

Student Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 11, 2020

Present: Lydia Jenkins-Slecowski, Brent Insua, Fiona Weigant, Lisa Bishop, Lucy Rojas, Chase Hayes, Adam Selcov, May Alvarez, Yuhao Chen, Elliot Lewis, Isaac Karth, Esther Chung, Venkatesh Nagubandi, Brynna Downey

1. Approval of Agenda and [Minutes](#)
 - a. Elliot motions to approve the agenda. Yuhao seconds the motion. No objections. Motion carries.
 - b. Adam motions to approve the agenda. May seconds the motion. No objections. Motion carries.

2. Announcements and Updates
 - a. Announcements
 - i. Lucy reminds everyone that next week's meeting will be at Bay Tree Amah Mutsun Conference Room.

3. Funding Call
 - a. Materials and Resources
 - i. [Numbered Folders](#)
 - ii. [Rating spreadsheet](#)
 - b. #9 KZSC Business Manager Year 2 (tabled from last meeting)
 - i. \$75,000 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. KZSC Radio Station
 - iv. Lydia removes herself from the conversation.
 - v. Adam explains that this item was tabled from last week - we were not able to reach consensus at the last meeting.
 - vi. Lisa says that she looked at the Student Media Referenda and there is a large carry forward. Can this fund source be used for this expense. Fiona asks who administers this fund source?
 - vii. Adam says that last week he moved to fund half of this request. There was no second.
 - viii. Brynna shares via email: "This seemed like a really great thing to sponsor on campus as it seemed to embody what makes UC Santa Cruz unique. By funding a business manager, the radio station would be able to do fund-raising in the future, continue professional development for students, and somehow make up for the lack of a communications/journalism major (I may or may not have read that right...). The application made it sound like they only needed one year of funding to get themselves off the

ground and develop a long-term revenue model. I'm all for funding things that just need a push and then are capable of sustaining themselves after that. I support funding 100%.”

- ix. Brent motions to fund half of the position, \$37,500, and encourage KZSC to inquire with Student Media Voice Fee (Measure 34) about the possibility of funding the other half. Second by Yuhao. No objections. Motion carries.
- c. #55 Student Advocate’s Office (SAO)
- i. \$22,090 for one year (\$1,091 in permanent funds)
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. SUA Office of Student Life
 - iv. Chase removes himself from the discussion.
 - v. Adam suggests that we should allocate the permanent funding to this request. It has been a few years that we have had this in our available funds. Adam suggests funding half of the one-time request.
 - vi. Adam motions to allocate the permanent funds for this proposal, \$1091. Second from May. No objections. Motion passes.
 - vii. Adam asks where is the budget going to? Fiona responds that the budget is broken down by categories, salary + benefits, equipment and supplies, travel, training for a total of \$22,090. There are three student employees and four case workers. Lydia says that the budget is in the word document on the second page. The case workers are also student employees.
 - viii. Brynna shares via email: “Anything that supports the pantries and slug support seems like a worthy recipient of student fees. With thousands of cases and pantry visits a year, this would have a huge impact on students. I'm for funding this 100%.” Adam clarifies that this funding is not going to a food pantry, correct?
 - ix. Lydia reminds the group that part of the funding
 - x. Brent says that SUA has a line item for student organizing travel. We can forgo this part of the proposal and fund the payroll and equipment.
 - xi. Adam motions to fund \$10,509 for the student advocate office chief of staff and the four case workers. Second from Yuhao. No objections. Motion carries.
- d. #42 QTEACH: Queer & Trans Education, Advocacy & Community Healing
- i. \$10,000.00 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. Cantu Center
 - iv. Brynna shares via email: “Crisis management training is invaluable, and I support funding this especially for an underserved population on campus. I appreciate that there was a detailed list of short-term and long-term goals and budget items. I support funding 100%.”

- v. Adam says it is somewhat risky given it's a pilot program. That said, Adam agrees with Brynna that it's important to fund these kinds of program. It is a good program. In terms of student impact, who would this program target? If this program is not structured appropriately it doesn't reach the people who really need it.
 - vi. Lydia says that she met with this group during the consultation process. There have been some specific incidents that occurred in residence halls, and this program did restorative circles. The training would prepare students do to this kind of work.
 - vii. Elliot says it's helpful to hear from Lydia. This is something very important that we need to fund. Students need a resource that they can go to help. Elliot supports fully funding.
 - viii. Adam asks whether the program would be aimed at helping RAs and community leaders who advocate on behalf of? Lydia says not necessarily, the assistance would be within the community where an incident takes place. Adam asks for example, an incident happens at Stevenson - is it mandatory that every student attend the restorative activity? Lydia says it's not geared for RA's. The facilitators would be available to people like RAs to come into a space. It's unclear whether interventions would be mandatory.
 - ix. Fiona asks who is doing the training? She would want to make sure whoever is training the interns to be advocates in a crisis are receiving the appropriate training. Lydia responds that the proposal outlines that the Director of the Cantu Center would be doing the training.
 - x. Adam wants to fully fund but there are a lot of questions. Adam motions to fund \$4000. Elliot seconds the motion. No objections. Motion passes.
- e. #40 SOMeCA: Peer-to-Peer Program
- i. \$9,009 for for two years
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. SOMeCA
 - iv. Brynna shares via email: "Correct me if I'm wrong, but this seems like a minimum wage increase application. All of the infrastructure is there, they're doing all the operations, they have the staff, they need to cover an extra \$1/hr. I support funding 100%."
 - v. The funding being requested is a total of \$9009 for a two year program. Lisa says that last year SFAC funded this program.
 - vi. Adam says that we should fund one year. Year one is \$3702.
 - vii. Fiona says that they are requesting the funding for the minimum wage increase. It appears they don't have the funding to make these salary increases over time.
 - viii. May motions to fund \$3702 for year one of the proposal. Brent seconds the motion. No objections. Motion passes.

