Rules and Policies Committee Minutes
2017-2018:12 Friday, April 20, 2018, 8:30 – 10:30AM, BSC 1st Floor, Senate Chambers

I. **Preliminaries**
A) Call to Order at: 8:34 AM
B) Quorum Check:
_X_ Joshua Ebiner, Attorney General, Chair **Excused Tardy**

Voting Members:
_X_ Catherine Kavianian, Senate President Pro-Tempore, Vice Chair
_X_ Farris Hamza, President
_X_ Carlos Gomez, Vice President
_X_ Cameron Pastrano, CLASS Senator
_X_ Rachel Hunter, Senator-at-Large (SIC)
_X_ Pasindu Senaratne, Senator-at-Large (IHC) **Excused Tardy**

Advisors:
_X_ Dr. Liz Roosa Millar, ASI Executive Director **Excused Tardy**
_X_ Powell Velasco, Designee for ASI Executive Director
_X_ Thavery Lay-Bounpraseuth, Coordinator, Asian Pacific Islander Student

Liaison:
_X_ Kellie Pinedo, Treasurer **Excused Tardy**

C) Approval of Minutes
  1) There were no minutes for approval
D) Agenda Changes
  1) There were no changes to the agenda, it was approved as posted
E) Introduction of Guests
  1) Michelle Sims, ASI, Administrative Assistant for Student Government
F) Open Forum
  1) There were no speakers

II. **Action Items**
A) There were no items

III. **Discussion Items**
A) ASI Senate Code
  1) Carlos led the discussion on the ASI Senate Code, and reviewed its Purpose, Composition, Role of Chair and Vice Chair, Meeting Content, Meetings, ASI Senators, Voting Procedures, and Confirmation by the ASI Senate
  2) Article IV – ASI Senators – Section II – Required Duties is the newest addition to the ASI Senate Code, and new requirements that is expected of ASI Senators. They must have a minimum of 4 office hours a week, and there is discussion to whether all office hours have to be within the Student Government office or in their own Colleges. They have a requirement to vote at ASI Senate and how the voting rights are not transferrable, and attendance at their Council meetings. They must be appointed to three ASI or University-Wide Committees, and it is currently two and has been recommended to increase it to three. There is a requirement to have additional attendance for at least two ASI events per academic term, such as a Games Room event, Campus Recreation event, and to engage with the students at the events. There will be a new mid-year review conducted by the ASI Vice

President, and it is not punitive but more of a policy. There will be a time period for open comment and provide feedback on their Senators. There is a requirement of hosting one event per academic year with constituents to help increase the face and visibility of Senators. Each Senator has a line item and has been underutilized, and to use the money set aside to use for programming. Working on one task per academic year, in consultation with the ASI Vice President, such as working on a resolution, policy, or what the student leader is interested in. The last addition is to meet with their advisor, once per academic term, and the College Senators shall meet with their College's Dean, the Senator-at-Large (IHC) would meet with the Director of Housing, the Senator-at-Large (MCC) would meet with the Senior Coordinator for the Cultural Centers, the Senator-at-Large (SIC) would meet with the Director of OSLCC, and the Senator-at-Large (Greek) would meet with the Greek Life Coordinator.

3) Carlos amended Article I – ASI Senate – Section V, adding a section on Agenda Items, and there should be a formal process to help prepare the agenda. "Agenda items intended for the ASI Senate shall be submitted to the ASI Vice President by 5:00PM, on the Friday before a regularly scheduled ASI Senate meeting".

4) On Article I – ASI Senate – Section IV – Vice-Chair, Rachel suggested that the ASI Senator Pro-Tempore should be defined more.
   i. Farris suggested to break down the ASI Senator Pro-Tempore elections in the ASI Senate Code.

5) Kellie added the Associate Director of Student Government to Article I – ASI Senate – Section II – Composition, as a third advisor.
   i. Rachel suggested to remove "designee" behind the ASI Executive Director as an advisor.
   ii. Powell commented that it is important to have a designee in case the ASI Executive Director cannot attend the meetings. Without a representative from the staff, then the ASI Senate is blind by that information that someone could bring forward. If it is strictly the ASI Executive Director and no one else, it is a disadvantage to the groups that needs counsel, no matter who it is from at that point. He does not recommend scratching "designee", but it makes sense to have the ASI Executive Director looking into the commonalities on the positions, and having a primary expert from the organization is present at the meetings.

