I. Call to order 11:47 am

II. Capital Projects Overview – Matt Fucile
   - Slide presentation
   - Gateway to campus
   - MU Renewal Project update/timeline/highlights.
     - Work beginning January 2015
     - Projected completion October 2016
     - MU: modernized, honor of veterans highlighted
     - Stores: modernized, new entrance
     - Games area: fewer machines; focus on bowling, billiards, computerized games
     - While down there will be a Shop 24 Kiosk for basic supplies
     - Timeline:
       - Jan 2015 East Wing renovation
       - Feb 2015 text sales move to Pavilion
       - March 2015 big stuff starts for Stores, Games
       - Dec 2015 Stores opens (prior to MU itself)
       - October 2016 Project completion
   - Unitrans project completed
   - MU loading dock in process
   - Freeborn closure to happen
   - Jason Lorgan re: textbooks
     - Winter quarter rush in current store location
     - Spring quarter 2015 through winter 2016 at Pavilion
   - Q – After completion, will Shop 24 continue? Will it eliminate student jobs?
     - Matt F – this TBD. May look for a different location/purpose
   - Re: Convenience store in MU – will be staffed with Stores employees; profits 50-50 for Stores/ASUCD

III. Review of New Committee Bylaws Draft (to date)
   - Andrew – will collect copies of draft at end of meeting
   - Vidur – make notes for them to read
   - Discussion
   - Q: were any other council chairs added?
     - Considered ICA but decided not necessary if Mike B can bring issues
     - -disability?
     - -ASUCD?
     - -Student Health Fee Advisory
     - -Why not other representatives, e.g. Student Community Center? Other places? Is there a conflict of interest if reps are mostly from groups that benefit from funding?
     - -Advocacy
     - -Assistant Director Academic Affairs
John Campbell – We need a list of other advisory groups before we can decide. JC will work to get that list for consideration

Jan Barnett – Make notes re: suggestions on the draft

Armando – selection of chairs – any better alternatives? OK with proposed process but wanted to know how people feel

Q: Using ASUCD selection process?

Armando – Keep it, with tweaks

Jan Barnett – The two committees have very different selection processes

SSFAAC – per ASUCD MOU

CURB – exempt from MOU, open to all students paying into fees. Chairs thought this was preferable

Adam – for SSFAAC, MOU didn’t apply for grad students. Had problems with consistency of process, made it nearly impossible to get a full slate of candidates for the committee

Armando – new process was to amend the difficulty of the process; would like to see a trial process to see how the new process works

Emily P suggestion – ideally there’s a composition of regular members. Self-nominate for chair position & apply, then board votes

Adam – clarified we’re discussing 2 processes – chair as well as regular members

Comment: CURB process seems preferable in order to get a full membership

Discussion – why are students not joining? Application process.

- Breakdown in process
- Many people just don’t know about the process
- SSFAAC – office of advocacy handled application process
- JC – sequencing of application process is a timing issue. Discussed a formula for process to happen in the same year the leadership is in rather than at the beginning of a new academic year with new leadership. Both councils are overseen by Student Affairs and the Vice Chancellor.
- CURB process is more streamlined
- Adam – will need new MOU – wouldn’t be bound by old one. ASUCD process and institutional memory would need to change.
- It’s not ASUCD’s site that’s used for applications
- ASUCD wants to be part of the process since it represents students
- CURB wants to use a process that’s been successful
- Q: Can we just include ASUCD in the process?
  - Adam – reasonable compromise. But has ASUCD been dissatisfied with CURB? Don’t want to favor efficiency and exclude input, but don’t want to create something unworkable

Comment: concern about conflict of interest re: use of funds

Emily – be sure student representation is broad enough

Q: have we reached out to other campuses?
  - Adam – yes, our process was unique

Q: Why? Intent?
  - Adam – culture at UCD was to have a more conservative fashion and narrow focus. Now we’re moving to a broader focus

Comment: We elect our executives at a different time than others

Q: Is there anything we do to impede the selection process?

ASUCD has interviews, CURB no interviews

Recommendation: administration handle setting up interviews, and make sure Advocacy people are involved?
• Q: Should we do interviews or just choose from applications?
  • Armando: ASUCD administrative advisor piece added to improve this
  • Would like to try it with interview but if we still have trouble would go with CURB process. If so, revert and eliminate ASUCD admin level
• Jan B – If we add an interview process and ensure appropriate representation, would that resolve the problem?
• Q: How many people are not picked for CURB?
  • ~20-25
• JC – Not a simple process, deliberate, not easy
• Kabir – Application is flawed (apply for 8 committees?), but if applicant didn’t explain why CURB was chosen they just threw it out. No point adjusting MOU and application until admin person is in and new process decided.
• Armando – agreed
• Emily – Adela wants a better-functioning SSFAAC. Academic Senate had powerful committees with ASUCD appointees who didn’t show up

• Andrew – move on to next section: voting members, paid positions with serious expectations for participation
  • Q: Where is the $ coming from to pay members?
    • Andrew – will have to be decided
    • Emily – other campuses do, it’s controversial, some use student fees
    • JC – there are several possible funding sources. There would be a choice not to receive pay. There is a level of commitment and respect that should be shown for these positions.
    • Emily – this is a serious committee with commitment. Adela receives requests for funding from many places, e.g. Tipsy Taxi and other places, and SSFAAC is needed to look at these
    • Adam – agrees that with added responsibilities and compensation an interview is needed
  • Q: Responsibility for advertising these positions?
    • Adam – not SSFAAC
  • Q: Who?
    • ASUCD?
      • Jan B – active website is necessary, other advertising needed
      • JC – the division owns the responsibility
      • Roman: Is the onus of recruitment on SSFAAC?
        • JC/Harley – no
    • Advocacy can help, will need funding
    • Discussion of possible campus-wide email to notify

• Andrew – Any other comments? If not, it’s a good cut-off time.
• JC – Next meeting is Dec. 5. Kelly Ratliff will be here to give us info. Assume chairs will want time to discuss at next level.
• Should we extend this meeting 15-30 minutes now because we want to present changes to VC?
• Need to consider convenience of class schedule.
• Decided – next meeting to start at 11:30 rather than 11:45. With cookies!

Adjourned 1:00 pm

Drafts/notes collected