

Student Fee Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
February 4, 2019

---

Attendees: Ashley John, Katie Hellier, Chase Hayes, Lydia Jenkins-Sieczkowski, Sue Carter, Lisa Bishop, Lucy Rojas, Venkatesh Nagubandi, Juliana Nzonga, Adam Selcov, Derek DeMarco, Regina Gomez, Veronica Mity

1. Approval of Agenda, Minutes, Announcements
  - a. Adam motions to approve the agenda; second by Venkatesh. No objections, motion passes.
  - b. Lydia motions to approve the minutes; second by Sue. No objections, motion passes.
  - c. Introductions – we have a few new members.
  - d. CSF Quarterly Meeting
    - i. Ashley explains that two weekends ago, the Winter CSF meeting was held at UCSF and UCOP. Ashley, Chase, Lydia, and Veronica attended the meeting.
    - ii. The Sunday meeting was at UCSF; the main goal was to prep for the meeting with UCOP on Monday. Agenda focused on getting UCOP to recognize CSF as the authority on student fees.
    - iii. On Monday, there were five agenda items discussed at UCOP.
      1. Voting thresholds were discussed for campus elections. Our campus has a 25% threshold, while most other campuses have 20%.
      2. SSF Buy Back, 5%
  - e. Announcements
    - i. Lisa asks that Summer Fees be added to the agenda as soon as possible. We need to have a decision as soon as possible. Ashley explains that there was discussion at the last meeting and a vote. The vote is not cited specifically in the minutes, therefore, Ashley calls for a vote: Proposal is to maintain summer fees at the same level. Adam motions to approve. Venkatesh seconds the motion. No objections, motion passes.
2. Funding Call
  - a. General observations
    - i. Adam shares that he found it difficult to compare proposals given the spread in the amounts and content. We should discuss this further for next year in terms of how we structure deliberations. Could we implement a cut off amount?
    - ii. Venkatesh explains that when it came to student impact, it seemed like some of the reports of how many students would be impacted was a stretch. It seemed difficult to compare this category.
    - iii. Lydia explains that it is difficult to evaluate things that seem they should be funded through other sources, whether SFAC funds should pay for things?
    - iv. Juliana mentions that there are many facility requests. Could these units seek funding from other sources? Lucy explains that only student fee funded facilities were eligible for the call; these facilities are not eligible for state funds.
    - v. Sue asks about past funding? Lucy explains that the funding awards from the past are posted to the SFAC website and are accessible. Adam says that he doesn't want to see this information, so his opinion is not biased. Katie suggests that once the rankings are established, we could see if the higher scores have been funded in the past. Venkatesh agrees with Adam.

- vi. Ashley asks whether there are any questions on things we can't fund? Question asked about TAPS? Response is yes. Veronica asks about salary for KZSC? Ashley responds the only salaries we can't fund are academic/instruction.
  - vii. Discussion regarding how to approach requests that mentioned that they may have funding from other sources. Regina says that it was good to see that proposal authors were trying to secure funding from various sources.
  - viii. Venkatesh asks what is permanent funding? One-time funds are issued one-time and when exhausted, the funding is gone. Permanent funds are reoccurring.
- b. Process Moving Forward
- i. Lucy reviews the scoring spreadsheet and system.
  - ii. Discussion on how to proceed, in terms of evaluation and discussion. Should we have a straw poll process to decide which proposals we will discuss further? Some members do not support this idea, as discussion can be essential to making a determination.
  - iii. Begin with straw poll (starting from the lowest score).
    - 1. #3: Funding for California Democratic Convention – Did anyone meet with this group for the consultation? The proposal stated they met with Adam, but Adam said he did not meet with the group. Adam motions not to fund. Regina seconds the motion. No objections. Motion passes to not fund the California Democratic Convention.
    - 2. #10: Graduate Writing Retreat – Requested amount: \$15,200
      - a. Adam explains that the average per person amount for the program is \$400. This is the one of the main reasons he is not supporting to fund.
      - b. Venkatesh – improving writing for 40 graduate students may not be very impactful. Juliana explains that 40 graduate students is a significant amount of graduate students. Discussion regarding the location of the retreat? Adam refers to Lucy's early comment that we cannot change a proposal.
      - c. Venkatesh suggests sending an email to ask whether the group could have their event on campus.
      - d. Discussion regarding funding the costs of the program, but not room and board.
      - e. Regina motions to further discuss this proposal. Adam seconds the motion. Motion carries.
    - 3. #64: Recreation Rental
      - a. Venkatesh explains that this is cool activity to do, but not a necessity.
      - b. Adam says that his issue with the proposal was that there was a lot of data about the recreation program, but there was no specific data on tent usage.
      - c. Juliana asks whether there is an urgent need for this.
      - d. Motion from Venkatesh to further discuss this proposal. There is no second. Motion fails. Adam motions to not fund. Juliana seconds the motion. There are no objections. Motion passes to not fund this proposal.
    - 4. #71 ARC Water Station

- a. Regina motions to not fund. Venkatesh seconds the motion. Veronica objects. Move to discussion. Veronica explains that the ARC is a busy building and everyone uses the water fountains. Adam responds that many people have never been to the ARC Center. Chase says that EOP is there in addition to tutoring. Katie motioned to table to next meeting. Venkatesh seconded to table. Motion carries.

3. Adjournment

- a. Regina motioned to adjourn; Juliana second the motion. No objections, meeting adjourned.