

Proposed Changes to LAUC By-Laws
Lunches with LAUC-I
May 19, 2005

Attendees: Collins, Jazayeri, Goldberg, Palmer, Vick

Each section of discussion usually included some questions. As each of the campus divisions posts comments and questions prior to the annual Assembly in Santa Barbara, we can continue on this discussion via email or special meeting if necessary.

The Executive Board will be much smaller and not have a representative of each campus. Some of the concerns expressed:

- Currently the larger group becomes part of the pool for recruiting officers for the next year. The task of recruiting knowledgeable, involved individuals will become more difficult. This is often how LAUC identifies leaders for a variety of activities and positions.
- We need more people familiar with the issues than a small Executive Committee
- Why does this group need to be smaller? In this day and age of email and other rapid communication, why concentrate some much in the hands of so few? Can't new ways of communicating, with deadlines if you want to be heard, be developed and used?
- Is the advice given to UCOP or the UL's as good and as representative from such a small group? Is quality sacrifice for speed?
- A consultation process usually provides a better, more informed opinion or decision.
- What instances, issues, etc. brought about this whole desire to be more responsive? Might help frame this discussion if we knew.
- Is there a way to distinguish between types of communication that might be handled rapidly by the new smaller group and those of importance that all should be consulted on?
- This document in draft form places a great deal of trust and power in the hands of a few colleagues on Exec. Bd. Some of us felt we need more checks and balances and procedures to avoid any possible problems in the future. E.g. what types of decisions would be appropriate for them to make quickly? What might require a vote of the Assembly/Council? What needs a vote of the full membership?
- A small executive board with the possibility of 2 people being from the same campus means other campuses with different ideas, needs, procedures, etc. may not be well represented.

We all agreed that the work done so far in producing drafts was extremely helpful. The concept of keeping within the By Laws those things that belong there and removing others and placing them within Rules for easier changing was a good one. What we did not see was any discussion of voting and how many votes would be necessary to change Rules and By Laws, etc. By email vote? At Assembly/Council? Quorums? Who votes

for what things? By-Laws, everyone. Changing the Rules? Recommendations to UCOP and ULs? If parliamentary rules apply to specific areas, state that.

Throughout the document the work “timely” is used. Maybe discussing deadlines be more specific?

The requirement for notifying the chair before coming to any open meeting, why is that so important? Insuring space? Making sure the meeting is not closed? What happens if the person does not notify the chair, are they excluded from an open meeting? Needs a little clarification.

The Chair Elect is new and learning about the organization. Maybe one of the duties of the Past Chair, in addition to just selecting candidates for office, can be assisting the Chair Elect with the planning of the Assembly/Council Meeting. The Past Chair can help insure continuity and mentoring of the Chair Elect.