



ASI Senate Meeting

Minutes

2012- 2013:24 Thursday, June 6, 2013, 3:00 –5:00 PM, BSC, 2nd Floor, England Evans

I. PRELIMINARIES

A. Call to Order

1. Chair Christine Hall called Senate 2012-2013:24 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
Amber Yoshioka, CEIS Senator
Rana Abuershaid, CLASS Senator
Dylan Devlin, CCHM Senator
Ariane Lebrilla, ENV Senator
Mary Haynes, Engineering Senator – **Excused Tardy**
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 – **Excused Tardy, Sub: Dr. Howlett Jr.**
Cora M. Culla, Executive Director

3. Non-voting Liaisons:

Devon Graves, Attorney General
Krikor Ketchedjian, Treasurer – **Excused Tardy**
Vacant, Academic Senate Rep.
Penne Fode, Staff Council Rep. – **Excused Absent**
Janeth Rodriguez, Alumni Association Rep. – **Excused Absent**
Cristian Garcia/Sara Robinson, Bronco Athletics Assoc. Rep.

C. Approval of Minutes

1. There were no minutes to approve

D. Pledge of Allegiance

E. Agenda Changes

1. Christine struck Discussion Item A. ASI Logo-Rebranding Recommendation
2. Cora added to Discussion Item C. BSC Space Study Recommendations the sub-titles that were consistent with the packets, C.1. Acceptance of BSC Space Study Report

ASI SENATE MEETING

June 6, 2013

Page - 2

- and C.2. Funding Authorization Recommendation
3. Christine approved the agenda as amended

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

1. ASI Total Revenue	\$ 6,393,857.00
2. ASI Total Expenses	\$ 4,971,195.00
3. ASI – NP & A Account Balance	\$ 108,345.00
4. ASI – Tutoring Retention Account Balance	\$ 5,764.00
5. ASI Prior Year's I Reserves	\$ 222,660.00
6. ASI Prior Year's II Reserves	\$ 127,518.00
7. ASI Prior Year's III Reserves	\$ 300,010.00

G. Introduction of Guests

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Powell Velasco | 5. Maria-Lisa Flemington |
| 2. Winston Bao | 6. Nancy Hwang |
| 3. Ozzie Tapia | 7. Krista Smith |
| 4. Barny Peake | 8. Terri Bell |

H. Reports – Posted on the SAN, not given verbally at the meeting

1. ASI Executive Director- Cora M. Culla – no report
2. ASI Advisor – Dr. Rebecca Gutierrez Keeton – no report
3. Academic Senate Rep. – vacant
4. Staff Council Rep. – Penne Fode – no report
5. Alumni Rep. – Janeth Rodriguez – no report
6. Athletics Rep. – Cristian Garcia – no report
7. Senator Pro Tempore – Mary Haynes – no report
8. Attorney General – Devon Graves – no report
9. Treasurer – Krikor Ketchedjian – no report
10. President – Chris Osuala – no report
11. Vice President – Christine Hall – no report
12. Senate Reports
 - a. Christina Kogat, Senator-at-Large, IHC *(attachment)
 - i. NACURH
 - ii. IHC Banquet
 - b. Sally Kandah, Science Senator *(attachment)
 - i. Science Council's Last General Meeting

I. Open Forum

1. Christine Hall – stated that a senate meeting was scheduled for next Thursday, June 13th from 2:00 – 4:00pm and she would confirm the room in an email.
2. Chris Osuala – thanked all of the senators that came out today to support project reCYCLE which turned out to be a really good event.
3. Ariane Lebrilla – added that the reCYCLE projects would be on display until 6:00pm and she thought that it was a very successful event and thanked everyone who came out and supported.
4. Cora M. Culla – thanked everyone who attended the ASI Graduation Celebration and showed support for the graduates and she also thanked the committee for the work

behind the scenes in putting it together.

II. ACTION ITEMS

A. Recommendation from the Finance Committee

1. Lambda Theta Alpha Latin Sorority Inc. \$4,000 NP & A
 - a. Sally made a motion to approve \$4,000 from the NP & A account for Lambda Theta Alpha Latin Sorority Inc., seconded by Rana
 - b. Christine called the vote: 14/0/0, motion passed

