



ASI Senate Meeting

Minutes

2012- 2013:7 Thursday, December 6, 2012, 3:00 –5:00 PM, BSC, 2nd Floor, Ursa Major B

I. PRELIMINARIES

A. Call to Order

1. Chair Christine Hall called Senate 2012-2013:7 to order at 3:04pm

B. Quorum Check

1. Voting Members:

- Christine Hall, Vice President, Chair
 - Chris Osuala, President – **Excused Tardy**
 - Stephanie Ferreira, Agriculture Senator
 - Joanna Ha, Business Senator - **Excused Absent**
 - Amber Yoshioka, CEIS Senator
 - Rana Abuershaid, CLASS Senator
 - Dylan Devlin, CCHM Senator
 - Ariane Lebrilla, ENV Senator
 - Mary Haynes, Engineering Senator
 - Sally Kandah, Science Senator
 - Tommy Ward, Senator-At-Large (MCC)
 - Caleb Rickard, Senator-At-Large (SIC)
 - Danielle Sigala, Senator-At-Large (Greek)
 - Christina Kogat, Senator-At Large (IHC)
- ##### 2. Advisors:
- Dr. Rebecca Gutierrez Keeton, Advisor
 - Cora M. Culla, Executive Director
- ##### 3. Non-voting Liaisons:
- Devon Graves, Attorney General
 - Krikor Ketchedjian, Treasurer
 - Vacant, Academic Senate Rep.
 - Penne Fode, Staff Council Rep. – **Excused Absent**
 - Janeth Rodriguez, Alumni Association Rep. – **Excused Absent**
 - Vacant, Bronco Athletics Association Rep.

C. Approval of Minutes

1. There were no minutes to approve

D. Agenda Changes

1. There were none

E. Financial Status – Given by Krikor Ketchedjian (attachments)

1. ASI Total Revenue \$ 4,079,521.00

ASI SENATE MEETING

December 6, 2012

Page - 2

2. ASI Total Expenses	\$ 1,756,173.00
3. ASI – NP & A Account Balance	\$ 160,892.00
4. ASI – Tutoring Retention Account Balance	\$ 5,764.00
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

F. Introduction of Guests

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Kaylin Murray | 5. Nancy Hwang |
| 2. Cathy Neale | 6. Josh Zeeman |
| 3. Powell Velasco | 7. Krista Smith |
| 4. Alex Preston | |

G. Open Forum

1. Cora M. Culla – stated that the university had already approved the recommendation of the senate for the amendment of the Articles of Incorporation. She added that they were now getting ready to transmit the information to the Chancellor's office and as soon as the filing fee check was ready they would proceed with the filing with the Secretary of State.

II. DISCUSSION ITEM

A. Student Success Fee Update (attachment)

1. Christine thanked everyone for attending this meeting during finals week and stated that it may be the most important meeting of the quarter due to how much it was going to impact students, not just current ones but future students, because it was going to include discussion about fees
2. She gave an update that the Fee Advisory Committee had been meeting, which included herself, Krikor, Chris, Amber and Josh Zeeman from Interhall Council, as the student members. She stated that they had received data back in regards to the Student Success Fee and so they had written a senate resolution to move forward with the student's voice throughout this whole process and ensure that student's needs were being met. She added that last night Chris, Devon, herself and Josh had met and reviewed everything, as well as consulted with Mark Bookman, the legal counsel for ASI, to make sure the appropriate language was included in the resolution.
3. She added that they understood that the university needed the fee increase, and it seemed that a lot of students supported the fee as well, but they just wanted to make sure that students were getting what they thought they were getting
4. Dylan asked if the resolution was supporting an altered version of the Student Success Fee
5. Christine acknowledged that the resolution requested that more of the fee go toward funding classes because 97.1% of students had said that getting classes and academic support was important to them. She added that they had found out that the university would only be adding forty new sections of classes per year which broke down to thirteen sections per quarter and spread over nine colleges, that was like one chemistry class. Since students were saying that getting classes to graduate was their highest priority, only having 2.6% of the proposed fee go toward adding classes