6) On Article II – Meeting Content – Section I – Preliminaries, Rachel read Farris's comment that it is unnecessary to include in the ASI Senate Code.
   i. Carlos commented that it is the nature of the ASI Senate meeting to have it as transparent as possible. This document is more educational, as it will be a go to document for the incoming Senators for the ASI Senate Code. They know what to expect, and he recommended keeping the Article.
   ii. Rachel suggested to change C. Agenda Changes to C. Agenda Items, as the Senators should be able to add items to the agenda without the consultation of the ASI Vice President if a majority of them want it on there.
   iii. Carlos commented that the reason why he added Action or Discussion Items to the agenda because it refers to the Gloria Romero Open Meetings Law, and adding the day of the meeting cheats the public beforehand. It is not good practice at all, and as a body, they should not be adding Action or Discussion Items on the day of the ASI Senate meetings. The role of the Chair decides what is added to the ASI Senate. It is not meant to silence people, but a matter of bouncing out what goes first, what goes second, and how to properly run that meeting.

iv. Kellie referenced the last Finance meeting held, and suggested to not add Discussion or Action Items on the day of ASI Senate meetings. This would allow Senators to not think on the fly, and to prepare for the discussions and action items ahead of time, and to not rush to vote on something.

v. Under B. Quorum Check, Farris suggested to change it to 2/3 majority, in case there is not 9 voting members.

vi. Carlos added that if a new Senator was added, a lot of ASI documents would need to be updated to reflect this change.

vii. Cameron went back to C. Agenda Changes, and commented that the ASI Senate is the main committee of ASI Student Government. All the decisions are made and every member of the ASI Senate has the opportunity to change the agenda, and they vote on it. If they do not want to change it because of the appropriate documents are not presented, they can say it at discussion. Having it outright say you cannot change or add anything blocks it, and takes away opportunities from speaking about items and having to wait another week or two.

viii. Carlos commented that if items were to come up that need attention, there are always Emergency Senate meetings. He suggested to consult with Mark Bookman, ASI Legal Counsel on this, as it is compliance with the law.

ix. Rachel agreed on consulting with Mark Bookman to determine if it is against the law, and is okay with the idea of adding a formal process of having items added on the agenda if the ASI Vice President does not add them. With Emergency Senate meetings, Senators also have to go through the ASI Vice President.

x. Carlos reiterated that it is the law that Special Meetings can be called by presiding officer of the group or by majority members of the group. That is the Gloria Romero Open Meetings Law. With agendas, it is serious enough that it needs to be consulted with Mark Bookman.

xi. Farris suggested to expand G. Reports and to include committees, projects, etc. for the Senator to report on.

xii. Cameron commented that a lot of this should be covered in the Student Government Retreat training, and the process should be telling a Senator what their responsibilities are.

xiii. Rachel stated that it states for Senators to report on relevant meetings, ongoing projects, and new projects, and thinks it is good enough.

xiv. Catherine suggested to add Council activities to the Reports section.

xv. Farris asked why Section II – Action Items, Section III – Discussion Items, Section IV – Information Items, and Section V – Adjournment were in the ASI Senate Code, as they were removed from the ASI Cabinet Code.

xvi. Carlos followed up and notified that the purpose of the ASI Senate Code is to be an educational document. If a student leader comes in and does not have to wait for training, and for the public too if they come to an ASI Senate meeting, they can see the intent.

7) Rachel asked about Article III – Meetings – Section II – Special Meetings, and if the ASI Senator Pro-Tempore can call for a special meeting, considering they are the Vice Chair.

i. Carlos noted that Article II and Article III will be reviewed and consulted by Mark Bookman.

    ii.   Powell suggested to have SB 2015-16:03 reviewed and consulted by Mark Bookman to see if it is still compliant.

8) Farris recommended to divide Article IV – ASI Senators – Section I – Role of ASI Senators into two sections. One section would cover their role in ASI and the other would cover their role in Council.

    i.   Catherine disagreed and noted that a decent foundation has been laid, and they are getting too specific with being too involved in their Councils. She likes how it is formatted currently as they have to uphold the ASI face within their Council without having the ASI body controlling the Councils.

    ii.   Cameron added that if there is some expectation for a Senator to do something with the Council, it should be in their Council By-Laws. He does not like the Senators having voting rights on the Council because they are a liaison. If there is an expectation or suggest to Councils that ASI would like for them to put in their By-Laws, but if they have an expectation of a Senator, then they should note it in their By-Laws. Senators are not supposed to be there for the Council, they are there for the entire College.

