

## COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS

April 28, 2011

**Present:** Sandy Bass, Sara Brickman, Haley Raunch for Sue Buyrn, Tyler Campbell, Michael Cardman, Rick Ferraro, William Hazel for Deepu George, Monika Gibson, Megan Lewis for Caroline Gimenez, Bo Hart, Lauren Heming, Designee for Stacey Pannell, Frank Hernandez, Eric Hodges, Monica Hunter, Rawlin Jefferson, Frances Kwong, Nathan Lavinka, Sharbari Dgy for Ana LoMascolo, Shane McCarty, Michelle McLeese, Jonathan Moore, Matt Parker, David Ramras, Robert Sebek, Katelin Shugart-Schmidt, Designee for Kim Carlson, Guy Sims, Ed Spencer, Joe Tran, Designee for Dani Bernabe, Leighton Vila, J. Corbin DiMeglio for Greer Kelly

**Absent:** Ryan Anderson, Parisa Ahmadi, Tom Brown, Brad Klein, Mary Ann Lewis, Frank Shushok, Shyrah Thomas, Alex Walker

**Guests:** Scott Bennett, Steve Burrell, Matthew Creasey, Samantha Holdren, Kristen Houston, Lauren Howard, Mary Jackson, Shree Narayanan, Elaine Quesenberry, Amanda Rumore

Mr. Lavinka called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. In order to determine whether or not a quorum was present, he asked that all voting members or a proxy filling in for someone, raise their hand. The count was 24, which is quorum and the meeting proceeded. He then explained the Sub-Committee formed to review the GSA SBB appeal request met this past Friday and there were issues raised on the validity and fairness of that sub-committee hearing. To ensure a fair process is, Dr. Spencer met with Mr. Lavinka and Mr. Bass to discuss how to proceed. The purpose of the subcommittee was to see if the appeal met at least one of the three bases for an appeal: 1) Established policies and procedures were not followed, 2) the organization was denied the opportunity to present significant evidence at the time of the hearing, and 3) the funding decision was arbitrary and capricious. The first decision of the Commission today is to decide whether the Commission needs to hear the appeal by determining whether or not it qualifies under one of the three. If so, the Commission will move on to the second decision of the day, consideration of the actual appeal. Mr. Lavinka then outlined the rules of the process. The Graduate Student Assembly will have 10 minutes to present their position on how at least one of the three criteria are met; the Student Budget Board will have 10 minutes to present their position on how GSA's appeal does not meet one of the three criteria. Then there will be 15 minutes for questions from Commission members and then each side will have two minutes to make a final statement, which will then be followed by a vote. During the process, Mr. Lavinka will serve as moderator and Mr. Bass will serve as timekeeper. Roberts Rules of Order, as it pertains to CSA procedures, will be followed.

Ms. Michelle McLeese, President of the Graduate Student Assembly, served as spokesperson for the Graduate Student Assembly, indicating that their appeal is based on the first two items of criteria: **1)** established policies and procedures were not followed and **2)** the organization was denied the opportunity to present significant evidence at the time of the hearing. She distributed documentation as evidence to support the criteria their appeal was

based on. On the first criteria, she handed out copies of page 4 from the Activity Fee Allocation Policies and Procedures for the Student Budget Board, section II, entitled "organization." This section states: "Each board must, at a minimum, produce minutes of its meetings..." (p.4). No minutes were taken during meetings and therefore on the grounds that policies and procedures were not followed an appeal should be granted. Furthermore, since no minutes were taken, Ms. McLeese argued, that it would be impossible to establish what actually took place at the initial hearing. On the second criteria, Ms. McLeese handed out copies of the 2010-11 Student Budget Board annual funding cut strategy attempting to show that the original content (#16) was changed based on false information from, "GSA office assistant not funded in annual funding, if hired, will be funded in contingency" to "GSA office assistant not funded in annual funding, if hired, can be considered for funding in contingency." Ms. McLeese argued that this change was based on false information that the GSA attempted to demonstrate but was denied the opportunity to present evidence at the time of the budget hearing. She passed out copies of email documentation showing that the graduate school (Robert Mayorga) and student activities (Monica Hunter) were aware: a) of the existence of a 0.5 assistantship (from the graduate school) and stipend (from budget board) combo and b) that it was only ever filled by a graduate student.

Ms. Monica Hunter, Chair of the Student Budget Board, yielded the floor to Mr. David Ramras, Co-Chair of the Student Budget Board, to serve as spokesperson. Mr. Ramras reviewed the General Funding guidelines as they pertain to the criteria that the appeal is based on. He explained that in regards to the first criteria on which the appeal is based, funding is not guaranteed, whether it has been granted before or not; that because the board does not fund at requested level does not constitute grounds for appeal; that during the hearing it was noted that this position was only open to graduate students and budget board funds are open to the entire university community, that the Budget Board does not pay for a member who receives academic credit, and each year the Budget Board creates funding cut strategies to ensure line item equity and to balance the budget. To address the second criteria, he noted that GSA had the same amount of time to present materials as other groups.

At this time 15 minutes were allowed for questions. Questions were raised and addressed regarding funding guidelines and strategies, whether or not GSA was pin pointed specifically, funding for academic credit, and the amount of time to produce evidence or the issue of not being allowed to present evidence, why minutes are not kept, the change in point #16 in the SBB Funding Cut Strategies, and why does GSA need or have a right to such a position. Closing statements were then presented by Michelle McLeese for the Graduate Student Assembly and by David Ramras for the Student Budget Board.

Mr. Lavinka stated that for clarification, the upcoming vote was to see whether or not this appeal meets with one or more of three criteria. Mr. Bass made a motion to vote by secret ballot, the motion was seconded and approved. The call was made for voting hands to make sure that individuals not allowed to vote do not and it was explained that the vote must be "yes", "no", or "abstain" with a majority vote being the determining factor. The ballots were

distributed and counted. The vote was: 11-yes, 12-no, and 4- abstain. Thus, the ruling was that there would not be a hearing before CSA.

Mr. Lavinka adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rhonda M. Rogers  
Recording Secretary