- f. #16 CARE Advocate for Survivors of Sexual Assault, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking
- i. \$209,300 for two years
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. Campus Advocacy, Resources, and Education (CARE)
 - iv. Adam says that this proposal was difficult for him to think about in terms of how much to fund. This deserves to be fully funded and we don't have that much funding to give out. Even funding one year would be difficult. Adam would like to give as much funding as possible. Can we spend $\frac{1}{3}$ of our budget on one proposal.
 - v. Elliot asks whether there is any alternative fund source? Lucy says...[add comment here]
 - vi. Adam suggests \$40,000 but that doesn't even fund half a position. Fiona says that in the proposal it says that if the position is only funded partial or one-year, the unit will do its best with its current resources. Reading between the lines, it doesn't look like they have any other sources of funding. Adam motions not to fund. We can't fund \$100,000 and they won't be able to create the position. Discussion:
 1. Lucy asks if Lisa can share the available funding that remains following the earmarks that have been made. Lisa says that we have \$521,589 remaining to allocate.
 2. Chase asks how many proposals have we funded. We've funded about half of the requested amounts thus far.
 3. Lydia asks whether we should come back to this proposal and revisit this proposal. Adam asks if we can earmark the full amount in our calculations.
 4. Adam withdraws his motion.
 - vii. Chase motions to fund year one \$104,650 for the CARE Advocate. If we need to adjust at the very end given other proposals, we can do so. Adam seconds the motion. No objections. Motion carries.
- g. #15 Student Parent Meal Plan
- i. \$19,289 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. STARS
 - iv. Adam suggests funding 500 meals to be split up however STARS would like. Each meal is \$9.50. \$4750.
 - v. May agrees that 500 is a good number; this is about one-fourth of the requested amount of meals.
 - vi. Chase asks what is the rationale of funding just one quarter? Adam says that 500
 - vii. May clarifies in their budget they are asking 500 meals per quarter. Should we assign to a specific quarter, or have STARS assign as they see best for the program.

- viii. Chase suggests funding \$7000, that is three meals per day for three quarters.
- ix. Fiona says that she is looking at the budget and the line item does specify 500 meals per quarter and a student coordinator.
- x. Fiona suggests that we fund 500 meals and a portion of the student coordinator's position. Fiona says it's important to make sure programs have infrastructure and support.
- xi. Adam motions to fund \$4750 for 500 meals. Second from May.
 - 1. Chase objects. Chase says that 500 meals is not enough to sustain a program like this. Chase motions to fund \$9500 for two quarters of the program.
 - 2. Adam clarifies that the proposal is not asking to fund one person over a sustained period of time. The program is meant to provide additional help to multiple students and their children. Adam doesn't think we should be thinking of this as funding one person's complete meals
 - 3. Role call on the first motion to fund \$4750 for 500 meals: Yes - 5, No - 3, Abstain - 3. Motion passes.
 - 4. Chase's motion is concluded with the vote.
 - 5. Lydia clarifies that the proposal says that 20 students will be awarded 25 meals each. Adam clarifies that he did not mention any restrictions.
- h. #49 Veteran Resource Center
 - i. \$60,977.46 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. UCSC Veteran Resource Center
 - iv. Elliot says that she met with the author of the proposal which included a tour of the Resource Center. One of the benefits of the program is that veterans can make copies however the printer was broken. The furniture is outdated. Elliot believes this is very important to support our student veterans and their dependents.
 - v. Fiona reminds everyone that the proposal includes three tiers of funding. If we decide to partially fund, let's follow the tiers. See page 8 of the proposal.
 - vi. Chase asks whether the the Veterans Center is funded through the state? The proposal budget reflects the Center's budget comes from SSF and Measure 7.
 - vii. Elliot says that we should fund Tier 1.
 - viii. Elliot motions to fund Tier 1 \$10,534.61. Venkatesh seconds the motion. Discussion: Fiona says there is a discrepancy between what is on the Google form and what was listed on the budget that was submitted. The Google form lists Tier 1 at \$12,377.38. Elliot withdraws the motion. The committee adds the amount requested from the budget to the tax amount

and the total is \$11,377.38. Fiona motions that we fund Tier 1 and tax at \$11,377.38. Elliot seconds the motion. No objections.

