Rules and Policies Committee Minutes

I. **Preliminaries**
    A) Call to Order at 3:04pm
    B) Quorum Check

    _X_ David Lee, Attorney General, Chair

    Voting Members:
    _X_ Joshua Ebiner, Senate President Pro-Tempore, Vice Chair
    _X_ Julian Herrera, President
    _X_ Diana Ascencio, Vice President
    _X_ Brandon Whalen, ENV Senator
    _X_ Greg Kommel, Science Senator
    _X_ Reeza Demonteverde, Engineering Senator

    Advisors:
    _X_ Cora Culla, ASI Executive Director
    ___ Dr. Susan Ashe, Director of Student Conduct & Integrity – **Excused Absence**

    Liaison:
    _X_ Chonlawan Khaothiemsang, Treasurer
    C) Approval of Minutes
        1) Cora will forward the changes to David but read the changes aloud to the committee
        2) Greg moved to approve the October 9, 2015 minutes as amended by Cora. Joshua seconded. Vote, 6:0:0, motion passes.
    D) Agenda Changes
        1) Joshua moved to add Elliott Popel as a special guest under Item B Preliminaries. Greg seconded. Vote, 6:0:0, motion passes.
    E) Introduction of Guests
        1) Elliott Popel, ASI Secretary of Sustainability
    F) Open Forum
        1) There were no speakers

II. **Information Item**
    A) ASI Rules and Policies Goals 2015-2016
        1) David reviewed the committee goals draft and outlined three groups they would like to review the ASI Document Review, Expedited Club Funding, and Council By-Laws he then read and reviewed the items and members that would be under each group
        2) David added that he would like to discuss expedited club funding to speed up the process of funding clubs as there may be a need to reduce the authority of some committees
        3) Discussion took place regarding expedited club funding:
            (a) Cora shared that the way the By-Laws are worded now if the budget request is $2,500 or less the Finance Committee has the authority to take final action but anything over $2,500 requires the approval of the ASI Senate and the budget request that gets acted on by both bodies are forwarded to the University for final approval because it involves the movement of funds from a fund account to a beneficiary organization
            (b) Short question and answer took place -- how long does it take to get approval from the University?

i. It would all depend on how fast the ASI Treasurer submits paperwork to Financial Services and all signatures are obtained approximately it would take two weeks

(c) Cora clarified the intent behind this suggestion-- the Finance Committee is not an advisory it is a recommending body to the Senate

   i. Discussion took place about the intent behind this suggestion instead of a budget request first being a Discussion Item then an Action Item, and easily this taking a month or more to be approved. The intent is to cut down this two-step process where it goes through the Finance Committee, and if the request is for more than $2,500 it is recommended to the Senate.

   ii. Cora suggested allowing the request to be made in just one meeting as oppose to it first being a discussion item at one meeting and then an action item at a second meeting. If the chair and committee are on top of the requests there should not be a need to have a discussion about it. The request should be taken straight to Action Item at the Finance Committee, and if the request is more than $2,500 then have it go to the Senate immediately. At the Senate level it could still start off as a discussion item, and then become an action item the duration of the request would then approximately only be three weeks.

   iii. This would not require a change in the ASI By-Laws but there would need to be a change in a Senate Bill that could be modified to give the recommending committees flexibility to take action right away

   iv. Chonlawan shared that she would like to avoid suspending Robert's Rules and thought possibly she could have a budget request as a Discussion Item and an Action Item on the same agenda she was advised by Vicki that they could not both occur in the same meeting to comply with student fees and either Gloria Romero or other rules – Cora clarified that this comes from a Senate Bill and not from anything else that Chonlawan might have been told and Cora suggested that because student leaders want to expedite the funding process for clubs that there be changes to this Senate Bill that she predicted could be up to ten years old

(d) Cora recommended that they could change the Senate Bill and determine a structure for the standing committees such as having a section for Discussion and Presentation and then excuse the groups while the committee decides whether or not fund the club and not make these decisions in front of the groups

(e) Discussion took place on if a request is more than $2,500 the Finance Committee could just make it a Discussion Item and then move the request up to Senate. It was shared that a request for more than $2,500 will still be brought up to Senate for the final decision and this could speed up the process for clubs. It was suggested that the Finance Committee not be excluded from making decisions in regards to club funding if it is more than $2,500 as the Finance Committee is still a recommending body to the Senate.

(f) Cora recommended that the chair of the committee should have the discretion to decide if the request will go through a two-step process or not. She explained that a club could come to the committee with a request for $5,000, and in this case the committee will want to have two meetings instead of one. During a finance committee they could also come to the conclusion that the club should only receive $2,500 and not $5,000. At this point it would never be brought up to Senate and the Finance Committee would vote on the request. Ultimately, the chair should make the decision and decide whether or not they will have to two meetings.

