

Student Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 4, 2020

Present: Lydia Jenkins-Sieczowski, Elliot Lewis, Adam Selcov, Chase Hayes, Brent Insua, Lisa Bishop, Lucy Rojas, Yuhao Chen, Veronica Mitry, Venkatesh Nagubandi, Fiona Weigant, Isaac Karth, Esther Chung.

1. Approval of Agenda and [Minutes](#)
 - a. Elliot motions to approve the agenda.
 - i. Discussion: Adam mentions that new scores have been submitted and the rankings have changed slightly. Should we re-organize the list so the order matches or continue as is, so that the order reflects the what's in the agenda? Adam suggests keeping the list as is. Chase agrees. Lucy suggests that if everyone wants to keep the list as is, we call out in the minutes when we are discussing something out of order.
 - ii. Brent seconds the motion. Motion passes.
 - b. Adam motions to approve the minutes. Elliot seconds the motion. No objections, motion carries.

2. Announcements and Updates
 - a. Announcements
 - i. Adam says that we are having a Mock Trial tournament on Saturday. Please come by and watch. Free for students to attend.
 - ii. Lucy confirms that the referendum authors will be here on February 25th. Lucy has asked that materials be shared in advance.
 - iii. Lisa shares a message from Lucy Van Doorn; please respond to the message regarding the Misc. and Course Fees call for schedule availability.
 - b. Request from Athletics and Recreation for representatives for Student Advisory Committee for Athletics and Recreation
 - i. Lydia shares that we are in receipt of a request from Athletics and Recreation for representatives to serve on the Student Advisory Committee for Athletics and Recreation. The committee will review various student fees that are part of Athletics and Recreation. There are no interested parties.
 - c. Request from Graduate Division
 - i. [Original Funding Award Letter](#)
 - ii. [Request to Amend Allocation](#)
 - iii. Lydia explains that we are in receipt of a request from the Graduate Division to amend their allocation from last year. This relates to the writing retreat activity that we funded last year.

- iv. Adam has mixed feelings about this request. On the one hand, we allocated the funds and we want to honor the spirit of the request. It seems though, because there is \$1500 left over, that the budget was inflated on the proposal side. Precedent says that we have re-allocated in the past.
 - v. Fiona says that the funding reallocation is aligned with the original proposal. There was a stipend for the students.
 - vi. Adam motions to not approve the proposal. Fiona seconds the motion.
 - vii. Discussion on the motion:
 - 1. Venkatesh says that switching line items makes sense within the proposal.
 - 2. Yuhao agrees with Adam
 - 3. Lucy asks whether folks read through the reasons why the request was being made to increase the funding.
 - a. Fiona says that part of the reason that there is leftover funding is because the attendance was less than expected. If the contract was specific to pay a set stipend, it should remain as that.
 - b. Discussion regarding whether it would be appropriate to offer the group the opportunity to submit any out of pocket costs by the graduate students for reimbursement.
 - c. No objections. Motion passes. The reallocation request is denied.
- d. Request from Engineering
- i. [Request to Amend Allocation](#)
 - ii. Request from Engineering: they are asking to extend the funding for use in summer 2020. The request says that they believe they can be more effective in summer session.
 - iii. Adam is not supportive of this request, especially as funding should be reconciled by fiscal close.
 - iv. The request is to extend use of \$4900.00 to September 1, 2020.
 - v. Chase says that the reasons given for the unexpected reasons why they want to spend into summer are unclear.
 - vi. Adam motions to not approve the reallocation. Chase seconds the motion. No objections. Motion passes.

