

**Student Fee Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Agenda**  
**February 3, 2021**

---

Present: Brynna Downey, Lisa Bishop , Chloe Mietzel , Mathew Sarti, Alvin Ho, Andy Huynh , Charlene Proo, Gloria Qiu, Isaac Karth, Sarah Avdeeff , Venkatesh Nagubandi , Vivian Pham, Lucy Rojas

1. Welcome and Introductions
  - a. Brynna reminds the group to complete the funding matrix as soon as possible, this helps inform the order of our discussion.
  - b. Brynna leads the group through introductions. Welcome Charlene as SFAC's newest Oakes representative!
  - c. We are still recruiting a Porter College representative.
  
2. Approval of Agenda and [January 12 minutes](#)
  - a. Gloria motions to approve the agenda, Isaac seconds. No objections, motion passes.
  - b. Alvin motions to approve the minutes, Vivian seconds. No objections, motion passes.
  
3. Funding Modifications to Proposals from 2019-2020
  - a. [Right Livelihood College](#)
    - i. Brynna recaps that it has been a trend that proposal authors will request extensions or amendments to previous allocations due to complications from the pandemic.
    - ii. Mathew asks what would happen if the amendment is denied? Brynna clarifies that the unused money would go into next year's funding pool.
    - iii. Lucy advises to ask for more information. Instead of putting the funding toward the webinars, it's unclear how much of the funds are going toward staff time without further clarity of how the funds are spent. She advises asking how much time is spent planning the events. She also suggests considering the likelihood of holding these events next year. Alvin agrees with Lucy.
    - iv. Lisa says that they can be asked to fill out a budget showing the staff allocations, how they are already being spent, etc.
    - v. There is general consensus to follow up asking for more specifics. The group reviews the materials submitted with this proposal last year. SFAC only funded \$5,500 for the event last year.

- vi. Gloria would be interested in asking for more information, specifically the amount of time that the coordinator would be working on the event, the stipend details, and a new budget sheet for the proposed project. Charlene and Vivian agree.
- vii. Isaac motions to table until more information, Alvin seconds. Motion passes.

#### 4. Funding Proposal Discussion

- a. [Google folder](#)
- b. Ranked [Evaluation spreadsheet](#)
  - i. Brynna explains that the sheet reflects a ranking based on overall scores given, and this is a starting point for discussion.
- c. Discussion: Approach for discussing proposals
  - i. Proposed tool: [running document](#) of thoughts on proposals
    - 1. Track your thoughts, suggested allocation in advance of meetings. This makes sure your voice will be heard if you can't attend in person.
  - ii. There are 43 proposals. The CAPS proposal will be withdrawn and is no longer in the pool, as SFAC previously approved a reallocation of last year's allocation.
  - iii. Brynna asks for ideas about how to approach this ranking.
    - 1. Mathew suggests discussing from highest to lowest ranking. Isaac agrees, SFAC has significantly more requests than funding. Gloria agrees with this method.
    - 2. Gloria asks if there are any proposals that could be immediately disqualified? Brynna says that we could do a quick analysis for SSF or M7 eligibility. UCCSF also has an overall recommendation for the use of student fees that reflects inappropriate allocations for SSF.
    - 3. Vivian asks how these lists were determined? Lucy says that state funds (19900) and auxiliary units are funded through other revenues. Lucy adds that some of the departments on CSF's list do qualify for M7 funds at UCSC specifically.
  - iv. Lucy says that one year, the committee started at the bottom to eliminate proposals with consensus to not fund. However, this process is unique to each year's committee.
    - 1. Venkatesh liked this bottom-up approach when a previous SFAC committee followed this. This could help prioritize funding towards proposals that align with the committee's values.
  - v. Isaac notes that proposals with strong support or non-support are typically quicker to discuss.
  - vi. Mathew motions to go straight to working through the lowest ranked proposals (the streamline model), Charlene seconds.

- d. Brynna asks if the group would like to give 5 minutes to discuss each proposal? Venkatesh said that this method helped progress the discussion when used in previous years.
    - i. Isaac motions to adopt the guideline of the 2min - 5 min - motion sequence. Venkatesh seconds. Motion passes.
5. Announcements & Updates
- a. Meeting day/time for Winter quarter - do Mondays and Wednesdays at 3 pm work for everyone?
    - i. Brynna asks the group how they feel about these times. Consensus that 3-4 pm on Mondays and Wednesdays work.
  - b. Weekend SFAC meeting
    - i. SFAC traditionally has a weekend meeting to complete the proposal process. This is unique to winter quarter. Venkatesh will send out a poll to determine which weekends work best for the group to meet.
  - c. Andy: CALPIRG
    - i. Andy says that CALPIRG is working towards clean energy across the UC campuses.
  - d. [Email from Aaron Jones](#) about Measure 68 Funds
    - i. Last week, EOP staff spoke with SFAC about the use of Measure 68 funds in the virtual environment. Aaron emailed the team asking if SFAC wanted more consultation, or to put their opinions in writing. Brynna reminds that SFAC is a recommending body. Aaron is looking for a statement in writing. Brynna will draft a response of SFAC's considerations, and next time SFAC meets the committee can approve to move forward with submitting to Aaron.
6. Funding Proposal Discussion
- a. Lucy suggests calling out the proposal title, number, and average score across committee members. She also suggests providing rationales for these decisions.
  - b. 40 points - #8 - Equestrian Team proposal for shirts and fees, \$3,500
    - i. Venkatesh motions to not fund proposal 8, Mathew seconds. No objections, motion passes.
    - ii. Alvin liked that they wanted to make their program affordable, but not many students are impacted by the funding. Mathew agrees, and felt that there was a small number of students who would be affected. Gloria agrees.
7. Adjournment
- a. Isaac motions to adjourn, Venkatesh seconds. No objections, motion passes.

**Upcoming Guests/Topics:**

- Director of Budget and Resource Management Kimberly Register
- Review of 2021 proposed referenda
- Review of Summer Fees Lisa Bishop
- Discussion of Use of Measure 68 Funds
- TAPS Annual Budget Review