

**Student Fee Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2025  
Kerr Hall #278 or Zoom  
3:00 - 4:30 pm**

---

Meeting started at 3:03pm

Present: Marshall, Mel, Cheryl, Trey, Lisa, Wahaj, Katie, Violet

Guests: David Lee, Daniel Pfaff, Ethan Mulle, Rachel Neuman, Sophie Trobitsch, Alyssa Windom

1. Welcome and Introductions
  - a. Members introductions: Name, Pronouns, Year, Major, and Space.
  - b. Order: Cowell, Stevenson, Crown, Merrill, Kresge, Porter, Oakes, RCC, C9, JRL, GSA, GSC, SAB, Provost, SUA, Lisa, Lucy
2. Approval of Agenda & [4/13/25 Minutes](#)
  - a. Tabled as we do not have quorum
3. Public Comment
  - a. No public comment made
4. Announcements & Updates
  - a. Member updates
    - i. Potential Cowell representative found, SCOC contacted on her behalf
  - b. Sometime this quarter Chair/Vice-Chair elections
    - i. Whenever the committee wants
  - c. End-of-year celebration proposed for week 9 or 10
    - i. Order food, go to a dining location
    - ii. Have a weekend get-together
    - iii. Do a fun activity post-meeting
5. Subcommittee Meetings Weekly on Zoom - Choose new times
  - a. [Outreach Committee](#)
  - b. [Audit Committee](#)
6. Campus Elections (3:15 - 4:00 pm)
  - a. Fee Referendum Presentations

Research Pathways funding to expand student opportunities to work on real-world public interest technology projects	New Fee	David Lee	dlee105@ucsc.edu	4/15/2025	3:15 PM
---	---------	-----------	------------------	-----------	---------

Graduate Student Facilities Fee	Fee Amendment/Increase	Ethan Mulle	emulle@ucsc.edu	4/15/2025	3:30 PM
Students for Empowerment and Accountability in Transportation Services (SEATS)	Fee Amendment/Increase	Alyssa Wind...	awindom@ucsc.edu	4/15/2025	3:45 PM

i. Research Pathways

1. Vision: Want to blend learning with real-world projects and experiential learning
  - a. Any student, not just upper-division students in specific majors
  - b. Skill building in user research, visual design, web development, generative AI
2. Student leads are largely unpaid
3. Impacts:
  - a. Accessible experiential learning opportunities
  - b. Programs and platforms for other UCSC students and larger community
  - c. 100% of fees go to undergraduate students
4. \$1.25 per quarter, \$0.75 in summer
5. UCSC has a history of supporting this kind of program, with an even higher fee before
6. Interest in designing/developing new technologies rather than utilizing established technology
7. Strong support in opinion poll; 63%
8. Q: What would be cut if the fee isn't implemented?
  - a. A: Overall decrease in size of the program
9. Q: Do you have students that actually go out and intern in the community, can this be a source of revenue?
  - a. A: Have worked with local high schools and local governments, have not charged for it, only have worked with nonprofit organizations
10. Q: How do you plan to ensure the carry-forward does not grow too large?
  - a. A: Amount of fees is so minimal, if it grows will support more student leads and fellows
  - b. Suggestion to adjust fee language to limit this

ii. Graduate Student Facilities

1. Mission: Provide a comfortable and welcoming space for graduate students and foster a sense of community
2. Also defined by the GSC building itself
  - a. 24 hour access
  - b. Staffed Mon-Fri 9-5
  - c. Reservable event space

3. Seeking \$30 increase to current fees to a total of \$62
4. Need additional funds due to pandemic and inconsistency in downstairs tenant
5. Covers facilities expenses, staff support, major maintenance projects
6. Current fee set to sunset in 15 years
7. 68% of people voted in favor last year, but did not pass as not enough people voted
8. 90% of graduate students would vote in favor
9. Unanimous vote in favor from GSA
10. Support from Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Peter Biehl
11. Q: When was the last time a graduate fee was passed? How can you ensure more students will vote?
  - a. A: The last time a graduate student fee was passed was in 2000, failed every time since due to low voter turnout
  - b. A: Making joint GSA events to garner support for the measure
  - c. Offering incentives, "voting parties"- free food for voting
12. Q: Have you thought about lowering your voter turnout?
  - a. A: Unaware this was even an option, ideal is 500 which is about 25%
13. Q: Can we pause inflationary adjustment to ensure that there isn't significant carry-over?
  - a. As they are facilities costs, carry-forward can go in reserves that go towards building maintenance
14. Q: Who has the power to lower the voter threshold?
  - a. A: Must go to the Chancellor to request, grad students can go below the 20% minimum, recommended to go through GSA

