI Senate to operate within that will be decided by the student body if this is placed on a referendum – just as ten years ago the parameters that ASI has been operating within were decided when the student body passed the 2002-03:02 initiative – it does not mean that the senate will need to have a referendum every year to pass an annual budget and it does mean that the senators will be the authority approving the annual budgets each year
25. Evin made a motion to **remove the approved amendment** to Johnathan’s motion so that **Article III, Section III, B,a** would revert back to the wording of Johnathan’s original motion which was: to remove the words: *“The percent of fee revenue maximum cap ceiling will be decreased each year until reaching 1% of total ASI fee revenue in eleven years, or”* which left *“Unless a change is mandated by a student wide referendum.”* , seconded by Gabe
- Discussion ensued
 - It was suggested that if this bill should be approved in the May referendum, it not take effect for the 2012-13 fiscal year that would begin July 1, 2012 due to the potential time conflict with the annual budget timeline between now and June 30, 2012
 - The ASI legal counsel is being asked if the plan to have a second budget process move through the senate right after the initial one would be acceptable to shorten the timeline if this bill passes the referendum

- It was pointed out that it would take 600 student signatures to place an initiative on the ballot that would change this bill, leading to the possibility of additional referendums
 - That possibility exists now
 - It was clarified that it would take a percentage of the number of voters in the prior election to add an initiative to the ballot and the amount might be correct at 30%
26. Matt called the vote: 5/8/0, motion failed
27. Matt called to question Johnathan's original motion to remove the words *"The percent of fee revenue maximum cap ceiling will be decreased each year until reaching 1% of total ASI fee revenue in eleven years, or"* which left *"Unless a change is mandated by a student wide referendum."* from **Article III, Section III, B, a**
28. Matt called the vote: 10/3/0, motion passed
29. **Article III, Section IV, Annual Inflationary Adjustment, A, c** – Brian and Matt recapped that the method for figuring the inflationary adjustment changed from using the most recently published month of the prior year to utilizing an annual average. There were no objections to this portion of the bill.
30. **Article III, Section III, Annually Budgeted Group Limits, B** - reopened
- Concern was expressed at keeping this section in the bill as the question had not been addressed if the Children's Center can stay open and provide service to the 71 children they are currently licensed to enroll at a budget allocation not to exceed 12% when they are currently receiving 13.8% - as a part of ASI it would be the goal to keep them afloat until they were able to be self-sustainable
31. Johnathan made a motion to strike **Article III, Section III, B** from the bill with the rationale that the senate has not been given enough information to make an informed decision, seconded by Dylan
- It was clarified that if this section was removed from the bill then the allocation to the Children's Center would be addressed during the annual budget process
32. Matt called the vote: 12/1/0, motion passed
33. **Article IV Financial Stipulations & Guidelines, B** – Brian stated that this was a change to increase the NP & A funding to 5% of the ASI fee revenue
- Currently, this year about \$37,110 has been placed in NP & A and with the change the figure would be more like \$86,576, however it is difficult to compare because there is presently a complex formula to establish the current funding – not just a percentage
 - There were no objections to this portion of the bill
34. **Article IV Financial Stipulations & Guidelines, E** – Brian explained that for future administrations, this would give them the flexibility to adjust the mandatory allocations and rates with a 2/3 approval of the seated Senate. There were no objections to this portion of the bill.
35. **Article IV Financial Stipulations & Guidelines, F**
- It was pointed out that by stating that a club's request must go to their "respective council", that could be interpreted as the entire body of council representatives at a council meeting and that will slow up the process. As the

goal was to speed up the process, it would be a good idea to also add the option of the council executive board.

- It was clarified that the annual budget process will be removed from councils and clubs in this bill and that clubs will not apply to the ASI Finance Committee for an annual allocation. They will instead apply to the ASI Finance Committee for mid-year requests and they will be able to do that as soon as they have first been to their council.
 - Any new guidelines on how the mid-year process should be changed, if this senate bill passes the student referendum, would be handled in the 2012-13 ASI Financial Guidelines and Stipulations document that is the final phase of Budget Deliberations that will be approved in the upcoming 2012 Spring Quarter senate meetings. The senate would assess the changes needed to provide for an efficient process for clubs and the ASI Finance Committee.