(g) Chonlawan shared that she would prefer to have a request as a Discussion Item and an Action Item in one meeting and not suspend Robert's Rules to avoid possibly having to do reimbursements for clubs if this process is done in one meeting

(h) Cora added that for the record going back to Vicki's comment she wanted to address that there is no violation of the Gloria Romero Open Meeting Law if they do this in one meeting because if the request is for more than $2,500 it is still going to Senate and there will be three meetings it is also reviewed by Financial Services, Cora herself

reviews it, and the University reviews it. Secondly, she shared that David and her need to look at this older Senate Bill first and revise it formally before they change their protocol.

4) Elliott Popel shared a short presentation on expediting club funding during this presentation he discussed:

   (a) The role of the sustainability committee and whether or not they should approve projects under TGIF he added that the time it is taking to get funding for projects has also been of concern to them

   (b) Elliott shared two models that addressed how funding could be expedited

   (c) He shared these two models with everyone to be able to ask everybody which of the two models discussed would make sense regarding the ASI By-Laws and what ASI could reasonably do and if either of these two models would work

   (d) Question and answer session took place:

      i. Greg asked if they implement the changes that they talked about and that Cora recommended wouldn't these two models become the same model because instead of going to Finance from Sustainability wouldn't it just go to Senate regardless? – Elliott said this would be the same model as to what they have discussed however he drafted this model before the discussion took place

      ii. Brandon asked why not Elliott being the Secretary of Sustainability seeing if a request is sustainable or not – Elliott responded that there might be budget requests that clubs bring to us and they think it's a TGIF related project and he needs to see where they could be provided funding from possibly from a different account

      ii. Reeza asked if the arrow shown on the power point from Finance to Senate would this only be for requests over $2,500 or with this include all requests be moved up to Senate – Elliott said this would be everything combined

      iii. Julian added that now the model he drafted should not be used and the earlier proposed plan should be used instead and he believes it would be a good idea for the treasure should sit on both the Finance and Sustainability Committee

      v. Joshua asked if the budget request is under $2,500 then can Sustainability allocate that money if it is related to TGIF? – Elliott responded that if the amount is under $2,500 then he would be able to release the funding to the club

      vi. Chonlawan clarified that TGIF is Suitability Committee's budget under reserve 5 they still have to vote to use the funding

      vii. Greg asked if Chonlawan thought a project was sustainable and Elliott did not think it was how would they resolve this issue – Elliott responded by saying they would find ways to make the project sustainable if there is no way then he would send it back to Finance Committee

   (e) Discussion took place about whether the Sustainability committees should keep or remove Students-at-large from the Sustainability Committee and put Senators in their place to be able to vote on budget allocations.

   (f) Lastly, Elliott discussed the last slide on his power point presentation that suggested the Reserve Policy be amended so that a single persons project be funded

      i. Cora shared that if you begin to open up funding to individual students you are opening up Pandora's Box. There are not enough resources to support the proposals of 24,000 students. If a student has a Sustainability project that needs to be funded they should be able to work with other registered student clubs and organizations.

B) ASI Rules and Policies Goal Implementation Timeline

   1) David read and reviewed how the ASI Rules and Policies Goal Timeline works so that everybody has a clear understanding on what they will be doing at each meeting

III. **Action Item**

   A) Electronic and Information Security Policy

1) David read the proposed changes to be made to the Electronic and Information Security Policy
   (a) Under Policy Statement a change was made to read "Division of Information Technology, which"
      i. Numbers 1-9 were removed and replaced with ". An official set of these documents shall be maintained in the ASI Administration Office."
   (b) Under ASI Specific Guidelines and Standards there was a change made to number 5 and 9
2) Cora suggested to modify the proposed change of "Division of Information Technology, which" with "University" and also suggested to replace "Storage Area Network (SAN)" with something broad
3) Discussion took place in regards to proposing a change to replace "Storage Area Network (SAN)" with something broad if "SAN" is removed from the document it was also suggested that all references to the "SAN" be removed
   (a) The proposed change to the document was to replace "file storage via the Storage Area Network (SAN)"with "the centralized campus electronic file server"
4) Greg proposed to include in the beginning of the document "(Cal Poly Pomona)" after "California State Polytechnic University, Pomona" so that in all other instances of the document instead of it always reading "California State Polytechnic University, Pomona" it can read "(Cal Poly Pomona)"
5) Under Policy Statement "PC" will be struck out
6) Julian moved to bring back this document back as an Action Item at the next meeting. Joshua seconded.
   (a) Short question and answer took place:
      i. Reeza asked if this document will just be looked at again at the next meeting or more changes are going to be made – Cora suggested working with other members of the committee to reflect changes discussed at the meeting
   (b) Vote, 6:0:0, motion passes.