B. Recommendation from the Rules and Policies Committee

1. ASI Finance Committee Code
 - a. Devon recapped that the Finance Committee Code was just like the R & P Code in that the Treasurer was noted as chair and no longer a voting member and their vote in case of a tie was replaced by Robert's Rules of Order and other details were now in compliance with the ASI By-Laws
 - b. Tommy made a motion to approve the ASI Finance Committee Code, seconded by Caleb
 - c. Christine called the vote: 14/0/0, motion passed
2. ASI Senate Rules
 - a. Devon recapped that the Senate Rules were worked on in the R & P Committee since the Fall Quarter and they were brought into compliance with the ASI By-Laws and the majority of references to Robert's Rules of Order were struck, leaving the responsibilities to the Attorney General as the parliamentarian of the senate
 - b. Rana made a motion to approve the ASI Senate Rules, seconded by Sally
 - c. Christine called the vote: 14/0/0, motion passed
3. ASI BEAT Code
 - a. Devon recapped that the BEAT Code had also been worked on in the R & P Committee since the Fall Quarter and it had not been updated in a long time with the additional changes such as removing all references to the Director of Programs and Marketing and replacing them with Executive Director or designee to make it a more timeless document. He thanked Barny, Maria-Lisa, Aisha and the BEAT Committee for their input at the R & P meetings.
 - b. Rana made a motion to approve the ASI BEAT Code, seconded by Dylan
 - c. Christine called the vote: 14/0/0, motion passed

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

B. ASI Reserve Policy Revision (attachment)

1. Krikor stated that an updated version of the proposed senate bill regarding the ASI Reserve Policy was being handed out
2. He noted that the first paragraph referred to the history of SB 2012-13:01, Amendments to Student Opportunities Initiative (SB: 2002-03:02), Article V, where an annual allocation shall be set aside for ASI Reserves as outlined in the document each year from 2013-14 to 2016-17. The amounts to be allocated to ASI Prior Years I, II, III and the New Programs and Augmentations account would be determined with a 2/3

vote of the seated senate during the ASI annual budget process.

3. He added that everything else was the same as the previous policy with the exception of the minimum level of Reserve III which was changed to \$200,000 and the minimum level for the NP & A account which was changed to \$100,000
4. Discussion ensued regarding including the senate bill that was being replaced in the background of the first paragraph as a document identity trail, a 2/3 senate vote was required to change budget documents such as this one, raising the minimum level of Reserve II from \$50,000 to 100,000, the word "recommended" was soft but it does mean that the amounts cannot drop below the amount specified and it could be changed to "required minimum" amounts, for NP & A there should be flexibility to use the funding and go below the recommended minimum amount so that the account is used for the intended purpose, concern over locking up money that might need to be used versus different balances maintained in the accounts, could add language for Reserve I that says "no lower than \$100,000", whatever amount is listed with that language – it did not mean that we cannot tap into it, the idea of targets over a period of time for the accounts to grow, starting next year the SOI would provide increased funding to the reserve accounts due to the new stipulation, only Reserve I needed an additional amount tied to it and any facilities concerns would come out of the BSC reserves-including the DBMER account- rather than these ASI reserve accounts

C. BSC Space Study Recommendations (attachments)

1. Acceptance of BSC Space Study Report

- a. Powell stated that the handouts being passed out were to replace those that were part of the packet and he introduced Winston Bao and Ozzie Tapia from LPA, Inc. Architects to give a presentation on the latest updates since May that would support the information in the two memos
- b. Winston reviewed the inclusive process updates since they last presented to the senate which included presentations to the Division of Student Affairs, to workshops for campus conversations and the University Cabinet
- c. He stated that their proposals were based on a low, medium and high version of the proposals to utilize the vacant space once the Bronco Fitness Center moves to the BRIC and along with those ideas would be different cost levels
- d. Ozzie explained that this master plan looks into the future and he outlined three options based on the surveys and the lack of social space, meeting room space and office spaces:
 - i. Option 1 - \$13.78/sq. ft. \$143,527: The objective was the minimal amount of work necessary to convert the spaces from fitness functions for varied uses described in the diagram. This was considered a "fit & finish" scope of work with no construction or demolition involved. He gave the details of the proposed work and the projected results.
 - ii. Option 2 - \$29.13/sq. ft. \$303,270: The objective was a typical tenant improvement (TI) scope of work with minor construction and demolition as needed. It included the basic scope of work outlined in Option 1, and the functions and strategies outlined were intended for longer term utilization of the swing space. He gave the details of the proposed work and the projected results.