36. Alicia Martin made a motion to add the words “*or council executive board*” after “*respective council*” in **Article IV, F**, seconded by Alicia Vajid

- Discussion ensued
- It was pointed out that the term “mid-year” was confusing as the process would be available all year long
 - This wording was used many other places and it would be very confusing at this point to change this label
 - It was decided to keep the label for “mid-year” in the document

37. Matt called the vote: 11/1/0, motion passed

38. **Article V, Section I Justification for Allocation Limits, B** - Brian recommended that this be removed from the document as it was no longer relevant now that **Article III, Section III, B** regarding the Children’s Center had been deleted.

39. Johnathan made a motion to strike **Article V, Section I, B**, seconded by Alicia Vajid

40. Matt called the vote: 11/0/0, motion passed

41. **Article V, Section II Justification for Redistribution, A. At-Large and Academic Councils, a. and b.**

- Proposed language to replace this section was placed on the overhead, read aloud and a few non-substantive changes were made

42. Matt made a motion to strike **Article V, Section II, A. At-Large and Academic Councils, a. and b.** and replace it with the updated words:

“This bill intends to provide for greater consistency, accountability and compliance of academic and at-large councils with all applicable policies and regulations. It also seeks to ensure that the allocation of funds to clubs is done in a timely, fair and equitable manner. Thus, academic and at-large councils shall still continue to be part of the process of allocating funds to clubs at a reduced level. The ASI Finance Committee will take on increased responsibility for allocations to clubs and utilize its oversight and authority to ensure that funds are utilized for approved events and used as approved, through the Accountability Reports. The Finance Committee shall also ensure consistency, fairness and timeliness in allocations to clubs, thereby supporting student engagement and involvement on our campus.”, seconded by Pulkit

43. Matt called the vote: 11/0/0, motion passed

44. **Article V, Section II Justification for Redistribution, B. Diversity Groups** - Brian pointed out that as Article III, Section II, D. had been amended, this justification was no longer necessary
45. Alicia Vajid made a motion to strike **Article V, Section II, B.**, seconded by Alicia Martin
46. Matt called the vote: 11/0/0, motion passed
47. Matt asked that the amended version of the Students' ASI Bill be shown on the overhead in the final format and asked everyone to please review it
48. Alicia Martin made a motion to approve the Students' ASI Bill as amended for the ballot in spring, seconded by Evin
 - A concern was expressed if there would be enough funds for the ASI Finance Committee to fund the normal amount of activities that clubs usually request or would it become very competitive to access the available funds
 - Brian stated that he believes that the numbers that he has projected should be sufficient, however if next year it is not sufficient then the senate could increase the amount to NP & A by 5% with a 2/3 vote
49. Matt called the vote: 7/3/0, motion passed

D. Nominations and Elections for ASI Standing Committee

1. ASI Finance Committee – Spring Quarter
 - a. Discussion ensued regarding the date and time for the meetings
 - b. This item was delayed until the next senate meeting

E. Senate Resolution – To Support Student Involvement in CSSA's Effort to Garner a Statewide Advocacy Fee

1. Johnathan recapped the resolution that was discussed at the last meeting
2. Matt made a motion approve the resolution, seconded by Shireen
3. Matt called the vote: 10/1/0, motion passed

Matt adjourned the regular session at 8:16pm and stated there would be a five minute break before moving into Executive Session

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Discussion Items

1. Implementation of approved Staffing Plans was discussed
2. Compensation Study update was discussed
3. General revisions to job descriptions were discussed

B. Information Items

1. Cora presented regarding the interim appointment for Program Assistant
2. Cora presented regarding the appointment of AR/Vault Cashier
3. Cora presented regarding the position opening for the Accounts Payable Fund Specialist
4. Discussion ensued

V. ADJOURNMENT

ASI SENATE MEETING

March 8, 2012

Page - 22

- A. Next Senate meeting will take place on Thursday, April, 5, 2012, 3:00 – 5:00pm, in the England Evans room
- B. Senate meeting 2011-12:12 was adjourned at 8:46pm

MINUTES SUBMITTED TO:

Matt Stafford, Chair of the Senate

Date

MINUTES APPROVED AT SENATE 2011-2012: _____

Vicki Jackson, Administrative Assistant

Date

TO VIEW REPORTS LISTED (WITH AN *) OPEN SEPARATE FILE ON DOCUMENTS WEBPAGE LABELED:
ASI SENATE MEETING ATTACHMENTS – REPORTS FOR MARCH 8, 2012