

**UFFAB Meeting Minutes**  
Thursday April 17th, 2014  
303 GSB Large Conference Room

**Members Present:** Jenna Muniz, ULC, Chair  
Lexi Evans, Warner College of Natural Resources, Vice Chair  
Ashley Cypress, College of Health and Human Sciences  
Michelle Staros, College of VMBS  
Amber Weimer, College of Natural Sciences  
Matt Fergen, College of Business  
Alex Brown, College of Engineering

**Members Not Present:** Jeff Cook, Graduate School  
Lance Oles, College of Agricultural Sciences  
Matt Lancto, College of Liberal Arts

**Members at Large Present:**

**Members at Large Not Present:** Sam Guinn, ASCSU Representative

**Associate Members Present:** Robert Edwards, College of Natural Sciences

**Associate Members Not Present:**

**Ex – Officio Members Present:** Steve Hultin, Faculty Advisor  
Becca Wren, Staff Support  
Lindsay Brown, Staff Support  
Cassidy Collins, Staff Support  
Andrew Olson, SFRB Liaison

**Ex – Officio Members Not Present:** Tamla Blunt, Ex-Officio Member  
Patrick Burns, Ex – Officio Member  
Kristi Buffington, Facilities Management

**Visitors:**

**I. Call to Order at 5:00 PM**

- a. Jenna called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.
- b. Michelle made a motion to approve the minutes from April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014.
- c. Alex seconded.

- d. All approved, none opposed, none abstained. Minutes accepted.

## II. Discussion of SFRB meeting

- a. Jenna mentioned that she and Lexi presented both the cash-funded project and the fee increase to the Student Fee Review Board earlier in the week. SFRB, along with Amy Parsons and ASCSU will see the proposed fee increase before it eventually goes to President Frank and the Board of Governors.
- b. SFRB asked Jenna and Lexi to submit a recommendation clarifying that the increases are independent of one another and that they required two different votes.
- c. Lexi added that at the President's Student Fee Advisory Council right after the SFRB meeting, Provost Miranda explained that he hoped discussion would stray away from differential tuition increases, as that is not an ideal solution to the issue.
- d. Dr. Antolin came to the meeting with information about peer institutions in other states, who have recently constructed similar Biology or Life Science buildings. On average, these buildings are of similar size and cost to that of the proposed CSU Biology Building.
- e. A Board member asked what the general response from SFRB was.
  - i. Jenna said that the most vocal people, who asked several questions, were not in favor.
  - ii. Andrew thought that by the end of the meeting, many people were moving towards being in favor, having heard the facts of the matter.
- f. SFRB votes on Tuesday, April 22<sup>nd</sup> and Andrew will most likely let Jenna and Lexi know the outcome of the vote later that night.
- g. Jenna asked if Sam Guinn is allowed to vote on SFRB, given that she serves on UFFAB and has already voted on the fee increase.
  - i. Andrew answered no, she does not get to vote.

## III. By-law Review

- a. Lexi proposed to add a clause in the bylaws that outlines a potential fee increase process, as the current bylaws have no such description. A procedure should be outlined clearly, in case of a future fee increase.
- b. Steve agreed that this would be helpful and also mentioned that this might be a good project to bring up at the UFFAB retreat. Potentially, a sub-committee could be formed from current UFFAB members at the retreat to help put that together throughout the fall.
- c. Michelle noticed that there is no specification of how many approved votes are needed to pass a motion. The bylaws do not specify between majority votes and 2/3 votes.
  - i. Jenna answered that quorum is 7. 7 Board members are needed to conduct a vote.
  - ii. Michelle countered that the bylaws specify that quorum is 7, but this number should be adjusted to 2/3 depending on how many members are serving on the Board.
  - iii. Steve suggested we consult Robert's Rules for clarification on this process and add it into Article 9.
  - iv. Lexi made a motion to legitimize the change.
  - v. Alex seconded.
  - vi. All approved, none abstained, none opposed. Clarification will be added.
- d. Lexi asked if we should clarify if members at large can vote.
  - i. Becca answered that specification is already in the bylaws.
- e. In Section 4 of Article 3, should there be a clause defining the rules for absences?
  - i. Michelle question whether an absentee should be automatically removed, or if the removal should be left up to a vote by the entire board.
- f. Lexi made a motion to add to Article 3 Section 4 that if a member misses (unexcused) more than 2 meetings, they are automatically removed from the Board.
  - i. Lindsay said this would complicate finding another representative from the College.
  - ii. Lexi suggested that the associate member of the removed representative should become the new representative. Otherwise, the removed member must find a replacement.

- g. Lexi made a motion to add to Article 3 Section 4 that if a member misses more than 2 unexcused meetings, their associate becomes the member.
  - i. Michelle seconded.
  - ii. All approved, none abstained, none opposed. Change will be added.
- h. Alex mentioned that the bylaws state that the proposal, legitimacy of proposal, and funding of the proposal are the only three types of votes that require explanations of opposed votes.
- i. Steve explained that the majority of the votes taken by the Board address one of those three aspects. The reasoning behind any opposed vote addressing those aspects have been recorded in the minutes, which have been very helpful in understanding the fee increase process.
- j. Michelle asked if the funding rules could be clarified as the “legitimacy process” only applicable to project proposals. By doing this, the term “legitimacy” will become more clear.
- k. Lexi mentioned that the edits to the bylaws will be made by Facilities Management and will be ready for a final approval vote next meeting.
- l. Amber asked if abstention voters should be required to explain their reasons for abstaining.
  - i. Lexi said that in the eyes of a Board like SFRB, an abstention is technically a no.
    - 1. Andrew disagreed, and clarified that SFRB would assume the voter is uninformed of the subject matter and refrained from voting.
  - ii. Alex said that he believes polling members after voting is unfair. He suggested an edit of no members being polled for reasoning after voting.
  - iii. Lexi disagreed, knowing that some members may be misinformed and are voting with incorrect information.
  - iv. Andrew suggested that UFFAB either require all members explaining both a yes and no vote, or no member is required to give any explanation. Either type of vote could be based off false information.
  - v. Most members agreed with explanations for all votes, being recorded anonymously unless otherwise specified.
- m. No member had any other edit to discuss.
- n. Becca reminded the Board that next meeting will involve the election of a new Chair and a new Vice Chair, as well as a tour of Animal Science. Meet in 303 GSB for the first portion of the meeting.

#### **IV. Adjourn at 5:52 PM**

- a. Next Meeting: April 24th, 2014, 5:00 - 6:00 PM, 303 GSB/Animal Science