

Student Fee Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

February 26, 2018

---

Present: Suini Torres, Regina Gomez, Alice Malmberg, Aaron Manzano, Gina Tu, Ashley John, Lucy Rojas, Lisa Bishop, John Steele, Cathy Thomas, Alan Christy, Ian Gregorio, Kiryl Karpiuk, Amanda Kazden

1. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes:

- a. Motion by Gina to approve the agenda, second by Aaron, no objections
- b. Motion by Aaron to approve the minutes, second by Gina, no objections
- c. Announcements: Alice: SCOC is showing the Incredibles tonight from 6-8pm in the College 9/10 Rec Room (below the MPR). There will be free pizza and a raffle, so come through!

2. Campus Based Fees: Testing Materials Fee

- a. Some people voted by email, but we can do an unofficial vote today about the official SFAC statement for the referendum. We are trying to finalize the language today.
- b. Suini: Can someone make a motion to fix the language about this program not running in the summer? The language and verb tense sounds weird. John: Motion to amend the language. Aaron: Second
- c. Amanda: Can we specify why we are talking about disregarding the Baytree Bookstore? John: The bookstore has a contract with the testing materials company, and disregarding the contract is bad. The bookstore also isn't making much money off of selling testing supplies, and they are a nonprofit organization, so this referendum would be going behind their back and doing them a disservice.
- d. Kiryl: Motion to amend the language to "the Student Fee Advisory Committee opposes this referendum. Gina: second. Any objections? None.
- e. Amanda: Motion to add more information about the Bookstore.
- f. Cathy: I suggest we offer an alternative to talking about the bookstore Bookstore -- for example, what if the responsibility for this program was shifted onto TAs or readers who weren't formally consulted in the referendum process? I also have concerns about the waste assessment of this project -- what will happen if there are leftover materials?
- g. Aaron: What do we want to add about the bookstore to make our concerns more fleshed out? John: Maybe we can turn it into a positive statement, for example: "Baytree is better equipped to continue facilitating this process."
- h. Cathy: Do we have language for this already in place, or are we trying to create it now?  
Suini: We are trying to finalize the proposed statement that we sent out via email two weeks ago. I'm only going to allow four more minutes of discussion on this because we have to do funding proposals.
- i. Amanda: I motion to enact John's suggested changes about the bookstore. Gina: Second.
- j. John: Can we write it out on the whiteboard? "The Student Fee Advisory Committee opposes this referendum because of logistical issues. At this time, the Baytree Bookstore is better equipped to provide the current services as is. In addition, this program will not run during the summer."
- k. Any objections to amending this motion? No objections. Suini: this is our current motion. Is there a motion to approve this statement? Gina: Motion to approve. Amanda: Second. No objections. Suini: Okay, then this is our official statement.

3. Funding Proposal Review

- a. Graduate Student Commons Ventilation Hood: Aaron has recused himself. Suini: are there any motions to not fund? If not, we can do a straw poll. Straw poll shows there is interest in exploring funding this proposal. We will maintain the proposal for further discussion.

- b. AATAT Outreach Troupe: Cathy: their event already happened in February. Suini: straw poll -- how did everyone feel? Straw poll shows that there is no interest in funding. Gina: Motion to not fund. Aaron: second. Suini: Objections? No objections.
- c. Experiential Leadership Program: Cathy: I was neutral towards them, my notes suggested funding them 25% of their request. Alice: I only wanted to fund one of their programs because the others seem to be repetitive. Straw poll shows that everyone is neutral towards funding. Suini: let's discuss at a later date, and note that some people are in favor of only offering partial funding.
- d. Baskin Speaker Series: Straw poll shows that everyone is neutral towards funding. We will discuss at a later date.
- e. West Fest 2019: Cathy: this proposal wasn't written well. John: Also, I was concerned that this event is reinforcing the west side vs. east side debate. Straw poll shows that everyone is neutral towards funding. We will discuss at a later date.
- f. Pathways to Research: Straw poll shows that everyone is positive or neutral towards funding. We will discuss at a later date.
- g. Grad Lab: Cathy: I'd like to partially fund. Straw poll shows that everyone is positive or neutral towards funding. We will discuss at a later date.
- h. Career Center Pre-Law/Pre-Health Coaching Programs: Straw poll shows that everyone is positive or neutral towards funding. We will discuss at a later date.
- i. WAVESS: Straw poll shows that everyone is positive or neutral towards funding. John: I've been involved with Smith, and I have a number of concerns about this proposal. Smith is disintegrating -- no new students have been matched with mentors this year -- and possibly going back to Cowell instead of staying with STARS. Also, Smith provided us with STARS' budget when they have their own budget. Suini: does this change people's input? Lucy: Asks if this just happen or did it happen before the applications were submitted? Alan: The separation from Smith and STARS has been happening since early January. The move to Cowell has only emerged in recent weeks. New straw poll shows people are now not in favor of funding. Gina: Motion to not fund. Aaron Second. No objections.
- j. Chicano Latino Resource Center Program Coordinator: The response to the straw is mixed, so we will discuss. Cathy suggests that we allocate \$15,000. \$18,000 was the total ask. The position engages with students. Suini suggests that we fund the salary, but only fund at \$15,000 if we have funds at the end. Aaron mentions student impact. Cathy explains that positions like this can serve as a lifeline for grad students and departments who cannot fund GSR positions. Position like this help the university as a whole.
- k. Men of Color: The response to the straw poll is mixed, therefore we will discuss. Cathy mentions that the budget was substantive, they are trying to do a lot with programming. It would be good to hear about the impact of last year's funding.
- l. GRAF: The response to the straw poll is mixed, therefore we will discuss. Aaron asks about the referendum and how this proposal is different or the same as the referendum. Lucy explains that when Adrienne came to visit she mentioned that the proposal and the referendum are meant as complementary to address the issues outlined in the proposal. Lisa mentions the large carry forward for GSA. She suggests not funding until the carry forward is spent down. There is discussion, followed by a straw poll on whether or not to fund.
  - i. Aaron makes a motion to not fund; Regina seconds the motion.
  - ii. Cathy objects to the motion, explaining this proposal would provide essential bridge funding for students coming to the university. Grad students don't receive their first pay check until November 1<sup>st</sup> and the bridge funding will assist with paying for housing, securing a lease, and augmenting what the departments cannot do. There is so much need. Aaron reminds the group

