



Executive Committee Meeting

Minutes

Tuesday, March 6th, 2018

Time: 4:18-5:50pm

Location: U-SU Board Room 303

Attendees: Executive Committee, General Public

Type of Meeting: General

I. Organizational Items:

a. Call to order by: Executive Committee at 4:18pm

b. Roll Call

David Zitser	<i>President</i>	Present
Neyda Umana	<i>Vice President for Academic Governance</i>	Excused Absent
Aaron Castaneda	<i>Vice President for Finance</i>	Present
Marcos Montes	<i>Vice President for External Affairs</i>	Present
Jeovany Aguilar	<i>Chief Justice</i>	Present
Jazmin Ortiz	<i>Secretary/ Treasurer</i>	Present
Lavernis Martin	<i>BOD Member</i>	Present
Jennifer Miller	<i>University Presidents Designee</i>	Excused Absent
Intef W. Weser	<i>Executive Director</i>	Present
Marcus Rodriguez	<i>Director of Programs and Leadership</i>	Excused Absent
Dena Florez	<i>Office Manager of Administration & Services</i>	Present
Public	<i>Undergraduate Academic Senator</i>	

c. Adoption of Agenda for Tuesday:

Adoption of Agenda for Tuesday:						
Offered By:	Jazmin Ortiz	Seconded by:		Lavernis Martin		
Motion to approve the adoption of Agenda for Tuesday, March 6 th , 2018.						
All in Favor	All	Opposed	0	Abstained	0	Motion: Passed

Friendly Amendment to the Agenda:

Offered By:	Aaron Castaneda	Seconded by:	None
-------------	-----------------	--------------	------

Postpone February 20 th minutes to next Executive Committee meeting.					
All in Favor	Consensus	Opposed		Abstained	Motion: Passed

II. Public Forum/Announcement

This time is allotted for members of the public or representatives to make announcements to the executive committee members.

III. Standing Discussion

- a. BOD Agenda: The committee will discuss potential agenda items for the next BOD.
- ✚ Aaron Castaneda: From the last meeting, the 6&6 Budget and a few policies will be added. Also, appointments will also be added, as per usual.
- ✚ Lavernis Martin: I believe it would be beneficial to add a discussion item to review the new Bi-weekly Template.

IV. Action Items

- a. Executive Officer Workflow: The committee will take action on the Executive Officer Workflow recommendations.
- ✚ Jazmin Ortiz: Intef, regarding the GIA Increase Proposal, do you think it will be ready by the next B.O.D.?
- ✚ Intef Weser: No, it won't be ready by then. David will explain his recommendation for the Workflow.
- ✚ David Zitser: This proposal is broken into three parts. The first part is the main part we talked about at the last Executive Committee meeting, which is the removal of the executives from many of the standing committees. The way it is currently designed, it incentivizes what I call the "essential committees" for each of the executives. All the executives will still sit on B.O.D. and Executive Committee. For example, the VPA would sit on Personnel and Cabinet of Commissioners to be able to do their job. However, the VPF would sit on B.O.D. and Executive Committee, but excluding the President, they would be the only executive that would be on Finance Committee and Club Funding. Furthermore, the VPG would sit on Shared Governance and Cabinet of Academic Senators. VPEAA will have CSSA and Legislative Affairs. Secretary/Treasurer would have Strategic Planning and the Ad Hoc Biweekly Workflow.
- ✚ Intef Weser: We have to clarify the committee composition, making sure that it's majority Board for all committees, but Exec and Personnel need to be primarily Board members. As committee members, you can't have designees for any Board positions.
- ✚ Marcos Montes: Does the President need to sit on all of the committees? Or is there any room to alleviate some of the work load on the President?
- ✚ Intef Weser: Club Funding could be one that the President could be removed from.
- ✚ David Zitser: That might be up to the committee.
- ✚ Jazmin Ortiz: When would this change be effective?
- ✚ David Zitser: Next year.
- ✚ Lavernis Martin: I the intent behind this proposed change, but increasing from one to two committees for the rest of the B.O.D. members might be too much extra workflow for the members, especially the college representatives.
- ✚ Intef Weser: For the President, in regards to participation in CSSA and Legislative Affairs, the VPEAA is the main representative in consultation with the President. Should we make the President's participation in Legislative Affairs more of an option? This wouldn't necessarily limit them from attending CSSA.
- ✚ David Zitser: The way it is structured is that each Vice President has "main" committees. We could make it that the President only sits on those "main" committees.
- ✚ Marcos Montes: I don't think the President should have to sit on all of those committees. They should definitely sit on Personnel and Finance. To have them sit on other committees just seems a bit redundant.
- ✚ David Zitser: This would also free up the President's schedule.
- ✚ Intef Weser: I recommend that the three committees that can be taken off the President's plate are Legislative Affairs, Club Funding, and potentially Shared Governance. Let's move onto Purpose 2.
- ✚ David Zitser: Purpose 2 is to address what happens once we remove those executives from those committees. We need to create a plan to fill up the vacancies. The first option listed on the proposal is to increase the requirements of ASI Board members from one internal and one external committee, to two internal and one external. Another option would be to give executives their base minimum for Purpose 1 and add one more internal committee requirement on top of that. The third option is to maximize Student-At-Large Seats, while at the same time maintaining Board of Directors majority. Purpose 2 is making Board members have their internal committee requirement raised from one to two, and possibly for Executives from zero to one in addition to their minimum.