    iii.   Carlos noted that the first sentence under Section I – Role of ASI Senators does not encompass the At-Large Senators, and suggested to add constituents. He likes the idea of changing Article IV – ASI Senators to have Section II – Required Duties and Section III – Recommended Duties.

    iv.   Cameron disagreed with the addition of Recommended Duties. The ASI Senate Code is supposed to be raising expectations of what a Senator is supposed to be doing. If we want the organization to actually connect with the student population and increasing the sense of well-being and belonging, the organization needs to push the people in it to do those types of things. Senators would look at the duties and see what the minimum they are required to do.

    v.   Farris agreed with Cameron's side, and there needs to be a clear set guidelines and expectations.

    vi.   A discussion took place on Senators having voting rights on the Executive Board within their Councils.

    vii.   Catherine asked about Section I., "Hosting one event per academic year with constituents" and asked if it was in coordination with their constituents or with the Student Activities and Programs department. She followed up and asked about Section J., "Working on one task per academic year, in consultation with the ASI Vice President" and asked if it should be the ASI Secretary of Internal Affairs.

    viii.   Rachel suggested it should be the ASI Senator Pro-Tempore, not the ASI Vice President or ASI Secretary of Internal Affairs.

    ix.   Carlos noted that Section I. is meant for the Senators using their outreach money that they have allocated from the budget, providing something to the event and not just showing up.

    x.   Catherine stated that hosting one event with constituents should be separate from the Council.

    xi.   Rachel commented that it is a lot of required duties for a Senator to do and could be grounds for removal if these duties are not met.

    xii.   Catherine noted that it is a lot of what they are currently doing, and is very capable of doing these duties. She added that with the review from the ASI Vice President, they will

see if they are doing the minimum, some, or most of the duties, and does not automatically have them considered to be removed.

    xiii.   Liz commented that the sentence, "Each ASI Senator shall make every effort to adhere to the following required duties" shows that if a Senator tries to meet with their advisor and cannot meet with them, then it is out of their control but tried to make every effort to complete the duty. She suggested to change Section II – Required Duties to Section II – Duties.

9) For Article V – Voting Procedures – Section II – Confirmation by the ASI Senate, Cameron commented how awkward the Confirmations were for the ASI Senate. He suggested to have Senators be allowed to attend the interviews or to hear them, and to make a logical decision and reinforce the decision of the ASI President because it is the most qualified candidate.

    i.   Kellie commented that the ASI Secretary of Programs needs to be added instead of ASI Senator Pro-Tempore, as they are no longer chairing the Facilities and Operations Committee.

    ii.   Farris followed up and noted it is the ASI President's job to interview and bring an individual to the ASI Senate. He does not think the Senators should be attending the interviews. He likes the idea of having a review panel, having it as a Discussion Item first, and then Action Item at the next Senate meeting.

    iii.   Rachel stated that she would prefer if the Senators being in the interviews, or a fair compromise would be to have notes submitted on the SAN. It would give Senators the chance to ask informed questions, as the ASI Senate is brand new and do not know what to ask and what is appropriate to ask.

    iv.   Carlos agreed that the process is not designed well. The process is at the very beginning and do not understand the magnitude of their decisions at that time. He does not like the idea of providing meeting notes or sitting in the interviews. It is the ASI President's Cabinet, with the advisement of the ASI Vice President and advisors, to make their appointments. He likes the idea of the hearing process and questions to ask them. Having the discussion, hearing, and confirming them at the following Senate meeting. It would be a learning moment and understand what that is. Maybe specify in some document or training that a big role of Senators is confirming appointed members.

    v.   Kellie commented that she does not like the idea of having all the Senators in the interview process and sees it as intimidating.

    vi.   Catherine based it off how a search committee works, and the Senators do not need all the information from all the candidates. She does not agree with having the Senators be in the interview but likes the idea of having it as a discussion, then a hearing, and going to action at the next Senate meeting. She proposed the idea of having the current Senators teaching their next successor that the first order of business is to appoint the Cabinet members.

    vii.   Rachel also sees it as a search committee, but the ASI Senate is essentially the search committee as they are the recommending body. They should have access to the interviews and the notes, and as a new Senator, they do not know what to ask but have every available opportunity to have the questions. Approving appointed members is not a learning moment, but an actual moment and having the information is helpful.

