

Student Fee Referenda Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 26, 2012

Members present: Fabrizio Mejia, Mark Lucia, Hugh Graham, Gordo Hoople, Olivier Bouan (proxy for Anthony D'Asaro, Connor Landgraf, Justin Sayarath, Bahar Navab, Walter Wong, Michael Ferencz, Kelsey Finn

Members absent: Claudia Covello, Jodie Rouse, Anthony D'Asaro

Recorder: Sabina Garcia

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Role of the Committee
(Mark Lucia and Hugh Graham gave some background for the committee.)
 - a. This committee was formed initially to provide feedback on referenda proposed by campus departments. The committee is responsible for making sure departments follow policy, are transparent in their actions, that they follow proper procedures, etc... as related to proposed student fee referenda.
 - b. However, as the trend has shifted towards student-proposed fee referenda the committee has taken on more of an advisory and consultative role. While the ASUC is ultimately accountable to ensure that its bylaws are upheld, the SFRC's primary goal is to advise whether a proposed referendum is implementable, and to ensure that it is compliant with all applicable policies including those of the campus, those of the Office of the President, and those of the ASUC.
 - c. The question is not whether a particular proposal has merit, but rather whether it is within compliance and logistically implementable. The committee should bring any problems with referenda to light so that they may be addressed. Examples may include but are not limited to:
 - Does the referendum outline a plan for how funds are managed? Is there a defined structure for who is accountable for each step required to manage the income?
 - Is there a tax from UCOP on the income? How is that disclosed to students in the referendum?
 - Who is impacted by the implementation of the fee? Are Summer Sessions Students included? What categories of students are included or excluded?
 - Has the required level of Return-to-Aid been included in the fee?
3. Lessons from last year
 - a. Connor Landgraf and Bahar Navab advised the committee that the ASUC is working to amend by-laws. The committee discussed the need to ensure that campus policy needs to integrate smoothly with ASUC student initiated process. It was agreed that there is a need to be clear on where there are inconsistencies

between campus policy and ASUC by-laws as they relate to referenda. Some issues to consider here include:

- THE SFRC's role as it relates to referenda approved by obtaining student signatures.
 - If students get enough signatures, they don't need senate approval. In that case, can ASUC by-laws be amended to require that signed referenda still be vetted by the SFRC to ensure implementability
 - There is tension in the possibility that changes may be required after signatures have been obtained, in which case, the proposal may be different than what was initially authorized under the signature process
- The overall ASUC ballot length may be a deterrent to voters. Suggest that referenda and other items that impact all students should be at the beginning of the ballot while elected offices are listed at the end.
- Is the 2-sentence rule (limiting description of fee referendum proposals to two sentences) too limiting? Will changing the order of the ballot have an impact and negate the limiting factor?

- b. The line of communication between SFRC and the Office of the President should be clearer
 - Hugh Graham will be the primary interface with UCOP as needed
- c. All SFRC members should read UCOP policies and be familiar with them. The UC fee policies can be found at:
<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/ucpolicies/aos/uc80.html>

4. Timeline

- a. Department-sponsored referenda are on Fall Ballot only
- b. Student-sponsored referenda are on Spring Ballot as the ASUC operates the spring elections
 - Can we streamline this process? As it is currently defined, it can appear that this is a department workaround to make students accountable for things that could be department issues, like the Class Pass.
 - A streamlining would require that funding for the election process is taken into account. ASUC currently funds the spring election, so including department-sponsored referenda would add cost for the ASUC.
- c. Immediate priority is to strengthen the process for this year. Current timeline includes the following:
 - Proposals are due by November 1
 - Final Fee Language Draft is due by Dec 1
 - Material is due to Office of the President by January 15 (SFRC proposes change to Feb 1)
 - SFRC is to finalize by February 1 (SFRC proposes change to Feb 15)
 - Elections are held in early April

5. Status of Possible Spring Referenda

- a. Class Pass referenda must proceed. Current AC Transit contract expires so vote must proceed
- b. Wellness Center may not be proposed dependent on November election results for Prop 30. If 20% fee increase is instituted this will not be put forth
- c. Technology Fee may also not be proposed dependent upon election results for Prop 30
 - The technology fee is currently being analyzed to think more broadly about how it could be utilized. There is concern if it is just used to fund software licensing.
 - It was agreed that until there is a permanent CIO the decisions around this issue should likely be postponed.
- d. There is an ASUC survey going out today to help determine which fee proposals should be put forward.

Next meeting will be scheduled before Thanksgiving.