

Student Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2019

Present: Ashley John, Venkatesh Nagubandi, Adam Selcov, Katie Hellier, Chase Hayes, Lisa Bishop, Lucy Rojas, Lydia Jenkins-Sleczkowski, Ian Gregorio, Veronica Mitry, Sue Carter, Regina Gomez

Guest: Vice Provost Jaye Padgett

1. Approval of Agenda, Minutes, Announcements
 - a. Adam motions to amend the agenda to reduce the elections event discussion by five minutes and allocate new agenda item, SCOC. Lydia seconds the motion. No objections. Adam motions to approve the agenda. Lydia seconds the motion. No objections.
 - b. Minutes: Adam suggests that Katie and Venkatesh be given the opportunity to vote on the funding call as the minutes currently reflect they were not present. No action taken. Lydia motions to approve the minutes. Venkatesh seconds the motion. No objections.
2. Review of agenda items for the remainder of the quarter
 - a. May 13th: Elections Event, 1:00 - 3:00 pm.
 - b. May 20th: Proctoru Presentation, Visit with Dean of Students Garrett Naiman, Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair
 - i. Adam asks whether we should solicit feedback in advance of the meeting from students regarding interest.
 - ii. Intro to CS Class, or Psychology Class. Venkatesh suggests a different course, such as CS 101.
 - iii. Recommendation from Katie: include Committee on Planning & Budget, Academic Senate committee on any future discussions.
 - c. May 27th: No meeting - Memorial Day
 - d. June 3rd: Last meeting of quarter - vote on By-Law updates, Voting for Chair and Vice Chair.
3. Funding Proposal Memo
 - a. Ashley notes that we will include the Buy-Back information in the funding memos that go to the principal officers.
 - b. Adam motions to approve the memo. Lydia seconds the motion. No objections.
 - c. Funding spreadsheet
4. Campus Elections Event Prep
 - a. All four referenda groups have confirmed their participation.
 - b. The event will be catering by Taqueria Santa Cruz.
 - c. The program is as follows: students will be given a quarter sheet and asked to visit the different tables to collect a signature. Then they receive food.

- d. Feedback on the flyer: update how SFAC is listed, and spell out SFAC. Add url. Edit “new referendum” to read something like “find out what’s going to be on the ballot”
5. SCOC
- a. Adam shares that it was brought up at Stevenson Student Council last week that SCOC may not be using their budget in the best way it could. Over the past few years, it has been a tradition for each pair of sister college to put on an event with a budget of \$1,000. There is also a snack budget.
 - b. Discussion
 - i. Veronica explains that SCOC has not spent much of its budget this year as its be spending could be based on the committee taking time to get organized. Katie adds that she does a similar function for GSA and has been asked by committee chairs about undergraduates being appointed.
 - ii. Lucy clarifies that SCOC is not funded by Measure 7, and is funded by Measure 16/22.
 - iii. Venkatesh adds that he thinks this year is an isolated experience, and suggests that any analysis include several years of budget review.
 - iv. Sue asks how many people attend these events.
 - v. Adam suggests that we ask for the budget so we can understand how funds are being spent. It’s mentioned that SCOC hasn’t been paid for the last two quarters.
 - vi. Lisa can obtain reports.
6. Quarry Amphitheater
- a. Lucy explains that she would like to provide updates to SFAC on the Quarry Amphitheater project and ask for SFAC to make a recommendation that \$10,000 of available project funds be designated for a design feasibility study. Lucy’s presentation includes the following:
 - i. November 2014, SFAC recommends use of \$6.388 million in Student Fee reserves to be allocated for Quarry Amphitheater project (\$3.388 million in Seismic & Life Safety Fee Reserves and \$3 million in SSF reserves)
 - ii. University Relations raised an additional \$1.6 million
 - iii. Total project budget of \$8 million
 - iv. Quarry re-opened in fall 2017 following two-year renovation
 - v. As of October 2018, \$759K remained in the project account (the project came in under budget). Andrea Hilderman of Physical Planning and Construction recommended maintaining \$100,000 in reserves through November 2019 to provide a buffer during the design build warranty timeline. \$85K would be maintained to pay for the safety wall. That leaves about \$574K. Lisa indicates this is all Student Services Fees.
 - vi. Whatever is not used from the project balance will be returned to the Student Services Plant Reserve account to be used toward other student fee funded facility projects.
 - vii. Lucy explains that there are a few critical projects that are associated with the first phase of renovations that were determined after the facility

opened. These include: renovation of a storage shed and upgrades to electrical in the entrance area, the stage needs to be sealed, and security cameras must be upgraded.