3. Funding Call

- a. Materials and Resources
 - i. [Numbered Folders](#)
 - ii. [Rating spreadsheet](#)
- b. Proposal Discussion
 - i. Continuing with last week's methodology, the following are the next three lowest ranked proposals:

1. #7 Grad Lab
 - a. \$25,000 requested for one year.
 - b. SSF or M7
 - c. Collaboration between GSC and GSA
 - d. Fiona is going to step out for discussion on the next two proposals as she sits on the GSC board.
 - e. Adam says there are some ethical things that we should discuss regarding this proposal. This proposal is asking for funding and they will also fund others. Adam is concerned that we will not have a sense of where funding is going, whether the fund source is used appropriately.
 - f. Elliot agrees with Adam, it's like writing a blank check. The idea is cool but we wouldn't be able to track student impact and the investment.
 - g. May wrote via email: "There were no examples on the types of events or programs that they had in mind for the Gradlab. Most of student funding is stated to be intended to go towards snacks. Would have preferred if they had a clear budget."
 - h. Lisa agrees that the budget was too general.
 - i. Adam motions to not fund this proposal. Brent seconds the motion. No objections. This proposal will not be funded.
2. #58 Coffee, Bagels, and Donuts With...
 - a. \$7,200 request for one year
 - b. SSF or M7
 - c. Graduate Student Commons
 - d. Lisa states that last year this group asked for \$10,000 and we funded \$2,000.
 - e. Adam says that he remembers this proposal from last year. If there is already funding toward this activity, it is difficult to measure student impact of adding some additional events.
 - f. Issac says that this is one of the few channels between graduate students and administration; these kinds of activities are critical right now.
 - g. Lydia mentions that she really liked that the Coastal Campus and Silicon Valley campus were mentioned as key outreach areas. These are underserved communities.
 - h. Adam asks what is the impact of additional meetings? Isaac says that if there are more events, there could be additional guests to engage with. Lucy agrees and says

VPSS funds this activity and she has seen the roster. The guests include Deans, Vice Chancellors, Vice Provosts.

- i. Adam asks what the funding will go to? The funding is used for food and to fund a stipend for a graduate student who coordinates the program.
- j. May says via email: "Currently the bimonthly attendance is only at 30-40 attendees. Though the intention is to gain more attendance by opening it to other campuses, there is no plan on expanding student outreach. No clear budget."
- k. Adam makes a motion to fund \$1,000 toward this proposal. Chase seconds the motion.
 - i. Isaac asks why we would fund less than last year. Adam says that we have less money. Last year it was a new program and we provided some seed money. This year we are adding on. Chase says that using Student Services Fees to fund meetings with administrators is not ideal. There are other ways to open up lines of communication for this kind of proposal.

3. #52 Physics Ergonomics Update

- a. \$74,010 for one year
- b. SSF
- c. Physics Graduate Experience Development initiative (GEDi) Council
- d. May writes via email: "Low student impact. Only 70-80 students. Only accessible by the Physics Graduate students."
- e. Adam says that there will also be a comment about graduate students having lower impact, but we need to pay attention to graduate students. Adam says that he didn't have strong feelings about this proposal.
- f. Fiona says that we should find ways to support graduate students, but this may not be the way best way to support graduate students. Fiona is happy that they have reached out to the ergonomics program.
- g. Chase says that this scored low for him because this seems like something the university should pay for. Is it appropriate to use Student Services Fee for this purpose.
- h. Lucy and Lisa discuss that it may not be appropriate to use SSF to pay for facility costs in an academic program. Chase reviews the proposal and it seems like the furniture will be used for student programming.