- iii. Option 3 - \$81.45/sq. ft. \$825,941: The objective was to provide spaces outlined in the Final Phase (III) of the master plan; this was the complete build-out in the Space Study with extensive renovation. Coffee retail space and Café & Study Lounge on the first floor and meeting rooms on the second floor. The open plan would serve as a pre-cursor and interim space needed for future phases. He gave the details of the proposed work and the projected results.
- iv. He added that furnishings were not included in any of the options and would be an estimated \$20/sq. ft. or approximately \$200,000 to be added to the amount of the respective option
- e. Discussion ensued regarding clarification of the three options
- f. Ozzie stated that it was his understanding that the ASI Leadership Team was recommending Option 2
- g. Winston concluded with a recap of the schedule which included that they were on time and presenting to the senate on June 6th for action and would incorporate all documents into a final report by June 14th so that it could be submitted to the university for approval
- h. Christine pointed out that it was a discussion item today and would not be an action item until the senate meeting next Thursday on June 13th
- i. Powell reviewed the memo titled, *Bronco Student Center (BSC) Space Study Master plan Recommendation*, and noted that the diagram attached to the original memo should now be included with this memo. He stated that the recommendation was that the senate accept what was being presented to them in the form of the diagram, even though the final report was not here yet, and this would then be the master plan for the BSC in terms of space allocation and utilization. He added that in the recommendation it listed that it was flexible, and when ASI was ready to implement this it can be re-evaluated but with the research that was done, this was the plan that was being put before the senate to accept.
- j. He stated that the *Project Summary* noted the work that was done, statistics in terms of the surveys and the feedback that was gathered
- k. He added that the *Proposed Space Plan* was represented by the attached diagram
- l. He stated that the *Funding* was represented by the separate memo that was also handed out and he would review that one next
- m. He explained that the *Timeline* was based on having the space not ready for use - for the shortest amount of time
- n. Discussion ensued regarding the color coding of Student Government, Senate, Beat, GAS and ASI Programs should be blue for services and not pink for administrative, the timeline to complete Option 1 and 2 would be about 3-5 months and for Option 3 more like 6-8 months and that phased construction could not begin until Campus Rec had vacated the space which they had planned to do over the summer
- o. Powell reviewed the memo titled, *Request for Bronco Student Center (BSC) Dormitory, Building, Maintenance, Equipment and Reserve (DBMER) funding not to exceed \$500,000.00*, and noted that they were recommending Option 2 that was covered in the presentation by LPA with construction costs of

about \$300,000.00 and the furnishings for around \$200,000.00 which was a rough estimate and depended on what was proposed for the space and he gave examples of different scenarios. Therefore, the projected total would arrive at the requested amount of not to exceed \$500,000.00.

- p. Cora stated that the current balance in the DBMER account was \$1,878,000 and if this request was approved then the balance would be reduced to \$1,378,000
- q. Chris stated that this was the plan for the funding for the swing space but what was the funding plan for the rest of the space study that they were being asked to approve
- r. Cora responded that in the first memo that was presented it was acknowledged that their ability to fully implement the plan would be contingent on the availability of resources and in a prior LPA presentation, the round number of ten million dollars in today's dollars, was needed to implement it and since ASI does not currently have that they will have to strategically plan for the full implementation and have a serious conversation on where those resources would come from
- s. Christine asked that if they agreed to the swing phase today, then would that ultimately lead into an agreement of the implementation of the space study regardless of it being contingent on the funding, and so was there any way to see that strategic plan as far as a timeline, before the senate were to agree to this today
- t. Cora stated that they needed to look at this in two phases, as ASI will have a significant amount of space in the BSC (10,000 sq. ft. total) that will be vacated. The goal all along has been to develop a plan that can be implemented immediately next year so that by the time that the BRIC opens in 2014 the 10,000 sq. ft. would actually be used for a productive purpose to serve the students and the campus community. She added that given the amount of resources that ASI had today, they have identified the DBMER fund as a place where they can potentially tap into up to \$500,000 to make that first part of it happen. She stated that she agreed that by saying yes to this first part, there was already buy-in to what the ultimate plan would be. She noted that based on her assessment, she did not think that they would be in a financial position to fully implement this plan until probably 4-5 years at the earliest from today. She added that this was why they needed to implement something next year that would be ready to have in place for the next 3-5 years.
- u. Christine stated that the clarification that she was seeking was that they were voting on the BSC Space Study recommendation, not just voting on the swing space, so in 4-5 years where was the funding coming from
- v. Cora qualified that what the senate was voting on was accepting the report and she added that in the memo they were very intentional in saying that, "The ASI Senate reserves the right to make appropriate revisions with approval by the university when ASI is ready to fully implement the BSC Space Study." She added that they did not know when they would be in a financial position to be able to implement the full study, so the buy-in was to the first phase where they have 10,000 sq. ft. of space and they want to put it to

good use. She stated that if they determine that they do not have the funds to do the rest then they should have a comfort level that what they had constructed next year they will be comfortable with. She added that if somewhere down the road, ASI decided they really wanted to move into the full implementation, and there was no strategic plan that she can present to them, this would require resources that they did not have in their accounts today. She noted that if they were talking about a student fee initiative to make that happen, she said that she was highly sensitive to the fact that the campus will be implementing a Student Success Fee next year and the student fee increase connected with the BRIC will kick-in in 2014-15 and if that was the route that ASI planned to take then it was only politically and morally appropriate for ASI to think about a fee initiative to support this down the road and that was not going to happen immediately. She explained that in the meantime, they needed to have a plan that they have the resources for, which rather it happens in 3-5 years or doesn't happen at all, ASI would be comfortable with.

