

## Finance Committee 2014-2015 Minutes/Discussion Pertaining to Policy 213

October 3, 2014

### Discussion I

a. Policy 213 – Academic/Student Organization Travel – Finance Committee will review policy.

- Carina Kan – “We will take turns reading this policy through, it is crucial that we understand this policy because one of our funding requests deals with this.”
- The Committee took turns verbally reading each section of Policy 213
- Carina Kan – “There are 5 important parts of this policy that we should take note of: The requests must be made at least 6 weeks before, we can only fund transportation and lodging, we can only fund if the University has underwritten an amount of 30% or more, we only fund students, we have to approve them by a 2/3 vote not a simple majority.”

### Action Items

a. Funding Proposal Review for:

i. Society of Hispanic Engineers and Science Students – 2014  
SHPE National Conference - \$1033.20

- There was a brief presentation on what the conference would be about.
- Carina Kan stated that the proposal was only asking to be funded for the travel expense up to \$500.
- Antonio Canzona asked Ernesto, the presenter, if there were any attempts to getting 30% funding from the University (as stated in policy 213 5.4).
- Ernesto stated that they simply followed the procedure of what they did last year by which they had received A.S.I. funding, in which case the club was the entity that funded the 30%.
- Carina Kan – We have to decide whether or not we want to include “club” in the definition of University stated in policy 213.
- MOTION MOVED – DISCUSSION BEGINS
- Shane Vera and Ruth Ramos think that the travel should be funded because there is a strong level of commitment and representation of CSULA.
- Shane Vera notes that he thinks the policy should be changed which would allow any entity to fund the 30% as opposed to only the University.
- Carina Kan responded that if the committee decides to approve funding, it would be with the current policy in place and we would be considered to be operating by the exact words of our policy. Carina also wanted the committee to keep in mind that we are only funding one student, as opposed to other events when multiple students are funded. Antonio Canzona states that he understands that there are some policies with gray areas in which case if a club were on the fence we would just give it to them, but this policy is clear cut: it states “5.4 A.S.I. will **only** fund academic/student organization travel if the University has underwritten an amount greater than 30% of the total travel cost for the event.” We would have to respect this policy because we honestly don’t know the reasoning as to why the policy exists and it shouldn’t be discredited immediately. If we disregard this policy we would be subsequently disregarding past committees and their reasoning behind putting it in place. If we want to fund this request, we would first have to argue the merit of the policy itself and change it before funding this club. As it stands right

now the club funded the 30% and the policy clearly states the University must provide that funding prior to A.S.I. funding.

- Intef Weser followed up by stating that when it comes to student traveling the CSU has a blanket travel insurance covered for students. A probable reason as to why the policy is in place is because if A.S.I. funds travels without University support our organization might have to assume responsibility for it. If the University doesn't sign off on the funding, is there really coverage for it?
- Shane Vera – Since University is not defined in this policy, I would argue that a club is part of the University. All students are stakeholders of this University, a club is recognized by the University. How else would you define University? Is it only Administration or Departments? Clubs and Organizations are recognized entities of this University which would fall under the definition of University.
- Brian Wu agreed with Shane and supported a change in the policy which would more clearly broaden the definition of University.
- Carina Kan agrees that this is a gray area and the committee must make a decision whether or not to step into this gray area.
- Antonio Canzona notes that although “University” isn’t explicitly defined, the definition of the term is implied under 5.7.5 of the policy. It states that a student organization/teams requesting funding are required to supply “Verification of university funding (usually incorporated into the Dean's/Director's and Chair's/Vice President's Letter.)” In a way, this states that “University” and “University funding” has to do with finances by which the Dean/Director and Chair/Vice President of the University would have knowledge of, as opposed to clubs or organizations.
- Shane Vera catches a key word in the policy “usually” which means it is not certain.
- Antonio Canzona - “Usually” is referring to the form of verification. There still needs to be Verification of university funding which this request does not have. In stating 5.7.5 of the policy, it still implies the definition of university.
- Carina Kan notes that if this committee approves the request it is a recommendation that still needs to go through the BOD.
- Shane Vera goes back to the issue of funding only one student that there is only one student. This conference is supported by and represents the club, the engineering department, and the entire CSULA community.
- Nicholas Carrillo refers to the policy at section 5.4 and believes that since “if and only if the University” was not included, it is open to including other entities.
- Antonio Canzona believes that since “only” was both bolded and underlined in that section of the policy, anything mentioned after should be carefully and strictly followed.
- Intef Weser is still concerned about the coverage and would research more information about University coverage so that there would be more clarity prior to the time this motion reaching the BOD.
- Shane Vera believes that the policy is not being violated with the approval of this motion.

