

Student Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 20, 2019

Attendees: Ashley John, Katie Hellier, Lisa Bishop, Lydia Jenkins-Sleczkoswki, Ian Gregorio, Chase Hayes, Elliot Lewis, Regina Gomez, Adam Selcov, Derek DeMarco, Lucy Rojas, Veronica Mitry, Viggly Iyer, Venkatesh Nagubandi, Julian Nzongo

Guests:

- Patrick Verzosa, ProctorU
- Associate Vice Chancellor & Dean of Students Garrett Naiman
- Sierra Berg, SUA Academic Affairs Office

1. Approval of Agenda, Minutes, Announcements

- a. Regina motions to approve the agenda. Elliot seconds the motion. No objections. Motion carries.
- b. Lydia motions to approve the minutes. Elliot seconds the motion. No objections. Motion carries.

2. ProctorU Presentation

- a. Link to Video
- b. [Link to Slide Deck](#)
- c. Questions and discussion
 - i. Adam: if we were accessing services through ProctorU, what are the costs? There are negotiated rates for the UC system.
 - ii. Katie: are there options for handwritten tests, where you could have proctoring and submission by taking photos? Patrick responds that how that works through ProctorU, is that a student comes in, clears their work space. When they are ready to submit, there are instructions on how much time a student has to submit. At this point, ProctorU disconnects from the process. They do not proctor during the submission process, because they are not able to observe what's happening during that point.
 - iii. Are there safety issues between proctor and student? Student does not see the proctor; prior feedback was that it can be "creepy." and other feedback. If a test taker doesn't feel OK with the proctor, the test taker can request another proctor and the manager can then proctor the exam. They will then review the video of the session and the proctor may receive coaching. The system is ADA compliant, so they can honor requests (i.e. test taker requests a female proctor, etc.).
 - iv. General protocol for a student who has issues with the proctor, first step is to approach the proctor, this could be problematic and challenging. Is there another process in development to address this?
 - v. Question regarding waiting times for proctors. For instance, if a large class of 100 for instance were taking an exam at the same time, were

there be issues? Patrick responds that they can do about 2,000 exams per hour - that's global. The sooner they have information in about needs, the better in terms of them being able to schedule their proctors.

vi. Discussion

1. As a DRC student, this could be hugely impactful. This could be helpful for relaxation, to work in your own space, as long as there is professor interaction.
2. Adam adds that when we heard this presentation at the beginning of spring quarter, we thought about how this process could help classes that are really impacted that have an enrollment cap.
3. Katie suggests that any other discussion should include faculty.
4. Regina gives her experience of using ProctorU for an exam. She says that the requirements that the exam requires created some planning - clear desk, quiet space, etc. A housemate reported issues with internet connectivity.
5. Chase mentions how do you balance student needs in an impacted course, for instance students need to buy books and then there's a cost to take the exam - where should our resources go? Viggie asks about this. Adam responds that originally, his idea was that we would cover a pilot program as an experiment.
6. Ashley suggests that next steps would include further discussion, invitation to faculty to further discussion.

3. Quarry Amphitheater Project

- a. Ashley reminds the group that Lucy made a presentation last meeting about the use of \$10,000 of remaining capital project funds to be designated for a design feasibility study for a few additional critical projects for the Quarry amphitheater.
- b. Lucy says that the request would be for SFAC to make a recommendation that would then to to CPEVC for approval.
- c. \$800,000 left over not used in the project account.
- d. Adam says that he is in support of this. Ian agrees that because the committee already allocated the funding, he is supportive. Lydia adds that utilizing the funds would be in the spirit of the previous allocation from the 2014 committee. Lydia appreciates that it is coming back to the committee for review.
- e. Viggie asks a clarifying question: are these funds are particularly for facilities? Lucy explains that the SSF reserve can be used to fund projects for student fee funded buildings.
- f. Questions about the deferred maintenance on academic spaces; Lucy clarifies that SSF funds can not be used for academic spaces.
- g. Adam motions to fully approve up to recommend \$10,000 for the project. Lydia seconds the motion. No objections.

4. Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair

- a. Vice Chair
 - i. Veronica nominates herself.

- ii. Lydia nominates Adam. Adam accepts the nomination.
 - b. Chair
 - i. Adam nominates Lydia. Lydia accepts.
 - ii. Veronica nominates Chase. Chase accepts.
 - iii. Viggie nominates himself for Chair.
- 5. Visit with Dean of Students Garrett Naiman
 - a. Introductions - the group members introduce themselves to Garrett
 - b. Ashley provides an overview of what the committee has been up to this year. With the funding call, we allocated approximately \$1.3 million. We reviewed 75 proposals. We engaged in more outreach this year which increased the number of proposal requests from student organizations. We held an elections event on May 13th; it was an educational event. With about 300 people in attendance.
 - c. Adam explains that there were \$3.7 million in requests during the funding call, we allocated \$1.3 million in requests.
 - d. Action item: provide Dean Naiman with the full list of SFAC allocations.
 - e. Garrett's comments
 - i. Garrett acknowledges the committee's efforts. He deeply appreciates SFAC's work. He shares that he believes budgets are moral documents and where we invest our resources reflects our values.
 - ii. Garrett asks why did you get involved in SFAC? Committee members comment.
 - f. Recreation Discussion
 - i. Recreation department
 - ii. \$200,000 carryforward in the student fee that is paid for recreation, Measure 26. The budget is about \$162,000 per year (after return to aid).
 - iii. Adam will share a [presentation](#) that was prepared for SUA, following a meeting that he and Ashley had with Lucy Van Doorn.
 - iv. Outcome: Miscellaneous Fee committee recommended that recreation Misc Fees not be charged for one year.
 - v. The Recreation Department is not cutting classes; the program that may be cut is the Experiential Learning Program (ELP)
 - g. Garrett provides some reflections on his year, what drew him to UC Santa Cruz
 - i. Basic needs
 - ii. Former foster youth
 - iii. Concert - arts are transformative.
 - iv. Questions
 - 1. Viggie - basic needs is an interest of his as well. Transparency and more student involvement in how funds are administered, implemented, etc.
- 6. Adjournment
 - a. Regina motions to adjourn; Lydia seconds the motion. Motion carries.