B) ASI Internship Program Code
   1) Farris led the discussion on the ASI Internship Program Code, which is now the Bronco Associated Student Experience (BASE) Program. He amended the document with changes.
   2) Liz suggested to remove the word "interns" throughout the document.
   3) In Article III – Description and Scope – Section I – Eligibility, Rachel asked about eligibility and how the program is offered to all CPP students who do not meet VOE requirements, and wanted to know if it was because they missed the deadline to apply for ASI Senate and ASI Cabinet.
      i. Farris reviewed the three VOE requirements, which are academic standing, disciplinary standing, and a minimum 2.0 GPA.
      ii. A discussion took place on the interpretation of the Section.
      iii. Farris added that the program is geared towards first year, native, and transfer students. Priority of the program is more for the first year and transfer students. Every other student can still apply for it, but that is what the program is tailored for.
      iv. Carlos suggested to have Section I be the intent and purpose of the program, and Section II should have the eligibility.
      v. Liz commented that it is covered in the Purpose in Article I – Background.
      vi. Rachel asked if the VOE requirements could be listed in the document.

C) ASI Facilities and Operations Code
   1) Josh led the discussion of the ASI Facilities and Operations Code, and noted the ASI Secretary of Programs and Services will be chairing the Facilities and Operations Committee. The ASI Senator Pro-Tempore will serve as the Chair. He opened the floor to discussion on having ASI student staff serving on the committee in lieu of students.
      i. Farris had a conversation with the Games Room staff and they were not aware of the Facilities and Operations Committee. Students-at-large have no knowledge of the BSC or ASI Facilities and Operations. It is a good learning opportunity for them, and is fine with keeping Students-at-Large there but if the Committee wants to be shifted in a different direction, there would be a huge benefit of having ASI student staff serve.
      ii. Rachel likes the idea of having student staff sitting on the Facilities and Operations Committee. They are still student representatives and are the student voice, they do still bring a perspective that is valuable to the Facilities and Operations Committee.
      iii. Carlos recommended to have the ASI Secretary of Programs and Services removed as a voting member, as they are the Chair. Arrangements would need to be made if a building manager would be interested and available to serve.
      iv. Cameron likes the idea of having student staff, and asked what departments they should come from.
      v. Powell commented that if they get too specific, it would eliminate others who are really interested and could come from other departments.
      vi. Rachel asked about the scholarship for the Facilities and Operations Committee, and there should be a discussion of the Directors of the ASI departments that there is compensation. She agrees that the student staff should not be from a specific department.
      vii. Carlos asked if it should be student staff designated to serve all year, or come to the meetings when it is appropriate and be liaisons.
      viii. Cameron likes the idea of having student staff serve as liaisons, and do not have to be there all the time.
      ix. Liz commented that it already says there can be up to student representative serving on the Facilities and Operations Committee, and this would not eliminate the opportunity from student staff at ASI. Ensuring that there is a separation from the student job and

this would be a paid experience and hour limitations. This would be a separate service and be compensated for the process. They would also be sitting as a student of CPP, not an ASI employee.

D) ASI Education Enhancement Board Code
   1) Josh led the discussion of the ASI Education Enhancement Board Code, and followed in the same guidelines of the ASI Facilities and Operations Code and the ASI Finance Committee Code. He recommended to add one Senator to serve, and having a minimum of two and maximum of four student representatives. He opened the floor to discussion.
     i. Farris suggested to have the ASI Senator Pro-Tempore as Vice Chair and be a voting member. He wants to explore the idea of having it as a mini Special Projects Improve Classroom Experience (SPICE) Committee.
     ii. Cameron suggested to make the Board a Committee and having more Senators serve.
     iii. Rachel added that if it is changed to a Committee, then the ASI Secretary of Education should not be a voting member since they are the Chair, just like other ASI Cabinet members.
     iv. Carlos likes the idea of removing the ASI Senator Pro-Tempore from Education Enhancement and adding another Senator position.
     v. Catherine disagrees with removing the ASI Senator Pro-Tempore. That is the role they are re-creating for them, especially since they are no longer the Chair of the Facilities and Operations Committee. She sees it as mimicking other committees by having three Senators and the Chair should not vote. There is not enough substance from the advisors, and suggested to have a representative from Academic Senate serve as an advisor.
     vi. Rachel agrees with the ASI Senator Pro-Tempore serving as the Vice Chair, and they are bringing the perspective of both the ASI Senate and ASI Cabinet. And to have an advisor that brings more insight.
     vii. Carlos suggested to keep the advisors to one university advisor or designee for now, as this is a new task, and help shape it next year.

6) **Information Items**
   A) There were no items

7) **Adjournment**
   A) Next Rules and Policies Committee Meeting: Friday, May 4, 2018 at 8:30AM-10:30AM, BSC 1st Floor, Senate Chambers
   B) Meeting was adjourned at 10:29AM