### iii. SEATS

1. 1.14% reallocation of fee
2. VEST commission, Advisory committee for TAPS, establish town halls and clear communication throughout
  - a. TAPS has issues with spreading information throughout
3. Healthy and sustainable relationship between students in TAPS
4. Need to start this now to prevent further incidents
5. Q: If you do not use all of the revenue, due to carry-over, how will the money go back into TAPS?
  - a. A: Thought that entire carry-forward needed to go to TAPS, need to keep money open for issues that come up and higher cost initiatives such as safety consultants
  - b. Proposed carry-forward is very low
  - c. Definitely can add it in language for a percentage of carry-forward

6. Q: Process for representatives must be documented within the by-laws, seems like a self-referential loop as students must be appointed already in order to be appointed
  - a. A: Students who have been creating the Vest Commission are to create the first by-laws
  - b. However, nothing about this is in writing, by-laws must be created already in order to appoint the first members
  - c. Recommend to clarify in writing that the students currently working on the committee will be the first committee members
7. Q: At one time there was a paragraph stating that the commission could make recommendations to reduce the fee at any time, but currently this responsibility rests with SFAC, should be a clause in writing to clarify who has the power to make these decisions
  - a. Follow up: Will the student body will sunset the fee?
  - b. A: In fee language, cannot view transportation as a singular entity, need to give students an opening to ask questions about the fees they are paying to the commission and to avoid interfering with SFAC
  - c. A: Want to have writing in language that the fee will be sunset between now and 2030 when needed and proper procedures will be followed
8. Q: Would SEATS have the ultimate responsibility over fee adjustments or SFAC?
  - a. A: Would like to have collaborative meetings with SFAC, can create more transparency between the two groups
- b. [Schedule + Materials](#) (statements and budgets)
- c. Deliberations for today's presentations
  - i. Research Pathways
    1. Would like to support, students helping out have been unpaid and it's something all undergraduate students can benefit from
    2. Would support if they included clear language preventing escalation or too much carry-forward
    3. Beneficial as there's currently a lack of money going into research, and it would be very beneficial as a research-funded university
    4. Great program for supporting student hands-on development
    5. Only so much you can do with work-study positions, can provide a lot more experiential work
    6. Consensus: Support it providing they give a restriction on their escalator
  - ii. Graduate Student Facilities
    1. Would like to support, \$62 seems high but it is their only source
    2. Perhaps they will come to SFAC less in the future if they have the funds
    3. They are definitely strapped for funds and put in a lot of time and energy to the GSC

4. Should put it in ballot language, endorsing as GSA is also endorsing
  5. Consensus: Support
- iii. SEATS
  1. Like the idea of collaboration between SFAC and SEATS
  2. Idea of 1.14% going towards transportation seems to not be so coordinated
  3. SUGB puts a lot of work in, frustrating for events to be cancelled and student voices to be blocked
  4. Do need to make some tweaks to the language in the fee
  5. Important to lay the groundwork for a group of students working with TAPS specifically
  6. Should hold TAPS accountable for student collaboration
  7. Students pay a large fee but services are still inadequate, so hiring a consultant is a good idea
  8. Should have a permanent staff member managing the process as every year there will be turnover
  9. Think 15% is a good recommendation for limiting carry-forward
  10. Consensus: Support, but language must be added to prevent large carry-forward and return the money to TAPS
- iv. Straw poll
  1. 6/6 Support
- d. Draft statements (from last week)
  - i. Theater Arts Fee Increase: The Student Fee Advisory Committee supports this proposed \$3.00 fee increase because it reflects the rising costs for payroll, costumes, and production materials; costs that have gone up significantly while the fee itself has remained unchanged since its inception in 2003. This fee increase will help sustain the quality of campus theater while expanding access while allowing students to attend more free performances.
  - ii. Resource Centers Fee: SFAC supports this proposed fee because, for the first time, it would provide direct and sustainable funding for the Resource Centers, which have never had a dedicated fee despite their critical role in student support and community building. The budget is responsible and transparent, with a clear focus on expanding student employment opportunities and programming.
  - iii. Student Government Fee Increase: The Student Fee Advisory Committee did not reach consensus....
    1. Deliberate in small groups (based on how folks voted to develop a pro and con statement.
      - a. No consensus, going to write sentence in support and sentence against
      - b. Think that they don't know how much money they have, if they want to lower their carry forward and actually start receiving revenue from their fees it makes sense to give \$100,000 as they will still have enough carry forward for next year's budget

- c. They say they have a budget analyst, seems odd as that may have avoided this debacle
    - d. They seem to lack a staff financial advisor
  - iv. Everyone agrees with other draft statements
- 7. Discussion on TAPS Letter
  - a. [2024 Letter](#)
  - b. [Response from Dan \(to questions we developed on March 11th\)](#)
  - c. No time to discuss
- 8. Adjournment
  - a. Meeting adjourned at 4:29pm

**Upcoming Guests/Topics:**

- 1. 2024-2025 Funding Call
  - a. Resources
    - i. [Proposal Folder](#)
    - ii. [Rating Worksheet](#)
    - iii. [Absent Member Notes](#)
- 2. Student Fee Summit
  - a. [Google Doc](#)
- 3. Campus Based Fees Review for summer session, FY 26