<b>Offered By:</b>	<b>Shane Vera</b>	<b>Seconded by:</b>	<b>Ruth Ramos</b>
Motion to Approve funding request for Society of Hispanic Engineers and Science Students to attend the 2014 SHPE National Conference - \$500			
<b>All in Favor</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Abstained</b> 1
<b>Motion:</b> passed			

October 17, 2014

- b. Policy 213 – Academic/Student Organization Travel – The Finance Committee will take action on the policy
- ✦ Carina Kan opens discussion by indicating that the committee has reviewed and used this policy (Policy 213) last meeting on October 3, 2014. Regarding discussion on an action item to fund a student travel request which dealt with the policy, the committee agreed that changes should be made to sections 5.4 and 5.7.5.
  - ✦ MOTION MOVED – DISCUSSION BEGINS
  - ✦ Antonio Canzona – It is preferable that we table/postpone action on this policy to next meeting. We don't have much information to sink our teeth in, all we have is the policy in front of us. Prior to next meeting the committee should be supplied with past committee/BOD minutes, with discussion regarding section 5.4 and 5.7.5. Without any background information, the committee would be inhibited of making an informed decision. The committee should review the reasoning of why these sections of the policy were established. Action on this policy should be based on our agreement or disagreement with the reasons for putting these policies into play.

<b>Offered By:</b>	<b>Michael Flores</b>	<b>Seconded by:</b>	<b>Sean Vera</b>			
Motion to amend Policy 213 – Academic/Student Organization Travel – Section 5.4 and 5.7.5						
<b>All in Favor</b>		<b>Opposed</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Abstained</b>		<b>Motion:</b> failed

<b>Offered By:</b>	<b>Shane Vera</b>	<b>Seconded by:</b>	<b>Dean Truong</b>			
Motion to table Policy 213 – Academic/Student Organization Travel to next meeting.						
<b>All in Favor</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Opposed</b>		<b>Abstained</b>		<b>Motion:</b> passed

January 16, 2015

a. Policy 213 – Academic/Student Organization Travel – The Finance Committee will review the policy

- ✦ Carina Kan – We have seen this policy before and have discussed changing 5.4. “A.S.I. will only fund academic/student organization travel if the University has underwritten an amount greater than 30% of the total travel cost for the event.” We were debating about what the definition of “university” encompassed last time, and we generally agreed that clubs and orgs should be included.
- ✦ Antonio Canzona's main issue with changing this would be that his perceived original intention of having university being the entity to provide the 30% funding was to have the club try to get funding from their own college first and look for the rest of the funding at ASI. Changing this clause would be eliminating that incentive.
- ✦ Carina Kan theorized that many of the smaller clubs would not receive the same support as the larger clubs from the University.
- ✦ Shane Vera thought that we shouldn't even include university. This would include any way of providing 30% is satisfactory.
- ✦ Carina Kan responded by stating that we include university for the same reason why we require a letter of support from their Academic Dean and Faculty Adviser. This is to make sure that the university is supporting their travel. They will be representing CSULA wherever they go and the university has the choice whether or not to let them represent us.
- ✦ Intef Weser explained that this travel policy is not meant for people to simply travel for the experience, it's for academic presentations, participate in competitions, etc. He believes that there still should be a university connection and support; it should not be eliminated at all.
- ✦ Antonio Canzona agrees and provides a counter argument to what Carina said about small clubs not getting enough support from the university. He proposed that the policy is kept as it is, but we simply decrease the percentage needed (30%) so that it would be easier for clubs and orgs to receive university funding.
- ✦ Ruth Ramos agrees with Shane's idea and believes that the letter of support is enough to prove that they have support from the university.
- ✦ Antonio Canzona explains that this clause is directly related with 5.7.5 “Student Organization/Teams requesting funding are required to supply the following: Verification of university funding (usually incorporated into the Dean's/Director's and Chair's/Vice President's Letter.)” So they would both need to be changed.
- ✦ Antonio Canzona also wanted to make sure that if we allow this loophole, will we still be covered with the university insurance even if they didn't financially support it.
- ✦ Intef Weser confirmed that ASI will still be covered.
- ✦ Carina Kan outlined three different changes that could be made to section 5.4: Option #1 30% of the total cost is covered (regardless of the means); Option #2 30% of the total cost is covered by the University or any club/org recognized by the University; Option #3 keep it as is, just change 30% to 10%. The percentages of the first 2 options could also be decided and changed later on.
- ✦ The committee did an informal vote on the options. Results: Option #1 – 9 votes, Option #2 – 0 votes, Option #3 – 1 vote.
- ✦ The committee agreed that if option #1 was chosen, the percentage should dictate the willingness of the club to go on the trip and/or seek support.
- ✦ Carina Kan proposed the different percentages which the committee decided to vote on (assuming option #1 was chosen for the policy). Results: 30% - 6 votes, 20% - 1 vote, 10% - 1 vote.
- ✦ Carina Kan added that 5.7.1 would be eliminated because there is no such thing as a Academic/Student Organization Travel Request form.
- ✦ Antonio Canzona proposed that we change 5.7.5 to Verification of university or club/org funding.