

**CURB/SSFAAC Meeting**  
**November 21, 2014**  
**Special Events Room, MU East Wing**  
**11:45 am – 1:00 pm**

- 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. Topsy 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