- i. Chase asks for clarification on what is being requested. It is 75 desks and 75 chairs.
 - j. Chase motions to table the request. No second.
 - k. Fiona motions to not fund. Adam seconds the motion. Chase objects. He would like more time to further review the proposal. The proposal is confusing because it starts out talking about the council then talks about the desks being used for research and TA work.
 - l. Vote on motion: 3-Yes. 0-No. 5-Abstentions. Motion carries. This proposal will not be funded. Suggest to the group that they read out to Kelli Roberts in SHR.
- ii. Starting from the top ranked proposals
- 1. #13 Slug Support Basic Needs
 - a. \$100,000 for one year
 - b. SSF or M7
 - c. Dean of Students Office/Slug Support Program
 - d. May wrote via email: "I personally gave this one my highest ranking. Budget was very clear, but I do understand it would be a fourth of our budget. This is a very good proposal, and I think it would benefit our students immensely. If we can not fund the full amount, we should definitely fund partially."
 - e. Adam says this was one of our highest funded last year and suspects it will be a high funding amount. Adam thinks that we should fund as much as we can, around \$30,000.
 - f. Elliot says that this program provides so much to students. There a lot of people who need this support. We should provide as much funding as possible because the program is far reaching.
 - g. Chase says that they don't need to turn students away anymore or require students to take loans because of Slug Support.
 - h. Venkatesh says that the pantries are really important.
 - i. Lucy explains that the Slug Support now has good funding levels for housing and food security needs, but is in need for other funds to help with expenses related to mental health, transportation, text books, technology, etc.
 - j. Adam motions to fund \$40,000. Esther seconds the motion. No objections. Motion carries.
 - 2. #32 Resource Center Student Employees
 - a. \$88,200 for one year
 - b. SSF or M7

- c. All six Resource Centers
 - d. Elliot says that this proposal would be successful with other funding bodies. Suggests the group looks elsewhere to make this happen.
 - e. Fiona says that it is very important to fund student positions and it's important that they are reaching to get to \$15. The proposal mentions that the department adjust their budget. She suggests \$50,000.
 - f. Adam says that we shouldn't fund \$50,000 to any one proposal. Adam suggests that we fund 6 work study and 3 non-work study for \$25,000. Adam suggests funding all work study. Chase says that we should fund some non-work study because there may be non-work study students who want to work at the Resource Centers.
 - g. May wrote via email: "This is worth funding as it provides jobs to those from historically disadvantaged communities on campus in safe and supportive environments. Each resource center provided their permanent budget. They do not have enough allocated to provide for the amount of students they want to hire. We have funded them in the past. I think we should continue supporting them."
 - h. Adam motions to fund \$25,200 for 6 work study positions and 3 non work study positions. Chase seconds the motion. No objections. Motion carries.
3. #12 Disability, Identity, and Community Programming
- a. \$24,300 for one year
 - b. SSF
 - c. Disability Resource Center
 - d. Chase says that he is concerned about the correlation between the programming and disability-identifying students.
 - e. Adam says this goes back to something we talked about a few weeks ago. Something is missing. Their budget is not complete. The spreadsheet that was provided does not add up to \$24,300. Adam says that they submitted an incomplete budget and we should consider this in the assessment. Adam says that we should assess based on the info we have, and therefore he would not support funding this.
 - f. Lydia says that we did not see the full budget and she would not fund without having a fuller picture.
 - g. Adam says that when he met with David, David talked about funding programming and salary. We can't assume

this was the intention. Adam restates his position that we should assess based on the information we have. We should set a precedent and not ask for more information from proposal authors.

- h. Elliot asks whether we reached out last year to ask for more information.
 - i. Chase says this is the reason we need to require a standard budget. There are questions that he has about the budget. Chase sees a programming line budget
 - j. May wrote via email: "I support the DRC wanting to put on programs to create a community for those using the DRC. The budget was very transparent. I think funding at least two interns would go a long way programming wise. I also think funding at least 50% of the programming budget would give them a good start to executing their plan to expand their programming."
 - k. Adam motions not to fund. Fiona seconds the motion. No objections. Motion passes.
 - l. Chase comments that we need to remind our proposal authors to follow the rubric and explain how the programs they are proposing connect to the mission of their programs.
 - m. Lucy asks how do we reconcile that we are not funding one of the highest ranking proposals. Discussion: The ranges are very wide on the scores. There are some scores in the 60's and some in the 90's. Fiona is not inclined to fund cookies and movies; she would have been interested in funding programming that is more relevant. Chase adds that he would like to see a greater connection between the programming and the goals of the program. Fiona says, for instance, workshops to help students develop skills to ask for accommodations.
4. #18 EOP Textbook Lending Library, Program: Student Payroll and Supplemental Materials
- a. \$76,878.80 over two years
 - b. SSF or M7
 - c. EOP
 - d. May wrote via email: "The EOP Textbook Lending Library is a great resource for students. Given the increase of demand in the program, it only makes sense to have to increase the payroll. It is also innovative for the TLL to want to expand to supplemental material since textbooks are not the only thing to be requested in courses."