IV. **Discussion Item**
   A) UBSS By-Laws
      1) David read the proposed changes UBSS made to the UBSS By-Laws
         (a) They inserted a logo that was not previously there
         (b) Under Article 1 Section 1 they removed the space before "General"
         (c) Under Article 1 Section 2 they removed the space before "Specific"
         (d) Article 4 Non-Discrimination they struck out "and" before "marital status"
         (e) Under Article 3 Section 5 Funding Requirements Sub-Section A they struck out "five" and inserted "one of the first three"
         (f) On page 5 they inserted sub-sections H, I, and J
            i. H states "All Recognized Student Senate Organizations must present their requested budget for the school year to the VP of Finance and the President or Executive Vice President by the fifth meeting of the Senate; if an organization fails to do so it will be put on probation and lose its voting rights. In addition, no funding will be released to the organization until the presentation is given, and will not necessarily be considered in total allocations by UBSS"
            ii. I states "If a Recognized Student Senate Organization does not delegate a representative to attend the Senate meetings by the third meeting of the fall quarter, it will be put on probation and loose its voting rights. In addition, no funding will be released to the organization"

iii. J states " If a Recognized Student Senate Organization's Representative has more than two unexcused absents from Senate meetings in one quarter, the organization will lose its voting rights for that quarter and will not be allocated their fall disbursement from UBSS and or spring disbursement accordingly."

iv. Page 21 Article 9 Section 5 Sub-Section A they struck out "the Vice President" and inserted "an Executive Officer of the Senate."

2) David shared that his concern with these amendments excluding H,I, and J is that the OSLCC and SCI are the only ones that have the authority to put clubs on probation this wording must then be fixed in the document

   (a) He also shared that they must accommodate for clubs that register after their specified dates

3) Discussion took place regarding the UBSS By-Laws and if the committee will be able to make recommendations to the By-Laws it was addressed that this committee does not make any changes or actions to these items and whether or not this go through Senate it was later discovered that it does go through the Senate

4) Cora suggested that the amendments that are made by councils to their by-laws should not be modified in the meetings and allows the councils to maintain their modifications unless it is something drastic then the committee can discuss it

5) Reeza moved to have the UBSS By-Laws as a discussion item at the next meeting. Joshua seconded. Vote, 6:0:0, motion passes.

B) ASI By-Laws

1) David read the non-substantive proposed changes to be made to the ASI By-Laws

   (a) Specify the difference between Committee and Board

   (b) Under definition A strike out "Charter" and insert "Registered"

   (c) Under K strike out "Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters" and replace it with "general academic terms"

   (d) Article 4 Section 3 sub-section A1 replacing "fall quarter" with "academic year"

   (e) Section 4 Sub-Section A4 replacing "charter" with "by-laws"

   (f) Article 11 Section 1D replacing "Administrative Assistant" with "Student Government Coordinator"

   (g) Section 2 Article 16 replacing "quarter" with "term"

   (h) Article 18 Section 3 replacing "quarter" with "academic term"

   (i) Article 20 Section 4C replacing "quarter" with academic term"

   (j) Article 23 replacing "Administrative Assistant" with "Student Government Coordinator"

   (k) David asked for discussion to take place under Article 24 Section 3 in regards to "in the winter quarter" and suggestions to be made to replace it with non-specific language

      i. It was proposed to change "in the winter quarter" with "in the month of January" "for the spring quarter" it was proposed to insert "April"

   (l) Article 29 Section 2 replacing "fall quarter" with "the academic term"

   (m) Under Section I – Regular Elections replace "Spring Quarter" with "Last term of the academic year"

   (n) It was recommended that all of these proposed changes be done outside of the Sub-Senate Committee meeting

   (o) Chairs were assigned to review each document and make amendments

      i. ASI Document Review – Greg Kommel Chair

      ii. Amending Senate Bill – Julian Herrera Chair

2) Joshua moved to postpone Discussion Items C and D to a later Rules and Policies Committee Meeting. Greg seconded. Vote, 6:0:0, motion passes.

    C)   ASI Senate Rules
    D)   ASI Cabinet Rules

V. Adjournment
    A)   Next Rules and Policies Committee Meeting: Friday, November 6, 2015 at 3:00-5:00pm, BSC, 2nd Floor, England Evans
    B)   Meeting was adjourned at 4:59pm