- w. Discussion ensued regarding the outcome of the surveys reflecting the need for more meeting space and yet Option 2 was designated as office space and that there were exiting code concerns regarding the proper exits for a larger number of people occupying the space if it was changed to meeting space, how this impacted the three options, the fact that Ursa Major events are quite often loud and would impact office space so acoustical ceiling measures would need to be addressed, the funding was being requested early in order to do all of the necessary paperwork steps to hire the architect and have the prep steps in place before any work would begin, the difference between a bond floatation which was tied to student fees and accessing the current resources in the DBMER fund
- x. Further discussion took place specifically on the differences in accepting the BSC Space Study versus approving it and how this would impact the future
- y. Chris stated that he felt the concern around the table was that if the senate accepted the BSC Space Study, then 4-5 years down the line, when none of them were here, the precedent would have already been set that this was what the senate and ASI wanted to do, move forward with a \$10 million dollar project, and they can't necessarily get access to any of the student leaders that were here to find out what the conversation was like today and they'll think that this was the direction we were going in and think let's go ahead and approve this \$10 million dollar project and then there will be a fee increase. He added that they may not know that is not what we intended by this, that we just wanted to get the swing space done, but we had to accept the whole study.
- z. Cora stated that the minutes should reflect what Chris just fully articulated, that many of the directors should probably still be here 5 years from now and she hoped that he had enough trust in them and that they're not going to be unethical to represent that to the students. She pointed out that when he went through the process of amending the Student Opportunities Initiative, he was able to connect with the 2002-03 ASI President as the world was really small with all of the technology that we have- email, text and cellphone- so

the likelihood of future administrations not being able to get a hold of members of this administration was small. She added that, in looking around the table, there were the architects, the full ASI Leadership Team and university administrators that will review this so there's a difference between accepting and approving the report and in the past they have accepted feasibility studies and they were not later implemented exactly the way that they were drawn up as was evidenced by one for the recreation center. She stated that accepting was - you recognize that the study exists, you're accepting it, but for her, when you say that you are approving it, then you are approving exactly what is in the study. She added that they were voting on this and she was not, and they have the option of voting it down and if they vote it down, now they were talking about a swing phase that was part and parcel of that study that they voted down, so it gets weird and maybe they can modify the recommendation if they're not inclined to even accept the report. She also noted maybe they needed to go back to the drawing board and work this out with the Leadership Team and the architects because then what were they going to be implementing as part of the swing phase.

aa. Christine stated that just like Chris mentioned, the whole accepting versus approving, they go hand-in-hand in her opinion because if they do accept, then years down the road she thinks that their acceptance of it means that – had we had the funding we probably would have just said implement all of this right now. She added that as far as how it was worded, it says Bronco Student Center (BSC) Space Study Master Plan Recommendation and she thinks that everyone at the table doesn't want 10,000 sq. ft. to be unused so if the language could be clarified so that clearly they were accepting and approving the swing space because we don't want that to be empty, then that might help a little bit because there are some issues if we are talking about another student fee increase.

bb. Powell explained that the master plan was a guiding document and so that was the first document that was helping us as ASI gets to that point to try and make decisions so that when we do have money, this was what was presented and fit our needs at the time. He reviewed that when the BSC expansion was built the needs that were identified were a fitness center, a large meeting room space and a food court and now this go around the needs that were identified were much different than that. He added that when we get to that point, where we feel like it is time for us to implement the master plan in its entirety, it is up to the senate to make a decision to vote on a referendum, to put on a referendum for that, but at that time ASI would also probably revisit what was important to us again. He noted so if it is 5 years, that was 2003 and this is 2013, so it was only 10 years and you can see how the needs of the campus have changed. So at that point in time, using this master plan as a guiding document, you would be accepting the fact that ASI was presenting a guiding document for the organization and not be tied into that \$10 million number, and part of the presentation was about phasing which was based on if ASI had funding available. He added that ASI knows that we don't have funding available, but we don't want to leave at least the fitness center space empty, so if the senate was afraid that they were locking

their future into this plan, all they were locking the future into was using this plan as a guiding document