- ✚ Lavernis Martin: Although executives have their minimum number of committees respective to their areas, for other members of the B.O.D., they are going from one internal committee to two, in addition to their respective workloads. That may be something that we should consider since there already is an issue with maintaining people on their respective committees as it is.
- ✚ David Zitser: The reason for increasing the minimum for Board members is to ensure that they are familiar with the inner workings of those committees. It normally wouldn't make sense for college representatives to sit on these extra committees, but as Board members they would benefit from this increase. I understand the concern about the increase in workload, but we need to get Board members more involved with the internal workings of the organization. If that means further enforcing internal committee requirements, that should be fine.
- ✚ Dena Florez: Why would executives not sit on Strategic Planning Committee? The committee seems critical to their positions as it is where ASI's goals, structure, and plans are formed.
- ✚ David Zitser: Executives do not have to be part of Strategic Planning. Executive Committee already establishes the vision for ASI each year. Strategic Planning would benefit from having more diverse areas of ASI involved in it rather than primarily the executives. If we go with the option of increasing the internal committee requirements, executives can also choose to attend Strategic Planning Committee if they prefer.
- ✚ Dena Florez: Do you think that splitting up members and executives among these committees would add more work?
- ✚ David Zitser: Regarding the Strategic Planning codes and procedures, maybe we can have two seats for college reps, two for senators, two for commissioners, one executive seat, and so forth. The whole point of this, however, is to pull out committees that are non-essential for each area.
- ✚ Marcos Montes: Executives change year to year, as does their involvement with Strategic Planning.
- ✚ Jazmin Ortiz: How will we show that Board members or Students-At-Large are actually going to fill these spots if we leave so many vacant? Also, one of the suggestions was to remove one of the external committee requirements. What if this is done, but the executives are all required to sit on Shared Governance?
- ✚ David Zitser: Executives should still attend Shared Governance since we attend it as committee members, not executives.
- ✚ Intef Weser: For the committee requirement, I believe we will need some input from the majority of the members that vote on this. I think we need to set a more stringent expectation that by the second B.O.D., Board members are appointed to internal committees. If they aren't, that could be a consideration for removal. This way we will strengthen the requirements and fill the vacant seats.
- ✚ Marcial Romero (Public): Why not switch the wording from "B.O.D. members" to "ASI members"? I know that commissioners and senators are eager to be involved.
- ✚ David Zitser: The reasoning behind limiting it to that wording is because this addresses Board members' duties. Board members of an organization do make decisions at B.O.D. meetings, but they also need to be involved elsewhere in the organization at the committee level.
- ✚ Aaron Castaneda: David, please explain the premise of Purpose 3.
- ✚ David Zitser: Purpose 3 was the part of the document that contained my concern about pulling out executives from each of those committees. One of the things we addressed to fill that oversight was to have everything routed through the Executive Committee before it goes to the Board of Directors. The timeline attached is a suggestion if we do decide to adopt Purpose 3.
- ✚ Aaron Castaneda: The time between when Executive Committee meets, Tuesdays, which is proposed, and Friday, when the Board meets, will be at the 72-hour mark. This means the B.O.D. agenda needs to be posted exactly when Executive Committee starts.
- ✚ David Zitser: Yes, this is the intention. This would allow the members at Executive Committee to ask questions about the B.O.D. agenda during Exec. Ultimately, this choice is up to the committee.
- ✚ Aaron Castaneda: If we go with this proposed model, do you have a projected time that does not conflict with class schedules?
- ✚ David Zitser: For Purpose 3, I drafted three time slots to choose from, labeled as A, B, and C. They are not specific times.
- ✚ Aaron Castaneda: I understand that meeting Chairs have the discretion to choose the times that the meetings are held at. Can you clarify, Intef?
- ✚ Intef Weser: For our main committees, regarding people who get priority registration, we like to let them know in advance so they can plan their schedules around our meetings. By the time elections are over, they've already chosen their classes. This would be a challenge to change for the Fall semester. We'd have to address this right away.
- ✚ Aaron Castaneda: I believe that in some policies, Chairs have the discretion to change meeting times. If we pass this Purpose, do those policies get revoked?
- ✚ Intef Weser: Yes. If the President would want to change the times for a meeting, they would just have to get by in from the other members of those meetings. Did someone talk about the No Item expectation?
- ✚ Aaron Castaneda: Marcos briefly touched upon that. He mentioned that things shouldn't have to go to Exec Committee before B.O.D. because that would give Executive Committee too much power.

- David Zitser: If anyone chooses to motion on the Purposes, keep in mind that they are separate. We can approve just one if we prefer, or more than one.

