

**CURB/SSFAAC Meeting**  
**January 23, 2015**  
**ARC Meeting Room 1**  
**11:30 am – 1:00 pm**

- I. Call to order – Andrew Musca 11:40 am
- II. Recreation Advisory Council briefing – Ishmael Pluton
  - No updates – meeting upcoming
- III. Bookstore Advisory Council Briefing
  - No updates
- IV. Review of New Advisory Committee Bylaws
  - Discussed selection process for faculty members
    - Agreed language should be clearer on that
      - An email goes out directing to the website
      - Noted that CURB was left off the list on the website this year due to confusion over the roles of CURB and SSFAAC
  - Clarified that John Campbell is not filling 2 roles on the committee (Recreation Director and Student Affairs CFO)
  - Clarified the proposed voting process
    - Voting recommendations are only made annually
    - Funds discussed monthly will be voted on at the time so the information is fresh for the vote
    - Monthly results compiled and put together in annual letter or recommendation to the Vice Chancellor
  - Discussed ASUCD representation on committee – do we need 2?
    - Noted that Senate is a different body – need to be sure its opinion makes it to the table
    - No harm in having 2
    - We're concerned with the relationship – noted that formal appointment means and expectation that the appointed reps come
    - Agreed that since there are 9 ex-officio staff, the appointment of 2 ex-officio students is not unreasonable
  - Question – how will the fact that it is only open to members of the UC Davis community members be monitored?
    - What about alumni or others not included on the list
    - Determined that if it becomes an issue we can put restraints in place
    - John Campbell noted that this document should always be viewed as changeable, not to be viewed as static. This body has the opportunity to recommend changes as needed and as we move along and grow. What we're trying to do is create a sound model.
  - Question – is it possible to delegate responsibility to publicize for membership?
    - Fundamental responsibility is Chancellor's, but agree that publicity is important
    - JC - A draft was recently released for the 2015-16 year
    - Jan B – there is a body already in charge of publicizing info for the Administrative Advisory Committees for the Chancellor
    - This doesn't preclude our sending out information, we do have responsibility
    - Janice C noted that Greg works with the Administrative Advisory Committees
  - Question – is there any conflict of interest to consider? If represented bodies on the new committee are benefitting from funding decisions?

- Jan B – We'll be looking to legal counsel to give input on what potential conflict of interest issues might be
  - JC – the responsibility for that falls more to the body than being in the bylaws right now
- Discussed question of only one person being the deciding voter for LEAAP
  - Potentially yes, but the person is still responsible as representative of LSA
  - LEAAP is the law side of FACE funds. We do it this way to honor the wording of the referendum, but this body as a whole is still responsible to be advisory.
  - The change to requiring 66% was brilliant – makes a difference to the conversation and reflects more of a true majority for student opinion. If the LSA vote were different from the overall, that would be information worth investigating for the Chancellor
  - Having only one vote on something doesn't look great in the bylaws. Maybe add language like, "as representative for LSA."
  - Adam - Great idea. Need to be sure it doesn't present any procedural problems.
  - Nicole – it's already part of our role to vote on fees we might not be affected by, so should all vote?
  - Adam – goes back to how the referendum was written. Makes them 2 different referenda.
  - Jan B – we also want to give the most helpful info to the Vice Chancellor. This gives her the LSA stand on that fee even if it is only one vote.
  - JC – we haven't had a history that showed the separation of LEAAP & FACE – not mechanically possible, so this has to be the best advisory to the VC. It's complex – a big portion goes into the same pot and some goes to the Law School. It's almost impossible to split.
  - Adam- Note that the chair responsibility is to write an advisory letter to the VC that goes beyond the simple CPI issue.
- Question – can we remove gender pronouns?
  - Sure
- Question – was this run by Campus Counsel, and were there any issues
  - Yes. They are very concerned that we be sure the new committee fulfills the duties of both committees.
- Question – will this be going to ASUCD for approval?
  - No, reps for GSA, LSA and ASUCD are here at the table
- Jan B – noted that Campus Counsel said we had to go back to the approval letters of OP & Regents. Bylaws themselves never went before them. Original charges of the committees could be broadened, but not reduced.
- Discussed question of which CPI to use. New bylaws state SF Bay Area, but SASI says CPI of State of CA, which would be less than the Bay Area
  - JC noted it was taken to Campus Counsel last year and they said this body could determine
  - Kabir – concern that it is in direct conflict with referendum
  - JC notes that this body needs to act as one. If we need to keep CURB and SSFAAC separate, then we'll do that if that's how the voting decides, but if there is one specific designation in a referendum for one specific fee, that's something this body needs to deal with.
- Andrew – determined discussion could continue at a later time, but it was time to vote.
  - Paper ballots were distributed to voting members present
  - Andrew had received one vote from an absent member via email
- Question – should vote be delayed?

- No, vote to be taken now
- V. Call for a vote, 12:40 pm – then further discussion ensued
- Discussion of whether or not members will have to be present to vote
    - Determined that listening to the discussion is an important part of making an informed vote
    - Proposed schedule will include voting days
  - Question re: quorum for this vote, since bodies are still separate
    - JC – it's a combined group vote
  - Clarification – We've discussed changes to the bylaws, so what are we voting on?
    - The changes will be made and updates will be sent early next week
  - Discussion of who actually votes
    - Do chairs? Or only in case of a tie?
      - This is for something structurally different, not fee-related, so yes, chairs vote
    - ASUCD president?
      - Yes
  - Determined to go forward with the vote in the spirit of the discussion
    - Noted that the Vice Chancellor has asked for our combined vote/recommendation
  - Votes were counted
    - 12 yes (including the one Andrew received via email)
    - 1 no
  - Question – for next time, can abstention be an option?
    - Yes
- VI. Meeting adjourned

Ballot language:

**CURB/SSFAAC BALLOT**  
**January 23, 2015**

\_\_\_\_ I vote to **support (YES)** the adoption of the bylaws for a new Student Affairs Administrative Advisory Committee that will consolidate and replace two existing advisory committees: The Campus Unions Advisory Board and the Student Service Fee Administrative Advisory Committee.

\_\_\_\_ I vote to **deny (NO)** the adoption of the bylaws for a new Student Affairs Administrative Advisory Committee that will consolidate and replace two existing advisory committees: The Campus Unions Advisory Board and the Student Service Fee Administrative Advisory Committee.

**Comments:**