- caused Chris to do some research of other CSU campuses
6. She explained that Chris spoke to Katie Morrow, ASI President at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and learned that while their fee for student success is considered high, 80% of it does go towards classes because their students say classes are their priority
 7. Christine added that while better Wi-Fi and better advising were both important, if students can't get classes, then what good is all of that because that is what they were here for – so basically the resolution was requesting that more funding go toward classes and that there be a willingness to readjust the numbers of the fee
 8. She also explained that Josh had made a suggestion that, since the fee proposal was to make Athletics self-sustainable by the third year so that the Student Success Fee then support the whole Athletics program, he said why not wean them off slower so that more funding from the fee can go to classes instead of to Athletics, as 47% of students said that the Athletics program was very important to them. She added that this showed that the students felt that their top priority was their education and, as student representatives, student leaders think that the timeline for Athletics to be fully funded by the fee should be slowed down. She noted that 70% of students supported the fee increase, so they do want to move forward with it, but it was a matter of making sure of what they were getting with it now that additional data was available.
 9. Chris arrived to the meeting and handed out a copy of the proposed senate resolution with the title of *"A Resolution in Opposition of the Student Success Fee as Presented"* and everyone took a few minutes to read it
 10. Chris gave a recap of the status of the Student Success Fee
 - a. They had been meeting about this for numerous weeks
 - b. At the last Fee Advisory Committee meeting they were supposed to make a recommendation to President Ortiz to move forward with it or not but after that meeting the student members did not feel that they could move forward with the fee as outlined. It wasn't that they didn't support the fee and they could see that the university needed it, they just couldn't support it as outlined.
 - c. They had been trying for weeks to meet with Vice President Doug Freer, John McGuthry and the Provost in order to meet them half-way and have their voices be heard as well as negotiate, but they haven't been heard so this resolution was their last option
 - d. As Christine stated, the results of the consultation came back and it did prove favorable with about 71-72% of the students in support of the fee, however the student leaders could not support it because they felt like the students did not know exactly what they were supporting as far as the details of the allocations
 11. Chris stated that the following four points were the basis for why he could not support the fee as outlined
 - a. The process of Executive Order 1054, as the guiding document for the Fee Advisory, was violated. It states that for any new fee a voter pamphlet that goes out to the students, needs to be created by the committee just to make sure that the consultation is fair, with equal amounts of pros and cons. The student members did not feel that this was done as the Fee Advisory did not

meet until the week before Thanksgiving and the alternative consultation process was just ending at that time. It was felt that due to this the results of the consultation may have been skewed.

- b. The student members could not agree with the funding allocated toward classes and they felt that if the pamphlet had come before the Fee Advisory that they would have made sure that the details were included so that students would know that only 13 more sections per quarter were proposed compared to the 3,000 offered each quarter. He noted that was less than a .5% increase. This was upsetting because a lot of students wrote on their commentary that more classes was one of the main reasons that they supported the fee. He added that those 13 sections would have to be divided over nine colleges and one of the professors that sits on Fee Advisory said that Chemistry 121 alone would eat up those 13 sections.
 - c. The overview of the pamphlet focused on let your voice be heard and that this was about the students, but they did not feel that the way the future oversight was outlined for the fee that the student's voice was ever going to be heard as far as the future of the school. He added that as far as the breakdown, two of the line items had sub-committees however, the majority of them would be decided by the Provost and the Vice President of Student Affairs. He stated that he could not agree with that either.
 - d. The last point had to do with Athletics as Christine had mentioned. They do not want the funding for Athletics to go anywhere, they want it to still be funded. Only 41% of students favored Athletics and many said that they did not want as much money going to Athletics, while 97% wanted more money going toward classes. He noted that they couldn't agree with the proposed amount being allocated to this line item based on that feedback.
12. Chris reviewed that those were the four main points that they could not agree with so they developed the resolution. He added that he spoke with a lot of other ASI presidents to see how their Student Success Fee was implemented, including their sister campus, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (SLO), as theirs was the highest. Katie, their ASI President shared the following points:
- a. For their fee, they did both alternative consultation and a fee referendum
 - b. Their Audit Committee, which would be comparable to the CPP proposed Oversight/Executive Committee, except it was the only committee to govern the fee and their hands were not tied by specific allocations tied to line items, instead collect a pot of money every year and allocate it based on the student priorities established that year. They had pitched it to their student body that all of them were donors to the university, voluntarily giving their money, so they should choose where the donated money would go.
 - c. She gave the example that if any other donor gave money to the university, they would not have the campus tell them where it had to go, so therefore they consult with their students every year
13. Chris stated that when he asked the administrators who they talked to in order to determine what the students would want done with the fee, the response was that between the administrators working on this there was more than 30, 40 to 100 years of experience between them and so they knew what the students would want. He

added that he and the student leaders felt that this was not good enough.

