

SFRC
April 18, 2013

In Attendance: Claudia Covello, Kelsey Finn, Michael Ferencz, Hugh Graham, Walter Wong, Fabrizio Mejia, Bahar Navab, Conner Nannini

Absent: Mark Lucia, Jodie Rouse, Anthony D'Asaro, Connor Landgraf, Justin Sayarath,

1. Status of Referendum
 - a. Class Pass referendum was passed.
 - b. Health and Wellness Referendum
 - i. Challenge issued by two ASUC Senators contesting validity of Executive Order. Challenge is currently with Judicial Committee and status at this time is unclear.
 - ii. Facility is being funded by student fees so ASUC is protector of student interests. MOU requires student input and will be reviewed by campus attorney.
 - iii. Election results will be announced tonight via livestream. If passes, Senate will ratify within two weeks. Possible that charges can continue to be filed for two weeks after elections results are announced dependent upon ASUC guidelines.
2. Revisions to Campus Guidelines
 - a. Two copies of revisions provided to committee- one redlined with track changes visible.
 - b. Big changes from January revision are in the addendums, including the creation of separate proposal outlines for student versus departmental referenda, additional steps in the timelines, and clarification on roles and who is responsible for what.
 - c. New step added with CFO sign off after elections. Transmission of results with CFO sign off to chancellor before goes to UCOP.
 - d. Clarification of timelines as they relate to ASUC bylaws. Goal is to clarify process and timelines.
 - e. Lessons learned from this year that are incorporated into revisions
 - i. timing for materials for UCOP
 - ii. fees for summer students
 1. Consultation with Dean of Summer Sessions – committee can ensure that these conversations have taken place and help to facilitate dialogue with Summer Sessions to determine if and how fees may be applied to Summer Sessions students
 2. Summer Sessions have different concerns and priorities and timing that makes fees during this time less

straight-forward, necessitating a more in-depth conversation.

f. Addendums-

i. Addendum A

1. Separate section for student initiated fee referenda
 - a. Question of whether roles are clearly articulated- who is the sponsor? Is it the student who writes the ASUC resolution or the department that actually implements? Need to clarify who is a sponsor, who is a representative, who has authority in the department to move a process along.
2. Clear articulation of the two types of routes for referenda- student or departmental.
3. Timeline- concern about September 30 date because it is fairly early for students in the year. Dates have not been changed, but there has been a history of non-compliance because the dates are so early in the academic year.
4. Concept approval date was already established- requesting clarification if this is Senate that approves concept, or an Executive from ASUC.
5. Marketing campaign for referenda have looser timelines that Candidate rules. Can marketing begin on a concept/ Do we have to have approved language before marketing begins? Is it possible to have soft marketing before language approved?
 - a. This seems a reasonable compromise so that we can align language between committee and ASUC
6. New reminder about ASUC Senate votes- language indicates ASUC Senate votes whether to put referendum on ballot before the end of the candidate filing period.
7. Add step -ASUC Judicial Council ratifies election results before CFO sign-off.

ii. Addendum B

1. Further separates student-initiated fee process from departmental referenda
2. Provides guidelines for proposal outline
3. Clarifies that committee has ability to question whether fee can be implemented and if in accordance with UCOP policy. Question of whether language indicates that committee can block a proposal. Committee can not prohibit a referendum from moving forward but can strongly advise that a fee is not implementable. Suggest change to language to say that referendum is not viable

rather than prohibited (Page 11- clean copy , 2nd paragraph)

4. Clarification of need to identify estimates of where fees go- whether they go to units, or third-party service providers.
- iii. Addendum C
 1. Outlines Departmental referenda timeline
 - a. Same changes to student-initiated fee timeline.
 - b. Additional suggestions outlined above may also be incorporated as appropriate
 - c. Request greater emphasis on the section that provides equal funding to opposition for departmental referendum.
 - iv. Addendum D
 1. Removes references to student initiated fees now outlined separately in previous addendums
 2. Addendum D- Return to Aid- Request to make percentages 66.67% and 33.33% since including decimal points in the percentages add up to real dollars.
 - v. Addendum E
 1. Annual Report Outline
 - a. Sponsors are required to report annually on the uses of the fee. Change should be made that campus unit responsible for fee should be responsible for reporting.
 2. Change to indicate report issued after fiscal close when greater insight is available.
 - vi. Addendum F- No substantial changes
 - vii. Addendum G- Suggestion to change of language from enrolled students to registered students.
- g. Next steps are to submit changes to CACSSF. Next meeting is April 29. If able to get on agenda at this meeting, it would be overview of changes- high level summary of changes. Recommend annual review as this is a working document.
3. Change in co-chairs
 - a. Claudia concludes her role as co-chair.
 - b. Fabrizio is in first year as co-chair, so will be lead chair for next year but need to initiate co-chair for next year
 - i. Helpful if it is someone on CACSSF [clarification: the SFRC Co-Chairs are ex officio non-voting members of CACSSF; they do not need to be members of CACSSF already]
 - ii. Would be helpful to know which staff are continuing on CACSSF

Picking co-chair will be email process because there is some homework to be done. Will address within the next several weeks.