Motion to approve: Purpose 1 and Purpose 2

Offered By:	Marcos Montes		Seconded by:	David Zitser		
All in Favor	All	Opposed	0	Abstained	0	Motion: Passed

- Lavernis Martin: Regarding Purpose 2, I believe that becoming part of two committees could be beneficial if the goal is to empower the Board. However, although we are focusing on our internal committees, I believe that our external committees are going to be lacking. The Board would be too focused on the internal committees.
- Jazmin Ortiz: I'm fine with adding another committee, I just want to make sure I don't overdo or underdo my workload compared to everyone else.

Amendment to main Motion

Offered By:	David Zitser	Seconded by:	Lavernis Martin			
Adjust Purpose 2 to include the one internal committee requirement for Executives on top of their base minimum as stated in Purpose 1.						
All in Favor	All	Opposed	0	Abstained	0	Motion: Passed

- Intef Weser: I'd like to suggest that since there is a College Rep meeting this Thursday, this should be shared there. This needs to at least be put on the agenda.
- Lavernis Martin: David, since you will be at CHESS, would you like me to present this to the Cabinet of College Representatives?
- Marcos Montes: I suggest we take this to the Board as a discussion item, not an action item. Cabinet of College Representatives might not be the best place to bring this up since there are two Representatives-At-Large there and they will also be affected by this.
- Intef Weser: I still think it would be beneficial. The college reps will have an opportunity to discuss this.
- Jeovany Aguilar: What about the issue of executives getting less meetings?
- Intef Weser: I believe we need to provide context as we reduce your meetings, what does that free up for you to do in regards to your specific duties. We should outline what those duties could be to be clearer.
- Jazmin Ortiz: David, a lot of your conversations on Executive Workflow need to pass through me and Intef. We are already discussing a lot of the topic brought up here today. I would like you to reach out to me before you make another proposal or take action.
- David Zitser: Alright.
- Marcial Romero (Public): This is clearly a big organizational change that this meeting does not have enough time to discuss. I recommend tabling to the next meeting.

Amendment to Main Motion

Offered By:	Lavernis Martin	Seconded by:	Jazmin Ortiz			
Motion to table until the next Executive Committee meeting with more research and discussion on proposal.						
All in Favor	2	Opposed	3	Abstained	0	Motion: Failed

- Marcos Montes: Looking to vote for moving forward to at least present to college representatives.
- Jazmin Ortiz: I am fine with Purpose 1 & 2.
- Intef Weser: I agree with tabling this so long as there is a requirement for discussion.
- David Zitser: If this goes to the Cabinet and no one is there to present it, it might not go over well. We also want it to go to the B.O.D., at least as a discussion item first, so as not to exclude the Reps-At-Large. I think we shouldn't table this and that Exec Committee needs to take a stand at this. At the same time, we can have a discussion at B.O.D. where we can get both the college reps and Reps-At-Large input.
- Aaron Castaneda: If this is not voted on, can this still go to the B.O.D. as a discussion item?
- Intef Weser: Yes.

Call to Question

Offered By:	Lavernis Martin		Seconded by:		Jazmin Ortiz	
All in Favor	All	Opposed	0	Abstained	0	Motion: Passed

b. Policy Review & Amendments - The Committee will review and take action on policy recommendations to the following procedures.

i. ASI Officer Performance & Removal Procedure – Policy 020.

Intef Weser: To give context, the pieces in blue are conversations I've had with David, Dena, Neyda, and Jazmin. The meeting behavior and office usage sections were recommendations from the Bylaws Committee that they weren't supposed to be in the ethics policy.

David Zitser: The things done in Policy 22 have been moved to Policy 20. There is also additional language on how direct reports and their employees should interact with each other. That is the purpose of the training and status reports. We also spoke about the removal process, and this contains the summary of it.

Intef Weser: At the last meeting the desire was to have more expectations and clarify for what members and upper management should do. There is going to be more training. I suggest making a process map for this.

Offered By:	Jazmin Ortiz	Seconded by:		Lavernis Martin		
Motion to extent conversation by 5 minutes						
All in Favor	All	Opposed	0	Abstained	0	Motion: Passed

Offered By:	David Zitser	Seconded by:	Marcos Montes			
Motion to table Policy 20 until the next Executive Committee meeting.						
All in Favor	4	Opposed	1	Abstained	0	Motion: Passed

c. ASI Infrastructure Restructure – The Committee will discuss plans to restructure the organization.

Motion to approve: Chief of Staff Restructure

Offered By:	David Zitser		Seconded by:		None	
All in Favor		Opposed		Abstained		Motion: Failed

V. New Business

VI. Informational Items

VII. Reports

VIII. Discussion

IX. Adjournment:

Offered By:	Consensus		Seconded by:			
Motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:50pm						
All in Favor	All	Opposed		Abstained		Motion: Passed

CERTIFICATION

Official Minutes taken for the **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING** of the Associated Students, Inc, Cal State Los Angeles held on Tuesday, February 6th, 2018 in the University Student Union 303AB. Consensus by the A.S.I. Board of Directors on Tuesday,

Prepared by:

Dena Florez
Recording Secretary

Jazmin Ortiz
Secretary/Treasurer