

SFRC
Feb 15, 2013

In attendance:

Mark Lucia, Gordon Hoople, Walter Wong, Claudia Covello, Hugh Graham, Julian Ledesma, Conner Nannini,

By Phone: Michael Ferencz, Connor Landgraf

Not present: Bahar Navab, Kelsey Finn, Fabrizio Mejia, Justin Sayarath, Anthony D'Asaro

Welcome and Introductions

Substantial amount of work has happened since last meeting. Getting process and procedures right means that students, administration and departments are agreeing so this is a major accomplishment.

I. Status of Class Pass

Packet includes final fee language that went to OP.

(Connor Landgraf) not too many issues around technology fee other than to agree that it should be removed. Contract with AC Transit is still in works but doesn't need to be signed before goes to ballot. Will be negotiated and ready to sign if ballot passes. Contract will be finalized and waiting for signatures if ballot measure passes.

Q: What materials are needed for marketing of campaign? Do students need current agreement? Negotiated agreement?

A: Would be negotiated agreement used when serious marketing begins. Will work with AC Transit to obtain materials from them.

Q: Target date for marketing Class Pass?

A: Early March—doesn't require a significant amount of marketing because it is so popular. We agreed to move referendum to front page of ballot so that it is the first thing students vote on.

Q: Did we get language back from UCOP?

A: Supposed to get back by end of day, but we are continuing to check during meeting. Waiting for OP validation of language.

II. Health and Wellness Referendum

a. A lot has happened since last month. Include \$10 membership fee so that all students are eligible for membership in RSF as they are eligible for services at Tang Center.

i. Documents now label all components of facility

1. Structural assets and service commitments

ii. Mock up of structure was shared with group.

b. What happens to fee after Wellness Center debt is paid? Student expectations were that fee would expire in 2046 and that at that time another referendum would be issued to staff and operations to support the health and wellness center. Since it is so far out, the generation that would be impacted will make that decision. Current referendum has been modified to reflect this.

c. Fee committee that oversees fee will monitor and make sure that fee is appropriate over the life of the referendum. Expiration does not replace ongoing monitoring.

Q: This will get rid of the \$10 fee, but does it also get rid of the intramural fee.

A: Intramural fees will remain.

Q: Concerns about marketing but progress will make it easier.

Conner Nannini also works at RSF so has had conversations with RSF marketing team about generating support across campus. He will be part of the work group that will work out a marketing plan that will involve many other student stakeholder groups. Many student groups available to provide support. Q: We discussed putting recreation fee back in the title. Why did that not happen?

A: Work group debated this addition along with several other iterations but no changes were agreed upon and made. Proposal submitted to UCOP was as "Health and Wellness Center." Marketing committee can review and make a decision. Name of building does not have to match name of referendum. With the Health and Wellness Center title it implies something closer to the Tang Center versus the RSF. Students are happy with the Tang Center so concern that we don't need another- will students understand.

- d. Claudia, Connor, Bahar and Michael (RSF) are invited to Capital Projects Committee meeting on Feb 28th. This is critical step in path of building a new building. They will present proposal for approval by this committee. They already have financials and all required information.

Q: Equivalent funding for campaign. Has this been addressed?

A: If departmental referendum, the department can spend as much as they would like but have to provide equal funding to counter campaign. Student referendum is governed by ASUC by-laws. SFRC is much more hands off for student run election. Need to verify ASUC by-laws will allow that RSF to provide funding for marketing and if they would then also need to provide funding to any counter campaigns. Campaign spending limits in ASUC by-laws must be reviewed. Will be up to ASUC to decide.

- e. Pending issues
 - i. Name of building and referendum
 - ii. Funding source for marketing

III. Revised SFRC Policy

- a. Confusion about roles and responsibilities.
- b. Fee proposals vs. ballot language vs. voter guide
 - i. Committee on student fees write voter guide. We are now ahead of the game on this piece because of confusion- positive outcome. This is not what goes to UCOP.
 - ii. Fee proposal is what goes to UCOP. Several parties contributed- Budget Office, Capital projects, students....
 - iii. Addendum A is outline for a fee proposal- best guide for student referendum. All information that is required on dept referendum is also necessary for student referendum. Suggest additional revision to policy to be more explicit about what is required for student referendum.
 - 1. Addendum A is currently a little confusing because it includes information for both types of referendum in a combined fashion. Might be clearer to break them out into two separate sections for clarity even if it is somewhat redundant. Budget office owns the document but works with working group to adapt. Worked with legal counsel Now back to committee for review, but chancellor has final review. Step by step guide will be very helpful for future referendum. Terms must be agreed upon and clear.

2. Two-sentence law only applies to student referendum not departmental referendum.

Q: Where do voter guides get posted?

A: Run in Daily Cal, available on ASUC website, possibly at voting stations.

Q: Is full text of referendum published anywhere?

A: It should be, but SFRC is not clear where it goes officially. Health and Wellness will be on website that is developed. ASUC website should have an elections tab. SFRC website can post it but not an obvious place to look.

*Justin and Connor are best people to discuss ASUC questions and pending issues.

- iv. Document is still in draft- are there other remaining issues?

Lessons learned about language will still be reviewed. Timeline for Committee on Student Fees would be helpful. Challenge if ASUC by-laws change- maintaining consistency may be challenging if there is too much detail. Goal for final completion would be end of semester.

Committee meets in March and then possible de-brief in April. At that point if we can make any final decisions about guidelines before sending to Chancellor that would be ideal.

Schedule meeting March week before spring break and April meeting week after election.

- IV. ASUC bylaws will be adjusted to reflect the changes to the SFRC policy for next year. Will not be adjusted until after these two referendums have been presented to students on ballot. By-laws only require vote of Senate, not campus. (Update from Justin)