1. Currently the storage shed has been approved for temporary occupancy by the Fire Marshall; it is being used as the office for the Quarry Staff. It is essential to have staff on site to steward the facility, be present to mitigate vandalism, etc.

viii. It will cost up to \$10,000 to do complete a design study to inform us how much it will cost to upgrade the storage shed and do the other projects. Lucy is seeking a recommendation from SFAC to use \$10,000 from the left over project balance toward this study. Lucy and Lisa confirm that these are not new funds, this would be using funds that the past SFAC (2014) had voted to recommend for the project.

b. Table for further discussion on May 20th

7. By-Law Changes

- a. Adam reminds the group of a discussion we started last week regarding whether we may want to consider changing membership of SFAC. Some of the items to consider include whether the Provost and Staff member should be a voting members, should we expand membership to include student groups, etc.
 - i. Venkatesh mentions that if we expanded the membership, would we have the budget to cover the stipends. We could restructure to have some positions that would have leadership opportunities.
 - ii. Lydia reminds the group that last week we discussed the possibility of keeping our current size, as we can work nimbly and we get a lot of work done. Committee members here have good interactions, we make decisions quickly, there is no hierarchy.
 - iii. Venkatesh shares that we should have better systems to receive feedback from student organizations. Ashley reminds the group that we have two-year terms for a reason and this may be difficult to achieve with student organizations whose leadership turns over annually. Ashley says that improving our outreach to student orgs should be a goal.
 - iv. Adam says that groups could have a seat at SFAC without having voting membership.
 - v. Lydia shares that while our college representation model reflects UCSC structure, her opinion, while she tries to bring its college opinion into this space, is not always representative of her constituency.
 - vi. Viggly asks how other SFACs at other campuses are structured. Ashley says that the short answer is that every campus does it differently. UCB has a four year term. Adam will share a document that CSF generated which reflects each campus structure.
 - vii. Lisa shares that UCOP has given guidance on how SFAC's should be organized.

- b. Attendance option to appoint an alternate. Adam says that we haven't used; should we change. Feedback is that we should leave as is.
 - c. Venkatesh explains that when he started he was confused about the confidentiality part of the committee - could we expand that information in the by-laws.
8. Visit with Vice Provost Padgett
- a. Group begins with introductions
 - b. Ashley provides an overview of the funding allocation process, the timeline, the amounts that were allocated, the approach take to evaluate the proposals, etc. Adam adds information regarding the scale for evaluating and how it was applied. Adam mentions there was a large range in the amounts that were requested, \$1000 - \$100,000.
 - c. Adam explains that there were multiple requests from the same units/programs.
 - d. Venkatesh explains that we noticed that requests for technology often included requests for high end technology; we ended up funding less expensive options.
 - e. Adam explains that most requests that were for multi year but we funded single year mostly.
 - f. Lydia points out that we tried to reach out to orgs when we had questions.
 - g. Ashley talks about the proposal of the change in membership.
 - h. Adam points out the different ideas that were thrown around.
 - i. Jaye talks about the idea to potentially add a grad student.
 - j. Katie talks about how she felt comfortable in this particular group with undergraduates being receptive.
 - k. Venkatesh thinks its an interesting position for the staff to be in and he likes their insight.
 - l. Adam asks how the initial membership came to be and why the addition of the provost and staff member.
 - m. Vignesh agrees with Adam and thinks that Lucy and Lisa's contributions as advisory members are taken extremely seriously.
 - n. Lisa thinks that it's relatively new (2010).
 - o. Jaye says that if SFAC decides to change membership, he would be supportive
9. Adjournment
- a. Lydia motions to adjourn; second by Regina.