cc. Further discussion ensued regarding possible modifications of the motion regarding the acceptance of this plan, that Powell's comments would not be understandable for future senates, the two memos were separate and the senate was not necessarily ready to approve both at this time, could the two memos be separated, confusion over acceptance of the space study in order to approve the swing space plan, clarification of the process that was decided by the Leadership Team to have the study done and focus on the whole building-not just focus on the swing space- as they were related, the problem seems to be with acceptance of the master plan as a whole rather than the acceptance of using the fitness center space, acceptance was defined as an endorsement or acknowledgement that the space study exists-it was not an approval, the recommendation of the Leadership Team to accept the study was not intended to put pressure on future senates down the road to implement the study and then do a student fee increase to make it happen, a review of the feasibility study history for the recreation center and that it failed during a referendum and two years later was updated and then due to the fact that it was part of the ASI Strategic Plan was revisited with the students through alternative consultation and went through, assurance that there was no intent behind the recommendation to put undue pressure on future senates and because this senate accepted the report it had to happen and student fees had to increase, new language could be suggested and the Leadership would work with it, this project goes beyond the swing space and represented the future of the BSC, no one was confused about the difference between accept, endorse or approve-instead the problem was that language needed to be added that stated acceptance of the swing phase without moving ahead with the entire project because otherwise the intent would be that as a master plan the senate had wanted to move forward with it and have it approved in the future, that by accepting or approving the master plan a future senate would still have to take action to implement funding for it, as the cost of construction will go up-option 2 seemed reasonable, a need to focus on the swing space proposal and if it meets the needs of the students and staff that use it or should new recommendations be made for it, the

Tommy made a motion to extend the meeting until all business was completed, seconded by Chris

Christine called the vote: 13/0/1, motion passed

second floor space was restricted by the need for an expensive exterior space stairwell for exit purposes if the space was used for meeting rooms instead of a lesser code requirement for less people in the form of staff-which then would move Option 2 closer to Option 3 costs, the ASI Strategic Plan was a document that was very specific and spanned a five year plan representing a business master plan so it was a parallel to the BSC Space Study as a guiding document for the BSC which would make future decisions simpler, and LPA originally came back with two plans-the \$10 million and the \$865,000 plans-

and were asked for three options to be presented to the senate which is why there was now a low, medium and high plan being presented today as the Leadership Team wanted the senate to know how diligent and responsible they were being to work with the senate in terms of looking beyond their term and planning for the future and providing a framework for that future

2. Funding Authorization Recommendation

- a. This item was not opened separately but the topic was discussed throughout Item 1

D. Recognition of New Heritage Programs

1. Christine recapped that when they were originally amending the Student Opportunities Initiative and it was decided to distribute all of the funding amongst the existing groups and remove the Heritage Program Reserve account, the question had come up as to how would they recognize a new heritage program in the future
2. She added that even though it had been as much as ten years since a new heritage group had developed, people would still need to know what the criteria and process would be for that to happen
3. Chris stated that as a senate they needed to work together and discuss how they were going to go about that process and noted that Cora had given him a copy of a prior senate bill from 1996-97 as a reference and Byron had emailed his suggestions as well
4. Chris passed out the prior senate bill and a copy of Byron's comments for reference
5. Christine stated that she had spoken to Devon who was willing to take on the responsibility of drafting the formal document, so that would come as an action item to the next senate meeting as a combination of the two pieces of information but as a formal piece of legislation
6. She added that everyone could continue to read the handouts during Executive Session and give any feedback to Devon

Chris made an announcement that a Transition Meeting would be scheduled the week of 6/24 to 6/27 from possibly 12:00 – 2:00pm much like the one that this administration attended last year. Please let he or Christine know if there were any conflicts and watch for their email.

Christine adjourned regular session at 5:12pm to move to Executive Session

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

- A. Discussion Item – It was clarified that this was not an Action Item
 1. The ASI staffing structure and compensation matters were discussed

V. ADJOURNMENT

- A. Next Senate meeting will be determined
- B. Christine stated that senate meeting 2012-13:24 was adjourned at 5:27pm

ASI SENATE MEETING

June 6, 2013

Page - 11

MINUTES SUBMITTED TO:

Christine Hall, Chair of the Senate

Date

MINUTES APPROVED AT SENATE 2012-2013: _____

Vicki Jackson, Administrative Assistant

Date

TO VIEW REPORTS LISTED (WITH AN *) OPEN SEPARATE FILE ON DOCUMENTS WEBPAGE LABELED:
ASI SENATE MEETING ATTACHMENTS – REPORTS FOR JUNE 6, 2013