- i. #3 SHOP'n Cart!
 - i. \$25,000 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. Student Health Outreach and Promotion
 - iv. Adam says that he doesn't think we should be funding this at all. There are cars that cost less than \$25,000. It doesn't seem as though the program will be expanded.
 - v. Lydia says that she met with this proposal group and Meg explained that some students experience stigma in coming to a location like SHOP so this cart will find students where they are.
 - vi. Elliot says that when she was a first-year living on the West Side of campus, it was challenging to get to SHOP.
 - vii. Chase agrees with Elliot that based on geography, it can be difficult for students to seek services. He also sees Adam's perspective of spending this much funding on a car. Are there alternate programming ideas to meet the goals of remote programming?
 - viii. Yuhao motions to not fund. Adam seconds the motion. Fiona objects.

Discussion.

 1. Fiona says that the cost involved customizing the cart. Lucy explains that we could decide to fund up to a specific amount and see how the fundraising efforts go.
 2. Vote: Yes -6 No - 5 Abstain - 1
 3. Motion Passes to not fund.
 4. Lisa reminds the group that this proposal is for a vehicle that will require maintenance. Could the group share the vehicle with another group. Fiona responds that she noticed that the budget request includes 3 years of funding for maintenance. It would be Ta UC vehicle that requires maintenance, risk review, insurance. The proposal says that fund raising would continue to fund maintenance. The proposal says that the car would be shared with other units. This can be a source of revenue too.
 5. Lydia says that the motion to not fund passed and she recommends that we move on. Lydia will make a note to revisit the proposal when we finalize the funding allocations, given the discussion that occurred following the vote.
- j. #24 FRED (Facilitators for Racial Ethnic Diversity)
 - i. \$20,850 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. African American Resource & Cultural Center
 - iv. Adam suggests that we consider this proposal as we did #42 QTeach . He likes this proposal and thinks we should fund as much as possible.

- v. Elliot mentions that it looks like some of the content was copied and pasted from another proposal that was submitted.
 - vi. Brynna calculated that if we fund two facilitators that equates to \$9,000. Adam and Elliot agree with this amount. Brynna motions to fund \$7,440 for two facilitators, supplies and expenses. Adam seconds the motion. No objections. Motion carries.
- k. #29 We Belong: Collaboration for Community-Engaged Research and Immigrant Justice
- i. \$50,911 for one year
 - ii. SSF
 - iii. Community-Based Action Research and Advocacy Program (CARA) of Oakes College; Center for Labor Studies; Santa Cruz Institute for Social Transformation.
 - iv. Question regarding whether we can pay for GSR? Lucy specifies that we can not use SSF to offset tuition. Lucy says that if it's unclear we can be clear in the funding letter that the funding can only be used for payroll costs.
 - v. Adam suggests funding 2 grad students + 8 undergrads with the stipulation that it's through payroll. \$27,425
 - vi. Chase asks whether any course credit is being given? Lydia says that the proposal says summer research is not tied to course credit.
 - vii. Adam motions to fund 2 grad students and 8 undergraduate students for a total of \$27,525.
 - 1. Brynna says that it seems like a lot of money. Adam is open to reducing. Adam is open to reducing to \$20,000
 - 2. Adam moves to fund \$20,000 toward program costs with the stipulation that grad student expenses must be paid through payroll. Brynna seconds the motion.
 - a. Fiona says this is a wonderful research project, especially to provide undergraduate students with research opportunities. Fiona states that she doesn't know if we should be using our funds to fund this kind of activity especially when there are needs for things like basic needs. It is a good project and good community outreach.
 - b. Vote: Yes-7, No-1, Abstain-4. Motion passes.
- l. #35 Resource Centers Year End Ceremonies -
- i. \$29,000 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. All 6 Resource Centers
- m. #14 Global Programming -
- i. \$46,968.00 for one year
 - ii. SSF
 - iii. Global Engagement

- n. #56 Funding Slugbotics' ROV for the international MATE Competition
 - i. \$5,000 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. Slugbotics (student org)
- o. #45 Southwest Asian and North African Student (SWANA) Programs Intern
 - i. \$12,881 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. Asian American/Pacific Islander Resource Center
- p. #53 Pathways to Research (P2R) Program Proposal
 - i. \$152,348.78 for three years
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP), Pathways to Research
- q. #38 Sister Solidarity 2021
 - i. \$10,045 for one year
 - ii. SSF or M7
 - iii. Women's Center

4. Adjournment

- a. Yuhao motions to table the remaining agenda items to the next meeting. Fiona seconds the motion. No objections.
- b. Lisa confirms that we have \$373,000 remaining to allocate. Adam adds there are 36 proposals left to discuss.
- c. Esther motions to adjourn. Yuhao seconds the motion. Meeting adjourned.

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

Future Guests:

- Referendum Authors, 2/25/20 @ 2:30 pm
- iCP/EVC Kletzer, 2/25/20 @ 3:30 pm