that we have limited funds, and the referendum will likely pass. Cathy explains that there will be a negative trickle down effect if we can't keep grad students here.

- iii. Vote: Yes-7, No-3, Abstain-1. Motion to not fund passes.
- m. FRED/AARCC: The response to the straw poll is mostly positive, therefore, we will maintain for further discussion.
- n. Global Programs/Global Engagement: The response to the straw poll is mostly positive, therefore, we will maintain for further discussion.
- o. Resource Center Year End Ceremonies: The response to the straw poll is mostly positive, therefore, we will maintain for further discussion.
- p. Resource Center Student Employees: The response to the straw poll is mostly positive, therefore, we will maintain for further discussion.
- q. SOMeCA/Peer to Peer Program: The response to the straw poll is mostly positive, therefore, we will maintain for further discussion.
- r. AAPIRC: The response is all positive, therefore, we will maintain for further discussion.
- s. COUP: Cathy recuses herself from the discussion. Strawpoll is mixed so we move to a five minute discussion. Aaron asks about whether the journal that are produced will be sold? This seems odd to take student fees and then make a profit. There is a suggestion to partially fund. Gina shares the same concerns as Aaron. There is consensus that we do want to fund, so we will maintain for future discussion.
- t. AAPIRC PC: Result of straw poll is mixed, so the group moves to a five minute discussion. Suini is hesitant to fund a big ticket item like this. A more substantive funding model is needed to fund positions like this that are essential. Aaron explains that it doesn't seem sustainable to fund someone's position from year to year. Kiryl is concerned for the balance of funding one or some of the PC positions, when we have multiple requests from the Resource Centers. Gina motions to not fund. Regina seconds the motion. Cathy suggest that we invite EVC Tromp to come in to discuss this issue. There are no objections. Motion to not fund passes.
- u. Grad Division Graduation: Result of straw poll is mostly positive so we will maintain for further discussion.
- v. AARCC PC Position: Gina motions to no fund. Aaron seconds the motion. There are no objections. Motion carries.
- w. STARS Peer Mentoring: There is mixed response to the straw poll so the proposal will be maintained for further discussion.
- x. DRC Self-Care: There is mostly positive response to straw poll so we will maintain for future discussion.
- y. Cantu Staff Position: Gina motions to not fund. Ian seconds. There are no objections. Motion to not fund passes.
- z. EOP: Straw poll is mostly positive, so we will maintain for further discussion.
- aa. Westside Writing Center. Last year we funded \$15,000 from SSF. Cathy motions to fund \$25,000. John seconds the motion. There are no objections. Motion carries.
- bb. EOP: Ashley likes the idea but it seems like they don't need the funds immediately. Suini would like to cover the salary for two years, for the 2 student co-leads, 2 during the year and one in the summer. This is Plan B from the proposal. The total is \$13,303. Aaron motions to fund \$13,303. Gina seconds the motion. No objections, motion carries.
- cc. DRC Self-Care: Suini would like to fund parts 1 and 2, not 3 and 4. Part 1 is the grad ceremony, part 2 is programming. Aaron would like to fund part of part 3, suggestion funding the portion of all of the parts. Some estimates seem high. Regina suggests subtracting the refreshments and lounge and funding at \$17,000. Suini suggests we fund \$2700 for Part 1, \$3400 for Part 2. Aaron motions to fund \$10,000 as

follows: \$3,000 for Part 1, \$4,000 for Part 2, \$3,000 for Part 3, with the note that the lounge expansion is not to be funded. Gina seconds the motion. No objections.

dd. STARS Peer Mentoring: The total ask is for \$98,000 for two years. Suini wants to fund about \$15,200 for the peer mentors in the summer (\$14,400) and programming (\$800). Ashley makes a motion to fund at this level. Gina seconds the motion. No objections, motion carries.

4. Announcements

a. CSF is the first weekend of April. Ian, Suini and Juliana are confirmed to attend.

b. Saturday, meeting from 10am – 2pm at Provost House at Cowell.

5. Meeting Adjourned.