14. He elaborated that he continued to talk with Katie and learned that their committee for oversight was composed of seven students appointed by their ASI and four administrators/faculty and that all of the members of the committee had a one year term. Every year they send out a questionnaire and ask students where the allocations should go. So they did that and 67% of students said that they want more classes and 67% of the fee went toward more classes while ours has 2.6% going toward more classes. He added that when he shared that percentage with both Katie and our legal counsel, Mark Bookman, neither one could believe it in comparison to how Cal Poly San Luis Obispo was allocating their fee.
15. He added that he also spoke with the ASI President at Chico and they were saying the same type of thing as far as how their process goes, and that their administrators went out to students during the alternative consultation and asked them to identify their priorities. Chris noted that CPP students were presented with... this was what the money was going toward and do you support it, yes or no... so it was as if the administrators here knew what was best for the students and the process did not match what other campuses had done.
16. Chris outlined that one of the primary goals of the resolution was to spell out the main concerns that he had just identified and to also stress that in the future they want the Fee Advisory Committee to be consulted ahead of time in the process of any future fees so that we do not have to get to the point again where students feel that information was left out. He asked that everyone please review the resolution and opened the floor for questions.
17. A question and answer session took place that included the proposed procedures of the Oversight Committee, being identified as a CPP system and not as SLO in the resolution, majority needs as opposed to minority needs as identified by students and if the fee should be for everyone or specific allocations stay constant, waiting for the number from the Registrar's office on how many students did not get the classes that they needed, trying to negotiate on the allocations, that the resolution was intended to be submitted to the Fee Advisory Committee meeting tomorrow as a recommendation to them and the goal was to encourage that the allocations being proposed be reallocated, the senate represents the campus constituency and so their voice should be heard-not just the five students serving on Fee Advisory, the proposed line items were created by the three administrators: Vice President of Student Affairs, Doug Freer, John McGuthry for I & IT and Martin denBoer, Provost
18. The question and answer session continued with the status of Athletics as proposed in the resolution being under discussion with the Intercollegiate Athletics Board and the Fee Advisory Committee over a 90 day period so that a transition could be worked out to maintain their same funding from IRA, ASI and the General Fund but with one additional source added (Student Success Fee)which would reduce the other numbers, as the consultation process was not done according to the executive order – why was it not being voided – this was an option for the senate to pursue however the school does need the fee so why scrap the entire process, last spring the Fee Advisory did discuss a possible IRA fee referendum for this year but the Student Success Fee was not discussed once in their minutes, if more money went to a majority concern like classes the status of minority items like Rose Float, the

Cultural Centers and the computer upgrade could be jeopardized as line items, student input was the heart of the resolution and everyone here comes to the university for a higher education which means classes as the big picture, concern for the protection of the minority and programs that not all students want to see funded, mentioning SLO in the resolution was valid as a comparison that it was being done elsewhere, should budgetary figures be included in a resolution, the Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) will continue to fund groups like Rose Float and Athletics however the Student Success Fee has proposed to cover the debt service on a new student project lab that would be used for the Rose Float program, a comparison to SLO was beneficial as the administration used the same idea of comparing the existence of the fee on another campus and that the purpose of the resolution was to be used as a tool to encourage a conversation to raise these topics at the Fee Advisory meeting and show that a large group of students, represented by the senate, would like to see these serious negotiations take place

