Meeting Called to order with Quorum at 3:11pm

ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes – January 27, 2011 (see attached)
   Anish Bhayani motioned to approve January 27th minutes. Seconded by Jason Karavidas. The minutes were approved with no objections.

2. Proposed SFAB Charter (see attached)
   Discussion regarding the charter and it’s relation to the time sensitive referendum. AS and GSA councils are requiring that any Board requesting a referendum have a charter matching the new AS/GSA constitutions. Once our board approves a new charter it must then in turn be approved by both AS and GSA, then the Vice Chancellor, and OP for review of language. All the approvals must be in order prior to February 18th in order to get the referendum on the spring ballot. The new charter will, once approved, change the structure of the board to a student majority board.
   a. Rebecca Horwitz motions to approve charter, seconded by Kate Joy.
   b. Anish Bhayani objects. His objection is that there was a draft of a new charter already approved by AS and GSA and that the difference between that charter and the charter proposed today is that this charter is only advisory to the director and the other was a decisive board. There was a discussion regarding the differences between the purpose of the two charters and what it would mean as far as the boards role.
   c. Anish would like to motion to change the title of the board to Sports Facility Board, removing the word Advisory as well as adding wording from the other approved
charter’s section 7, as this is the trend AS is trying to force for all areas funded 95% or more by student fees:

The Board shall delegate the responsibility for the daily operations of the Sports Facilities to the Sports Facilities Director (herein “the Director”), who shall act in accordance with this charter, policies and resolutions of the Board, and University Policy and Procedures. The Director shall be responsible for all aspects of personnel administration of the staff, such as appointment and supervision, in accordance with Board policy, guidelines, and other applicable University policies. The Board shall participate on the selection committees for the appointment of the Director, any Assistant/Associate Directors, and any Managers of the Sports Facilities. The Board shall make up two-thirds (2/3) of the selection committee for new Directors.

d. Koch asks what the rationale of adding this section to the charter is, since the board has already made the decision to remain advisory. It is also asked for Donald Zelaya to share if this type of addition was covered in his meeting with VC Rue last year.

e. Donald Z. confirms that when he met last year with VC Rue that the AS/GSA approved charter had problematic areas regarding the board’s relationship to the Director of Sports Facilities. She felt uncomfortable passing the version AS/GSA had approved and forwarded to her. Specifically in relation to the ability to remove the Director.

f. Sections 7 and 8 of prior charter are discussed further:

Section 7: The Board shall delegate the responsibility for the daily operations of the Sports Facilities to the Sports Facilities Director (herein “the Director”), who shall act in accordance with this charter, policies and resolutions of the Board, and University Policy and Procedures. The Director shall be responsible for all aspects of personnel administration of the staff, such as appointment and supervision, in accordance with Board policy, guidelines, and other applicable University policies. The Board shall participate on the selection committees for the appointment of the Director, any Assistant/Associate Directors, and any Managers of the Sports Facilities. The Board shall make up two-thirds (2/3) of the selection committee for new Directors.

Section 8: The Board shall annually review and evaluate the performance of the Director, and in case of consistent unsatisfactory performance, negligence to the Board’s directives, or other inappropriate employee behavior, shall have the right to dismiss the Director, as long as the student Recreation Facility Fee funds this salary.

g. Anish further elaborates on how AS wants to ensure that the director will report to the board, and not the other way around. Dave Koch states that he feels student boards should remain advisory and not deputizing. There is a lot of required training for supervisory positions, sexual harassment as well as HR rules and requirements that would have to be completed by each member of the board, and every time we replace a board member the trainings would have to be redone.

h. Anish proposes to tweak his amendment so that instead of just copying over both sections that the board could strike the section regarding dismissal of the director, but SHOULD be a decision making entity with the director advisory to the board.

i. Don Chadwick states that he has mixed feelings regarding the changes proposed by Anish. He respects the opinions of the students and tries to meet their needs every
The current board is primarily a policy board. The thought of the board as a management board crosses the line for him. As the Director, he faces numerous managerial decisions on a daily basis that don’t fit into the realm of policy decisions. In regards to use and policy matters he actively seeks the opinions of the students as it directly involves them, but there are other management decisions that do not involve the board, and to have this board be a management board for him would not be a very practical idea.