- e. Elliot suggested \$15,500 for one year of materials in her notes.
 - f. Chase is interested in funding the books primarily.
 - g. Adam motions to fund \$15,500 to fund the supplemental materials line item for one year (clickers, readers, homework codes, calculators, cameras, art supplies). Elliot seconds. No objections. Motion carries.
5. #31 East Side and West Side College Sponsored Writing Centers
- a. \$102,353 over two years
 - b. SSF
 - c. Council of Provosts
 - d. May wrote via email: "Hypothetically this would be a fourth of our budget. I would feel more comfortable partially funding or even just funding them for one year. I think the writing centers are a really good resource for students and often utilized. The surveys show that the reception of the services the writing center provides is well received by students."
 - e. Chase asks whether there are other fund sources that could pay for this resource?
 - f. Lucy asks whether anyone has used these services or knows anyone who uses these programs? No one has direct experience with the program. Lisa suggests looking at the data of usage. There is usage for the Westside Writing Center.
 - g. Lydia says that most of the funding would go to wages.
 - h. The budget document for this proposal was incomplete.
 - i. The minimum hours to make the center viable is 44 per week. \$50,420 is the minimum needed to make the program viable for one year.
 - j. Adam motions to fund \$25,000 for half of year one. Chase seconds the motion. Motion passes.
6. #33 CAPS Peer Educator Program
- a. \$16,000 for one year
 - b. SSF or M7
 - c. CAPS
 - d. May wrote via email: "As we all know, CAPS has always had an influx of students seeking help oftentimes being turned away from CAPS. I think the PEP program is a great gateway program for these students to seek help and navigate mental health issues. It is a great stepping stone to those students who need help. I believe this is a program that would highly benefit the student body."

- e. Adam suggests that we fully fund this proposal.
 - f. Chase says that he would like to fund the staffing costs, but not the conference costs.
 - g. Elliot thinks that we should fully fund. It is a lower amount among the requests.
 - h. Fiona says that attending a peer educator conference for professional development is very important. Fiona thinks that we should fully fund.
 - i. Adam motions to fully fund. Brent seconds. No objections. Motion carries.
7. #9 KZSC Business Manager Year 2
- a. \$75,000 for one year
 - b. SSF or M7
 - c. KZSC Radio Station
 - d. Lydia leaves the room; she is recusing herself from discussion.
 - e. May wrote via email: "I think having a business manager is critical for KZSC. Given their long term goal of expanding the KZSC program and building, they need to have someone help the program survive or they risk cutting programs provided by KZSC that students enjoy."
 - f. Fiona is very much in support of this proposal. KZSC is part of UCSC's identity. She was devastated when the journalism major ended. Having a business manager should help increase revenue in year 2. If we vote to approve this, we should follow up and see how they are doing.
 - g. Elliot agrees and says this is very important. But she doesn't like the message of fully funding this proposal while we gave only \$40,000 to basic needs. Fiona responds that there will never be enough for basic needs and we need to think about supporting other programs.
 - h. Adam thinks that we can fund half and meet both goals mentioned by Fiona and Elliott. We can fund multiple proposals while still having basic needs at the top of our list.
 - i. Lisa asks what other funds are available to cover this need? Fiona says that it would be very difficult to do this position 50% time. We would risk losing this person if the position was part time.
 - j. Elliot agrees and recommends that there are other funding bodies that would be open to funding this.
 - k. Fiona motions to fully fund. No seconds. Motion dies.

- I. Chase motions to table discussion to the next meeting.
Brent seconds the motion. Motions carries.

4. Adjournment

- a. Chase motion to adjourn. Elliot seconds the motion. Motion carries.

Next meeting: February 18, 2020, 2:30 - 4:30 pm, Bay Tree Amah Mutsun