19. Cora stated that she had not seen this document before the meeting and added a few suggestions: that the title should be clarified with the addition of the date it was presented to the Fee Advisory Committee, that the Fee Advisory Committee be added to the list of distributed copies in the last Resolved and that if the intent was to negotiate with the university then she recommended being careful with some of the words, such as “disingenuous”, in the language as they came across as pretty strong
20. Chris stated that the student members of the Fee Advisory Committee had already tried wording that was politically correct and had tried to adopt a negotiating tone but it wasn't heard so these were the best words to reflect how they were feeling
21. Cora stated that she was not privy to all of the conversations that they had with the university and added that her comments were suggestions for them to take or leave. She added that she thought that the resolution would be stronger with wording for the recommended system for Cal Poly Pomona by extracting the elements from SLO in the document that were being recommended for Pomona. She also observed that normally all of the resolves were organized at the end of the resolution.
22. Chris stated that Mark Bookman said that for a resolution as long as this one it was acceptable to do it this way, with the resolves, for clarity and to eliminate confusion
23. Further discussion took place regarding the relevance of stating an actual allocation percentage as a hard number instead of wording such as “in proportion to student's desires... or opinion”, or something like that, and how without the numbers from the Registrar's office they were not sure of the exact number of classes not available and Chris clarified the figure that \$5 million of the \$7 million of SLO's fee goes toward classes
24. Cora asked that everyone be thoughtful of how this will impact the annual budget process in the spring and potentially any plans for a student referendum so to please work closely with the ASI Leadership Team and the Elections Chair on the timeline
25. Mary made a motion to suspend Robert's Rules and move Discussion Item A. to an Action Item as a senate resolution, seconded by Rana
26. Christine called the vote: 13/0/0, motion passed

III. ACTION ITEM

A. Student Success Fee Update - Senate Resolution (attachment)

1. Christine stated that now would be when they should make some of the more formal changes to the language of the resolution that had been discussed and it was displayed on the overhead for editing purposes
2. Christine made a motion to add to the end of the title the words "at the Fee Advisory Committee Meeting on November 30, 2012", seconded by Dylan
3. As there was no discussion, Christine called the vote: 12/1/0, motion passed
4. Christine made a motion to amend the final Resolved and add "The Fee Advisory Committee" before the "Poly Post", seconded by Stefanie
5. As there was no discussion, Christine called the vote: 13/0/0, motion passed
6. Rebecca noted that in the first Whereas on the second page the word "institute" was probably intended to be "institution"
7. Christine made a motion to amend the first Whereas on page two to include the word "institution" rather than "institute", seconded by Tommy
8. As there was no discussion, Christine called the vote, 13/0/0, motion passed
9. Tommy made a motion to amend the first Resolved on the third page and change: "...so that at least 50 percent of the..." to "...that better represents the opinion of students and the higher allocation of...", seconded by Caleb
10. As there was no discussion, Christine called the vote: 8/5/0, motion passed
11. Cora recommended that they consider toning down the references to SLO and extracting the elements from SLO that they would like to adopt for Cal Poly Pomona and she suggested that the authors could go back and do that to make it sound like our own system rather than a borrowed one
12. Chris stated that while he was willing to adopt some of their model, he wanted to still reference what SLO had implemented with their fee
13. Christine made a motion that the authors work to create their own model by extracting from the elements of Cal Poly San Luis Obispo so that they could make a Cal Poly Pomona model using specific language as a recommendation to be incorporated as a resolved within the resolution, seconded by Danielle
14. Discussion took place that clarified that the motion included that the senate would authorize the authors to make these changes, with the help of Cora, to the finalized document after the senate meeting so that the resolution could be submitted to the Fee Advisory Committee tomorrow
15. Christine called the vote: 10/3/0, motion passed
16. Cora stated that as a courtesy the final resolution could be emailed out either later tonight or tomorrow morning to the senate
17. Mary made a motion to amend the first Resolved on the third page that was edited earlier in the meeting in order to change "...and the higher allocation..." to "...and that a higher allocation...", seconded by Dylan
18. As there was no discussion, Christine called the vote: 13/0/0, motion passed
19. Caleb made a motion to approve the senate resolution, as amended, and pending the changes that will be made by the authors while working with Cora, seconded by Mary

ASI SENATE MEETING

December 6, 2012

Page - 8

20. As there was no discussion, Christine called the vote: 13/0/0, motion passed

21. Christine thanked everyone for their involvement as she and Chris have felt very passionate about this as it represents their duty of serving students. She added that she really appreciated their input in serving their colleges and their peers.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

A. Next Senate meeting will take place on Thursday, January 10, 2013, 3:00 – 5:00pm, in the England Evans room

B. Christine adjourned senate meeting 2012-13:7 at 4:34pm

MINUTES SUBMITTED TO:

Christine Hall, Chair of the Senate

Date

MINUTES APPROVED AT SENATE 2012-2013: _____

Vicki Jackson, Administrative Assistant

Date