Garo B. Informs the board that the section that really states what Anish is trying to do most clearly is in the purpose section of last year’s charter:

k. The Board, as representatives of UCSD students, has maximum feasible operating and decision making authority, as constrained by sound business practices, over self-assessed student Recreation Facility fees and facilities funded in majority by these fees.

This section really hits the heart of what AS wants. The “maximum feasible” gives more room than “delegate daily operation” does. Dave Koch points out that it is the word delegate that leads to HR/Supervision confusion and crosses the line.

l. AS wants not to manage everyone, but for the council to have strong oversight over the budget. Anish is asked to please specify exactly what it is that he wants his amendment to be.

1. "The Board, as representatives of UCSD students, has maximum feasible operating and decision making authority, as constrained by sound business practices, over self-assessed student Recreation Facility fees and facilities funded in majority by these fees."

2. "Daily operations of the Sports Facilities shall be done by Sports Facilities Director (herein “the Director”), who shall act in accordance with this charter, policies and resolutions of the Board, and University Policy and Procedures. The Director shall be responsible for all aspects of personnel administration of the staff, such as appointment and supervision, in accordance with Board policy, guidelines, and other applicable University policies."

Don notes that currently he reports to the board regarding policy and to his supervisor, the AVC, on management issues, and believes that the second of the 2 amendments above would cloud that hierarchy.

m. Anish motions to amend the charter proposed to include the first of the above 2 proposals only meaning the purpose section of the new charter would read:

The Sports Facilities Advisory Board (SFAB) is the principal advisory committee on sports facilities and related policies at the University of California, San Diego. SFAB operates under this charter with the approval of the Chancellor, the Associated Students Council and the Graduate Student Association Council. The Committee is charged by the Chancellor and given the responsibility of ensuring that the sports facilities have the emphases, breadth, and coordination to complement optimally the philosophy, missions, and goals of UCSD. The Board, as representatives of UCSD students, has maximum feasible operating and decision making authority, as constrained by sound business practices, over self-assessed student Recreation Facility fees and facilities funded in majority by these fees.
Anish’s motion is seconded by Nathan Wieneke. As there are no objections it was brought to a vote. With 5 nay (Jason Karavidas, Rebecca Horwitz, Adrian Tamas, Janessa Werhane, and Ron Campnell) and 6 aye (Garo Bournoutian, Anish Bhayani, Nathan Wieneke, Kate Joy, Judy Yu, and Donald Zelaya). The amendment passes.

n. Don Chadwick: the committee’s objective towards drafting a new charter was to address the concerns of AS/GSA while advancing the need to continue the Canyonview funding. The charter needs to remain consistent with University policies and practices. The VCSA office previously expressed concern regarding the new constitutions and how they relate to University policies. I feel like the committee came a long way to meet the concerns of AS/GSA. At a certain point, though, you feel you are being held hostage—simply to keep a facility open that serves 1000’s of students every day.

o. Motion to vote on charter with amendment Anish, seconded Nathan. As this is a charter vote it requires a 2/3 vote (10 votes) to pass. 1 abstain (Jason Karavidas), 7 aye (Garo Bournoutian, Anish Bhayani, Nathan Wieneke, Kate Joy, Judy Yu, Donald Zelaya, Adrian Tamas) 3 Nay (Rebecca Horwitz, Janessa Werhane, Ron Campnell). Charter with amendment fails.

p. Ron Campnell motions to remove the amendment from the charter, seconded by Jason Karavidas. 6 abstain (Garo Bournoutian, Anish Bhayani, Nathan Wieneke, Judy Yu, Donald Zelaya, Adrian Tamas), 1 Nay (Kate Joy), and 4 Aye (Jason Karavidas, Rebecca Horwitz, Janessa Werhane, and Ron Campnell). Motion to remove amendment passes.

q. Donald Zelaya Motions to vote on original charter language proposed, seconded by Garo. Must have 10 Aye votes to pass. 1 Nay (Anish Bhayani), 10 Aye (Jason Karavidas, Garo Bournoutian, Nathan Wieneke, Kate Joy, Judy Yu, Rebecca Horwitz, Donald Zelaya, Adrian Tamas, Janessa Werhane, Ron Campnell). Original Charter proposed is approved. Will only take effect once AS/GSA/VC approves it as well.

Next meeting at February 10, 2011

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm